



LIBRARY

OF THE

Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

EX 9225 .B767 W3 1887

Walker, Norman L.

Robert Buchanan, D.D.







DR. ROBERT BUCHANAN.







*N. W. Buchanan*

ROBERT BUCHANAN, D.D.

An Ecclesiastical Biography.

BY THE

REV. NORMAN L. WALKER,

AUTHOR OF "OUR CHURCH HERITAGE," "AN  
EARNEST PASTORATE," ETC.

---

SECOND THOUSAND.

---

LONDON: THOMAS NELSON AND SONS,  
EDINBURGH AND NEW YORK.

1877.



## PREFATORY NOTE.

---

THIS work was undertaken at the request of Dr. Buchanan's family. I was also urged to it by many of his most intimate friends in the Church, and in a way that made it impossible for me to decline the undertaking. I do not, however, propose to make any apology for the manner in which the work has been executed; it must, of course, be left to be judged on its own merits. Dr. Buchanan's public career stretches over a remarkable epoch,—from 1827 to 1875,—and in his Diaries he has left most interesting notices of the politico-ecclesiastical negotiations of the period. These have been embodied in the work, and of themselves add greatly to its value. I am anxious to take advantage of the opportunity afforded in a Preface to express my special obligations to D. Maclagan, Esq., of Edinburgh, and Dr. James Walker of Carnwath. Both of them read the proof-sheets as they passed through the Press; and as both have a peculiarly intimate acquaintance with the ecclesiastical history of the period through which Dr. Buchanan lived, there was scarcely a single chapter in connection with which I did not benefit by their suggestions and advice.

DYSART. *May 1877.*

NORMAN L. WALKER.





# CONTENTS.



## CHAPTER I.

### EARLY LIFE AND MINISTRY AT GARGUNNOCK.

Birth—School and college—Ordination—Snowstorm—First parish—The manse and church—A high watchword—Parochial labours—First Assembly—Bible Society..... 1-6

## CHAPTER II.

### THREE YEARS IN EAST LOTHIAN.

The new parish—The Fletchers of Salton—Diary—Visitation—A ministerial difficulty and conference—The Apoerypha Controversy—Dissent—As a country minister—Early fruit—Dr. Andrew Thomson..... 7-16

## CHAPTER III.

### THE NEW EPOCH.

French Revolution—Time of excitement—Modern era begun—History of Reform Bill—Social movements—Stir in ecclesiastical circles—Chalmers—Campbell of Row—Heresy trials—Literature—Is the wave spent?—The Oxford Movement—Breaking up of the Scottish Church..... 17-25

## CHAPTER IV.

### SETTLEMENT IN GLASGOW.

A former election to the Tron Parish—A change for the better—His new sphere of work—Dr. Dewar—Sabbath schools—The Veto Act—Vote in the Presbytery of Glasgow—Engagement in public business..... 26-33

## CHAPTER V.

### EDUCATIONAL REVIVAL.

Complaint of Parish Teachers—Mr. Dunlop—The "Presbyterian Review"—An Education Board—Scotland, a half-educated nation—Proposed Normal seminary—Maiden speech in the Assembly—Our National Schools and our National Church..... 34-41

## CHAPTER VI.

## AGITATION FOR CHURCH EXTENSION.

Rapid increase of Dissent—Moderate obstructiveness—The “Darling Object of the Church”—Mr. William Collins—The Moderatorship Controversy—Appeal for fresh State Endowments—Whig and Tory ministers—Royal Commission of Inquiry—Deep dissatisfaction—Meeting in Trades’ Hall—Speech by Mr. Buchanan—The Dean of Faculty’s warlike blast—Independence of the Church—The Dissenters—Working of the Commission—Deputation to London—First experience of railway travelling—Diary—Discussion in the House of Lords—Character of Sir James Graham—Last talk with the Tory leaders—No confidence in the Whigs—Banquet to Sir Robert Peel—A lesson..... 42-105

## CHAPTER VII.

## THE VOLUNTARY CONTROVERSY.

Sermon by Dr. Marshall—The *Christian Instructor*—Lectures on *Church Establishments*—Mutual misunderstandings—Two parties in Downing Street—Uses of the controversy—Its relation to the Veto Act..... 106-119

## CHAPTER VIII.

## DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

The Auchterarder disputed settlement—Appeal to the Civil Courts—Ominous utterances from the Bench and the Bar—Mr. Dunlop’s challenge on the subject of Ordination—Assembly of 1838—Mr. Buchanan’s speech—The debate and vote—Thickening of the conflict—Dr. Chalmers’ motion in 1839—Disenchantment—The Tories as faithless as the Whigs—Lord Aberdeen—Sir Robert Peel’s advice, and the answer of Chalmers—Principles of the opposite party—Devotion to THE CONTRACT—An illustration—Mr. Gladstone on Dr. Norman Macleod—What the Evangelicals really contended for—Lord Cockburn on the relations of the Civil Courts to the Church..... 120-159

## CHAPTER IX.

## PEACE NEGOTIATIONS.

Government appealed to—Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Dunlop as deputies in London—Interview with Lord Melbourne—Meetings with the Politicians—Lord Aberdeen’s Bill—Marquis of Breadalbane—Threats in Parliament—Duke of Argyle’s Bill—Claim of Right rejected—The Forty—Sir James Graham does not fulfil the hopes of the Church Extension Deputation—Letters to Mr. Dunlop and Dr. Harry Rainy—Dr. Buchanan and Sir Robert Peel—The Strathbogie ministers—Too late repentance of the Tory Statesmen..... 160-208

## CHAPTER X.

## THE DISRUPTION TIMES.

Encouraging letter from the Marquis of Lorne—Chalmers on the Whig and Tory Ministries—State of People—Lord Cockburn’s account of the Disruption—Letters from the Assembly of 1843—Speech in Canonmills—Last sermon in the Tron—

First sermon in the Free Church—Scene in the City Hall—Degree of D.D.—Church History Chair in Glasgow University—Busy days—The Glasgow Assembly—Strength of the Free Church—Its Finance—Its Missions—Its catholicity—Site-refusing—Call of Dr. Guthrie to London—Claims of the Metropolis recognized—The Inverness Assembly—Dr. Macdonald's famous text—Culloden—Letters from the Assembly Hall—Doehfour—Chalmers, Candlish, Guthrie, and Begg—Character of the times..... 209-257

## CHAPTER XI.

## PROBLEMS OF FINANCE.

Principle of a Sustentation Fund—Chalmers pronounced Utopian—The Reality—Dr. Buchanan designated to the Convener'ship—Success of his first efforts—Professor Miller—The dynamics and mechanics of the Fund—Paper read before the Statistical Society—First two Secretaries—Collectors—Equal Dividend—Modifications—Surplus Fund—Principles ascertained—Ministerial incomes in the Free Church—Dr. Buchanan's conclusions—Effect of Giving on Church work—Progress—Last letter from Rome ..... 258-287

## CHAPTER XII.

## THE WRITING OF THE STORY.

Two possible Historians—Publication of "The Ten Years' Conflict"—Opinions of Mr. Dunlop, Lord Jeffrey, Mr. Smith of Jordan Hill, and others—Letter from Mr. Gladstone—The Ten Years' Rebuilding..... 288-299

## CHAPTER XIII.

## MISSION WORK IN THE WYND8.

Mr. W. Campbell of Tillichewan—The Wynds—First evangelistic efforts of the Free Tron Church—The Schoolmaster in the Wynds—Glasgow Church Statistics—Speeches in Presbytery and General Assembly—New Building Society—The erection of the Wynd Church—Workers in the territory—Offshoots—Building of the Bridgegate, Trinity, Barony, and Augustine Churches—Extraordinary success—Characteristics of the mission—Dr. Buchanan's relation to it.. 300-338

## CHAPTER XIV.

## TRAVEL.

Furloughs—Interest in foreign countries—Paris—Brussels—Holland—Switzerland—Free Church of the Canton de Vaud—The Holy Land—Jerusalem and the Mount of Olives—The Dead Sea—Lake of Galilee—A yacht-voyage to Norway—Appreciation of natural beauty..... 339-360

## CHAPTER XV.

## THREATENED RENEWAL OF THE CONFLICT.

The Cardross Case—Joy of adversaries—Position of the Free Church—What might have happened if the Erastian view had been enforced—Lord Deas—Break-down of the Prosecution—Correspondence with Mr. M'Millan—Mr. Dunlop on Liberty of Conscience—Dr. Buchanan's speech in 1860—Christ and Cæsar—

The Scottish Bench now knows no such institution as *a Church*—A union between Church and State on Confession of Faith principles no longer possible..... 361-385

## CHAPTER XVI.

### HONOURS.

Translation to the College Church—Chosen Moderator of General Assembly—Dr. Cunningham—Tercentenary of the Reformation—The Revival—Dr. Candlish's congratulations—Presentation of four thousand guineas—Characteristic letters—Dr. Buchanan's fame as a financier..... 386-402

## CHAPTER XVII.

### BEGINNING OF THE UNION MOVEMENT.

A postponed duty—Drs. Chalmers, Candlish, and Cunningham in 1843—Proposal made in 1863—Dr. Buchanan's speech—Dr. Charles Brown—A clear understanding of the issues—Dr. Gibson's amendment—Mr. Dunlop—Dr. Begg..... 403-424

## CHAPTER XVIII.

### OVERCASTING OF THE SKY.

Fruit of first year's Conferences—Common principles—Differences—The shadow of a doubt—Dr. Buchanan anticipates it—His arguments for proceeding—Dr. Julius Wood's opposition—Increasing hostility to the movement—The crisis of 1867—Charges of inconsistency—Dr. Buchanan on Voluntaryism as understood by him in 1835 and in 1865—Dr. Cunningham on the weight to be attached to a theoretical difference..... 425-443

## CHAPTER XIX.

### THE CONTROVERSY.

Too soon to tell the Story of the Controversy—An incredible theory—The true explanation—Appearance of two tendencies—Misunderstanding—Revival of Moderatism—National Religion—Correspondence—A Scottish Churchman..... 444-472

## CHAPTER XX.

### THE NATIONAL CHURCH OF THE FUTURE.

The Church after 1843—Union Movement—A new issue raised—Two views—Plan in 1865—Anti-Patronage Deputation—Mr. Gladstone's Answer—The hereditary claim—A *coup d'état*—Dr. Buchanan on the Patronage Act—Lord Ardmillan—Letter to Mr. Dodds—Conclusions..... 473-490

## CHAPTER XXI.

### REVOLUTION IN THE SCOTTISH NATIONAL SCHOOL SYSTEM.

The Parochial Schools—Compulsory Free Church Scheme—Dr. Robert Macdonald—New National System—Result of a sectarian policy—Glasgow Normal School—School Board..... 491-499

## CHAPTER XXII.

## A CITIZEN OF GLASGOW.

Motto on coat of arms—Sabbath trains—Bible Society—Irish famine—Penny Savings Banks—Interest in educational institutions—The university—Principalship of Free Church College—Loch Katrine Water Scheme—General interest in the city..... 500-514

## CHAPTER XXIII.

## LAST YEAR AT HOME.

Death of Dr. Candlish—Last interview between Candlish and Buchanan—Letters—Union with Reformed Presbyterian Church—Proposed visit to Rome—Personal influence—Last speech on Sustentation Fund—Dr. Roxburgh—Preparation for visiting Italy—Free Church Continental Charges..... 515-531

## CHAPTER XXIV.

## ROME.

Journey from England—The Carnival—First impressions—Garibaldi and Gavazzi—Sight-seeing—Tivoli and the Appian Way—Chiesa Libera and the Waldenses—Roman Protestantism—Importance of Free Church Station—Appii Forum and the Three Taverns—Roman climate—Meeting of Presbytery—Italian infidelity—Need of a Luther—Last illness—Death..... 532-550

## CHAPTER XXV.

## THE NECROPOLIS.

A city of the dead—Dr. Buchanan's grave—The two funerals—Conveyance home of the remains—Streets of Glasgow on 18th of May 1875—Family left behind..... 551-555

## CHAPTER XXVI.

## "ULTIMUS ROMANORUM."

"A grave and stately figure"—His "splendid courtesy"—A reproach—Dr. Roxburgh on his personal character—Appreciation of humour—Kindliness—A sailor's testimony—Dr. Goold—Exposition of *Ecclesiastes*—His consistency—What changes he had seen—Dr. Cairns—Lord Moncrieff—The end..... 556-574



# DR. ROBERT BUCHANAN.

---

## CHAPTER I.

### EARLY LIFE, AND MINISTRY AT GARGUNNOCK.

ROBERT BUCHANAN was born on the 15th of August 1802, at St. Ninians, near Stirling, where his father carried on the combined business of a brewery and farm. At the usual age he was sent to the Parish School of his native village; and there, and at another school in the neighbouring town, he acquired such a knowledge of Latin and Greek as qualified him for entering the University in 1817. The greater part of his undergraduate course was taken in Glasgow, whither his parents had in the meantime removed; but he went to Edinburgh for his last year in the Arts, and there also he studied Divinity. Not much can now be recalled of this early period of his life; but one thing is well remembered,—that when at one time he himself was inclined to turn to a secular profession, it was the influence of his pious and excellent mother which secured his devotion to the Church. He was licensed by the Presbytery of Dunblane.

His term of probation as a licentiate was very brief. For some years he had acted as tutor in the family of the Drummonds of Blair-Drummond, and through their influence

he was presented, in October 1826, to the Parish of Gargun-  
nock. That he well deserved this distinction was soon made  
apparent to all, but at first the settlement threatened to be  
not entirely harmonious. Some of the people had set their  
hearts on another good man, the late Mr. Leitch of Stirling ;  
and this preference was strengthened by the consideration  
that Mr. Buchanan had preached his very first sermon from  
their pulpit, and had then nearly "stuck" in one of his  
prayers. This tradition about the prayer lingers in Gar-  
gunnock to this day, along with the explanation that when  
the young preacher stood up to lead the devotions of the con-  
gregation, he was startled and discomposed by the entrance  
into the church of a band of friends from Stirling. This  
little hitch, however, was easily got over ; and when the  
call was moderated in, on the 18th of January 1827 (Mr.  
Dempster of Denny presiding on the occasion), it was signed  
by "many heads of families," and at once sustained by the  
Presbytery. A correspondent, who was himself a student of  
divinity at this time, writes that he heard Mr. Buchanan,  
immediately before his ordination, preach for the late Dr.  
Bennie of Stirling. "His text," he says, "was Luke ii.  
13 and 14. The discourse was a masterly one, and made  
a deep impression on my mind. His manner was calm,  
measured, and dignified, yet very earnest and impressive—  
and, after the service, there were many inquiries made as to  
who the young man was."

By this time the Evangelical movement which issued in  
the Disruption of the Church had begun. Dr. Andrew  
Thomson had reached the zenith of his power as Editor of  
the *Christian Instructor*, and already he had done much to  
rouse the country to a sense of the evils of Moderatism and  
of the need for Bible circulation and the preaching of the  
doctrines of grace. How Mr. Buchanan became so well



acquainted with Dr. Thomson, we do not know. It is more than probable that he sat for a time under his ministry. But certain it is that he spent some of his last hours in Edinburgh before ordination in the house of the minister of St. George's, and that he entered on the work of his first charge in a large degree under the spell of his influence.

The ordination took place on the 6th of March 1827, Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Bonar of Larbert preaching and presiding. A tremendous snowstorm came on the day before. It has been described as "the greatest snowstorm of the century." While it lasted, a neighbouring minister, already alluded to (Mr. Leitch, then of Gartmore), had his communion, and Dr. Hamilton of Strathblane was engaged to assist him. Dr. Hamilton set out from home to fulfil his engagement, and proceeded a considerable distance; but the road at length became impassable, and he was obliged to return. Happily for Mr. Buchanan, the worst had not come by the time that he required to reach Gargunnoch. He set out from Edinburgh on horseback, and was able, by forced marches, to arrive at his destination, not quite at the hour appointed, it is said, but sufficiently near to it to allow the Presbytery to proceed. Such a ride, undertaken under such circumstances, was not likely to be forgotten, and the whole details of it seemed to be present to him even in the later years of his life.

Gargunnoch lies about six miles west of Stirling. It is bounded on the east and south by St. Ninians, and on the west by Kippen, Balfron, and Fintry, while the River Forth separates it on the north from Kilmadock and Kincardine. It is beautifully situated, and the scenery of the whole district is attractive in the highest degree. Nor is it without interest historically. Several objects, for example, are pointed out—among others, a fort—which are associated with the patriotic enterprise of Sir William Wallace. But more,

perhaps, to the present purpose, is the fact that this parish was one of the few which shared largely in the spiritual blessing which came with the great Revival of 1742. "In the parish of Gargunock," says Robe, in his "Narrative," "there are, as I am well informed, near a hundred persons awakened. There were some of them awakened at Kilsyth, when the Lord's Supper was given on the second Sabbath in July; others at Campsie, when it was given on the last Sabbath of said month; others at St. Ninians, when that sacrament was given on the first Sabbath of August. Upon the Thursday thereafter there were eighteen awakened in their own church while the Rev. John Warden, their own aged and diligent pastor, preached to them. There was also a considerable awakening the week thereafter—the minister of Campsie, his son, preaching there. The minister of the parish hath always had a singular dexterity in instructing and dealing with the consciences of the people under his charge."

The predecessors of Mr. Buchanan, in the cure of Gargunock, were not all of the stamp of good Mr. Warden. Still later in the century, the parish had as its minister a Mr. Thomson, who achieved for himself a peculiarly unenviable place in the Church History of Scotland. He was presented to St. Ninians, but was vehemently opposed. Not regarding the opposition, however, he persisted in the assertion of what he believed to be his legal rights, and after a contest which raged in the Ecclesiastical Courts for seven long years, he succeeded in making good his entry into the coveted sphere. But the Church paid dear for his victory. A Relief Congregation was forthwith formed, which has continued till this day to be one of the largest in the country.

A single ministry, if maintained for a good many years, tells more and longer, we believe, than many imagine; and although, after an interval of half a century, it would be

impossible to trace distinctly any of the evil fruits of Mr. Thomson's labours, yet some of these fruits without doubt remained even till 1827. Anyhow, it is far from being improbable that among his more godly parishioners Mr. Buchanan found some who were inheritors of promises made to their ancestors in the days of the Kilsyth awakenings.

Dr. Robertson, afterwards of South Leith, was minister of Gargunnoch when Sir John Sinclair's "Statistical Account of Scotland" was being prepared, and the description of the parish which appears there is from his pen. He tells (perhaps with some feeling) that *the manse was built for a bachelor*, and was too small for the accommodation of a family. It has since been added to, we understand, but that was not in the days of Mr. Buchanan,—who nevertheless married, on the 5th of March 1828, his first wife, Miss Handyside. "Few houses of the kind are more pleasantly situated," but its size was certainly a disadvantage. The church was not perfect, either, as an ecclesiastical edifice. It was and is a somewhat ungainly building, with outside stairs leading to the "lofts" or galleries above, and old-fashioned outside shutters closing in the windows during the ordinary days of the week. But some ancient incumbent had looked far above and beyond the unattractive features of the place. A little gate in the surrounding wall connects the churchyard with the manse. Through this each Sunday the minister passes to reach the pulpit; and here, on a very old stone which forms the lintel, this inscription is engraven: "*Hac itur ad astra.*" It seems rather a high-sounding motto in such a connection, but we cannot doubt that it was piety, not ambition, which inspired it; and who can tell how much of a stimulating influence it has exerted on the successive preachers who have read it on their way to the exercise of their office as ambassadors for Christ in the unpretending sanctuary!

The population of the parish was almost entirely agricultural; and this circumstance, joined to the secluded situation of his cure, made Mr. Buchanan's life at this time very still and unexciting. But this was no disadvantage to him. He had time to devote himself to study and pastoral work, and he seems to have made the fullest use of the opportunities offered. He not only preached twice every Sabbath, but he added—what was by no means common at the period—a week-evening service. (A course of lectures which he delivered on the Wanderings of the Israelites in the Wilderness is still spoken of in the district.) Sabbath schools also were commenced by him, with large attendances; and he is still remembered as an assiduous visitor and catechiser of old and young, and as unusually faithful in the exercise of discipline.

Altogether, the impression one gets of him is that of an earnest, whole-hearted, evangelical minister; and we do not wonder that when, at the end of three years, he was invited to move into another part of the vineyard, his departure was regarded with universal regret. We may only further add that, along with Dr. Moodie of Clackmannan and Mr. Bonar of Larbert, he represented his Presbytery in the Assembly of 1829—that famous Assembly in which Dr. Inglis was able to announce, on the part of the Committee for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, that £5000 had been collected for the establishment of a mission in India, and that a suitable agent—Mr. Duff—had been found willing to proceed to the East to begin the work. The Apocrypha controversy had then commenced. A fresh interest had been awakened in the circulation of the Scriptures. And among the contributions to the Bible Society acknowledged in the *Christian Instructor* of the day, is one of considerable amount from Gargunnoch, transmitted “by the hands of the Rev. Mr. Buchanan.”

## CHAPTER II.

### THREE YEARS IN EAST LOTHIAN.

AFTER a short pastorate of three years at Gargunnoch, Mr. Buchanan was translated to the parish of Salton, in East Lothian. How this came about, we have not been able to learn. But one link between the two districts is known to have existed at the time, and that may, as has been suggested, have had something to do with the transference. The patron of Salton, Mr. Fletcher, had a brother resident in Stirlingshire, and might have become acquainted with the young minister of Gargunnoch through him. Certain it is that it had become imperative to get a good and superior man for the vacant parish. Mr. Buchanan's immediate predecessor there had almost ruined the interests of the Church of Scotland in the district. "Religion," we have been informed, "had sunk, under his ministry, to the lowest ebb. Vice and Sabbath-breaking prevailed to a scandalous extent. Children in great numbers were growing up in ignorance and ungodliness. The parish church was all but deserted, the few worshippers sitting in it 'like crows in a mist!' And a large proportion of the people had become Dissenters, and had joined the Seceding churches in the town of Haddington." Whatever might have happened to be the private sentiments of the patron, he could not view such a state of matters with any satisfaction; and in looking round for a person whom he

could trust to rally the cause of the Establishment, it was his special good fortune to have his attention directed to one who possessed very peculiar qualifications for the office. Perhaps, too, it was no drawback to Mr. Buchanan, in the Laird of Salton's eyes, that he had in addition the qualities which fitted him for mingling in refined society. Once before, at least, a candidate for this same cure had failed of success, not through any defects in his doctrine or literature, but because he had borne himself uncouthly in the dining-room at the Hall. It counted, therefore, we cannot doubt, as a point in the new presentee's favour, that he had not only been a successful minister, but was unmistakably a gentleman.

Salton is a small parish two miles by three in extent, and it had in 1831 a population of eight hundred. It lies seventeen miles east from Edinburgh, and is distant four miles from the county town of Haddington. It is beautifully diversified by hill and dale, extensive woods, and highly cultivated farms. With the exception of some workmen employed in making bricks and burning lime, the population is almost exclusively agricultural. On many accounts the charge was a very desirable one. There were attached to it a good stipend, a pleasant manse, and a valuable glebe. It was, besides, within easy distance of Edinburgh. And, to crown all, there was what must have formed a strong attraction to a young and studious minister,—an excellent theological library. This library had been founded by a former resident, Norman Leslie; but it was afterwards greatly enriched by Bishop Burnet, who was for four years incumbent of the parish, and who bequeathed to his successors in office all his books, with a permanent endowment of fifty marks (or £5) a year to add to their number. The church is a commodious and stately edifice, with a lofty spire, situated on a commanding central height, and is seen for many miles around.

“At Stirling, 16th March 1830, the Presbytery of Stirling met, when there appeared Dr. Hamilton and Mr. Smith, Commissioners from the Presbytery of Haddington, to prosecute the translation of the Rev. Robert Buchanan, minister of Gargunnoch, to the church and parish of Salton.”

So runs the Minute which tells of the commencement of the process which ended in the transference of Mr. Buchanan to his new sphere; and we are able to complete the narrative in his own words. The following are some extracts from a diary which he commenced at this time, but which, unhappily, he seems soon to have discontinued:—

“*April 22.*—Admitted minister of this parish [Salton] by the Presbytery of Haddington, Mr. Smith of Gifford preaching and presiding. His text was taken from 1 Cor. ix. 16: ‘Necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel!’ The reception given me by the people was most cordial and encouraging. May it be a token that a door is opened among them for my ministry.

“*April 25.*—First of my Sabbaths in this parish. Was introduced by my friend, Dr. Gordon of Edinburgh, who preached an admirable discourse on the prophetic office of Christ. My own discourse was on the mutual obligations, as pastor and people, which we took on ourselves by the relation into which we had entered. Text from Ezekiel. Church very crowded. Fear curiosity brought many to-day who will not be very constant afterwards.

“*May 2.*—Preached on the obligations upon parents to train up their children in the knowledge and reverence of the Scriptures. Announced my purpose of opening a Sabbath school.

“*May 9.*—After service, opened a Sabbath school in the parish school-house. Great attendance of children. Uncertain as yet how we may get on.

“*May 15.*—Finished on the 12th my first visitation of the village of East Salton, which occupied me three days. Was gratified to find the men generally at home to receive my visit, as well as their wives and children. Their homes in general seemed well kept, and more comfortable on the whole than those of a similar class at Gargunnoch. Was everywhere very cordially welcomed, and my exhortations were respectfully listened to, though with what spirit and with what degree of understanding it will require a more intimate acquaintance with their state and character to ascertain. A few families I encountered that seemed decidedly interested in the things of religion. From them I learned of the existence of a Bible Society in the parish, auxiliary to the county one. They also informed me of a monthly prayer-meeting held among them in the West Salton school-

house. My predecessor, it seems, had given no encouragement to the Bible Society; from what motives, does not appear.

“*May 17.*—Began the visitation of West Salton, being anxious to have it completed throughout the parish before dispensing the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper. Having no elders (for though there are two in existence, —Lord Sinclair and Mr. Horn,—their long-continued non-residence makes them of no avail here), I am without any source of information as to the state of the people—who may be communicants, and who not—and am resolved, from personal inquiry, to have a communicants’ list made up before the Sabbath.

“*May 23.*—Went to Edinburgh to attend the General Assembly. Heard an appeal from Presbytery of Irvine on the subject of enjoining parish schoolmasters to open their schools with prayer and reading a portion of Scripture, not as a lesson, but as a devotional exercise. Decided in favour of Presbytery. Among many other cases, one of very great importance was determined upon,—an application from certain parishioners in Neilston for aid to carry on a process with their heritors. [The heritors had claimed the right to roup the church seats, and to appropriate the proceeds.]

“*May 30.*—I have now had four meetings with my Sabbath-school class. The children, upon the whole, behave with much outward propriety. Their reading, generally speaking, seems to me inferior to that of children of similar ages whom I taught at Gargunnoch. Some of them, no doubt, read the Scriptures very well indeed; but a considerable number, on the other hand, get on very awkwardly: no great proof, as it seems, of the Bishop’s Fund for education being productive of much benefit; but rather an illustration of the old saying, that what is got for nothing is often little cared for. Happy to find so many of the parents attending, for whom there is abundant accommodation,—it having been found necessary, after the first day’s meeting, to remove the class to the church, on account of the great number of children who had presented themselves for admission to the class.”

Under date June 2, there follows a long account of a difficulty which the young minister encountered at the outset of his visitations. He found in each of his two villages a fellowship meeting in existence, which different individuals attended, and in which laymen took their turn in the exposition of the Scriptures. Should the minister of the parish be present at such meetings? That was the question about which he was perplexed, and on which he sought the advice of, among others, Mr. Mackellar of Pencaitland, Mr. Flyter of



Alness and Mr. Buchanan of North Leith. He himself was disposed to think that the parochial clergyman should not attend the meetings,—except, perhaps, once a year or so for their encouragement, when he could take the whole conduct of them into his own hands; his chief reason for this opinion being, that it would never do for ministers to put themselves in the attitude of receiving instruction in the Word from men over whom the Church had placed them as teachers. In this view all whom he consulted concurred except Mr. Flyter, who testified that he had himself tried the thing and saw no evil results. At the same time, Mr. Flyter admitted that his neighbour, Mr. Stewart of Cromarty, had found it necessary to give over attendance at such meetings; and Mr. Buchanan of Salton adds, on his own account, that “it is suspected that the Ross-shire ministers are a good deal in bondage to ‘*the men*,’ as they are called,—a class in the community who are said there to arrogate to themselves the direction of religious matters. What they say, and what they influence the people to think, the minister, it is alleged, sometimes finds it necessary to assent to.”

“*June 8.*—Went to Haddington to attend the annual meeting of the Bible Society. They have not mingled in the Apocrypha controversy; having agreed, with a view to keep all parties and denominations together, to contribute neither to the London nor to the Edinburgh Society. Their funds are divided among other societies, about the purity of whose management there is no question. I have some doubts, however, whether there be not something objectionable in this neutrality. It involves us in co-operation with men who may be as unsound as any of the London Committee; whereas taking up the controversy would, if it *lessened*, have at the same time also *purged*, the Society, and given those who remained increased confidence in each other. And, besides, such a neutrality involves the withholding of the Society’s testimony on a most important subject, and at a time when it appears so many are unsound upon it; withholding it not only from the public and from the Church, but also from a Society—the Edinburgh—which, by its distinguished efforts in the cause of the ‘pure Word,’ has earned a title to the acknowledgments of all to whom that cause is dear. The attendance of ministers was considerable, but the

general audience was small. Report written and read by Mr. Thomson, Prestonkirk.

“*June 10.*—A meeting was held to-day of the trustees of Bishop Burnet’s Fund. Only Mr. Fletcher and myself present. Filled up the vacancies, and ordered the children’s clothing, but deferred the examination of accounts and of the general state of the funds till the 5th July, till which day the meeting was adjourned.

“*July 6.*—Meeting of Presbytery at Haddington. I applied for assessors to act with me in forming a kirk-session, and discharging its functions in my present want of an eldership. The Presbytery complied with my request, and nominated Messrs. Mackellar and Abernethy to act with me.

“*October 28.*—A meeting of inhabitants of the parish took place in the church, in consequence of an intimation made the previous Sabbath, to form a parish Bible Society. The meeting was very numerously attended. I delivered an address on the objects and prospects of the Bible Society cause, after which regulations for the government of the Society were adopted, and a list of office-bearers elected.

“*November 26.*—Lectured this evening on the Fulfilled Prophecies of Scripture,—the first lecture of a series to be continued occasionally during the winter. Church about two-thirds filled.”

In the whole of the diary from which the above extracts are taken, there is no reference whatever to the existence of Dissent in the parish. Yet it is certain there was a good deal of it; and among those who attended the fellowship meetings spoken of, there were, without any doubt, some—perhaps many—who worshipped on the Sabbath in the Secession congregations of Haddington. This ignoring of the currents outside the Establishment is in its way significant. The Evangelical clergy of the time had not a little of the High Church spirit; and there was no one who, in the later years of his life, was so ready as Dr. Buchanan to acknowledge that in his youth he had often done scanty justice to those who had kept the lights burning when the National Church was, to a great extent, in darkness. It is still remembered in Salton, that at a Bible Society’s meeting—probably it was the very one noticed above—a Seceder minister rose from among the audience to make a speech, and was summarily set

down by the chairman. Mr. Buchanan, in what he did, was, we can imagine, entirely in order. The minister may have indicated in some way that he was about to support the friends of the Apocrypha, or those who wished to maintain the neutrality which existed at Haddington, or he may have come to a parish meeting without the qualification of being himself a parishioner; but the people put upon his summary suppression their own interpretation. They saw in it, and we dare say they were so far right, something of that superciliousness with which the clergy of the then powerful Established Church treated their Seceding brethren, and which, by-and-by, did a good deal to embitter the Voluntary controversy.

With regard to the results of Mr. Buchanan's three years' pastorate in Salton, we cannot do better than quote the words of the Rev. Arthur Thomson, now minister of the Free Church at Yester:—

“Having been minister at Salton,” says he, “for twenty years, I can testify that his [Mr. Buchanan's] pastorate was invariably spoken of by all classes in terms of deepest gratitude, as marking the beginning of a new and blessed period in the annals of the parish. He visited regularly from house to house. Moral and religious statistics were carefully gleaned, clearly and comprehensively arranged, and patiently submitted to the consideration of all persons of influence in the community. Elders were ordained, the kirk-session having long ceased to exist. The first Sabbath school in connection with the Established Church was set agoing. On the Lord's day, the Scriptures were clearly expounded, ‘verse by verse;’ the greater part of the Acts of the Apostles having been gone over in this way. The gospel of the glory of God was proclaimed from the pulpit in all its fulness; and some have told me, and I have no doubt many others felt, that the

glad tidings came home to their hearts and consciences as for the first time. Very soon every department of pastoral work was so thoroughly organized, that Mr. Buchanan's successor at Salton was often heard affirming that everything was in such perfect order, that he had merely to carry forward what had been commenced. Vice and irreligion in their open and gross forms were dealt with so firmly, wisely, and effectually by the new minister of the parish, that they soon disappeared; and a marked difference for the better was observed in the whole external aspect of things,—especially on Sabbath-day and in the house of prayer, which was soon filled to the door. There is reason to believe that the Great Head of the Church was there, as elsewhere all over Scotland, preparing the people for the sifting crisis of 1843, and that the parishioners of Salton then acquired a love for an evangelical ministry, which many subsequent events have amply proved remains unabated to this day. In illustration of this, I may mention an incident of 1843, when Mr. [afterwards Principal] Fairbairn cast in his lot with the Free Church of Scotland. One of the most sagacious men in the parish remained in connection with the Established Church. The patron consulted him as to the sort of successor he should appoint in place of Mr. Fairbairn. The astute agriculturist at once answered: '*Whatever you do, Mr. Fletcher, if you please, don't put in a Moderate; for we canna desgest [sic] a Moderate after such ministers as we have had,*—such men as Buchanan, Hamilton, and Fairbairn.

“To what extent the highest ends of Dr. Buchanan's ministry at Salton were realized, the Great Day alone will declare. It does not admit of doubt that the Master owned and blessed the labours of his faithful servant, and that as preached by him the gospel was the power of God unto salvation. There still lives in the village of East Salton a most excellent and

estimable and Christian woman, now well nigh fourscore years old, who has always testified that she was brought to the Saviour by the instrumentality of Mr. Buchanan, who repeatedly visited her in the house of her master (the well-known Lord Gillies, then resident at Herdmanston, in the parish of Salton), during a season of severe and protracted sickness. No minister of the gospel could desire a more satisfactory seal to his ministry. For more than forty years this woman, by the grace of God, in the midst of sore and manifold trials, has really adorned the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things. It was not, I believe, until 1872, when Dr. Buchanan had occasion to visit Haddington on business connected with the Sustentation Fund, that he heard for the first time of this fruit of his early ministry; and I can never forget the grateful emotion which beamed in his countenance when he heard of the works of faith and labours of love of this humble but most devout and really honourable woman. 'Cast thy bread upon the waters, and thou shalt find it after many days.'"

Reference has been made to Mr. Buchanan's early intercourse with Dr. Andrew Thomson. Mr. Maclagan, in his interesting "History of St. George's," mentions another circumstance which connects their names together. Dr. Thomson literally died in harness. He preached in his own church on the forenoon of the last Sabbath he spent on earth; and on the succeeding Wednesday he was present at a meeting of the Edinburgh Presbytery, and took part in its business. It was his last work, however. He walked homeward from the meeting in company with a friend, and made no complaint to him of illness. But as he was about to enter his house in Melville Street, he suddenly fell down, and died in a moment. This was on the 9th of February 1831. Mr. Buchanan at that date had just been about ten

months in Salton. It was possibly to give some relief to the overburdened minister of St. George's, that he had come into town for the 6th, and had taken for him the afternoon service of that day. Anyhow, the very last sermon to which Dr. Thomson listened, was preached by one who was himself, for many a long year afterwards, to help to keep alight the torch of evangelical truth in Scotland. Mr. Buchanan attended the after-meeting of Presbytery referred to, and heard Dr. Thomson speak there. The same evening, while dining with Dr. Gordon, a note was handed in, which, in the midst of the conversation, was not immediately opened. When it was at last read, Dr. Gordon became speechless with emotion. It was an announcement of the fact that the Church had been, with awful suddenness, deprived of the leader whose tongue and hand appeared at the time to be most indispensable to it. The sound of his voice was, as it seemed, still ringing in their ears, and already he had passed from them into the silence of eternity. The death produced a profound impression over all the country; but we may well believe it was, in the circumstances, felt as a peculiarly solemn event by the young minister of Salton.

## CHAPTER III.

### THE NEW EPOCH.

THE years which Mr. Buchanan spent in Salton were stirring and memorable years in the public history of the country. Another French Revolution had taken place (in 1830), and although it would scarcely be correct to say that the very same "political hurricane" by which it was produced crossed the Channel and swept over England as well, still this is certainly true, that as in the deepest and quietest bays the waves break restlessly on the shore when there has been a storm out at sea, so society in Great Britain became everywhere more or less disturbed in sympathy with the agitation which about this time was convulsing the neighbouring nations of the Continent.

Nor was the excitement here altogether uncalled for. Our Government was nominally a representative one, but the representation, as all are now ready to admit, was a good deal of a mockery. The members of Parliament, for example, for the great city of Glasgow, were chosen not by a fair proportion even of the propertied inhabitants, but by the Town Council, which was self-elective, and which included a membership of only some thirty persons. Long before, at various times, cries for Reform had arisen; but these had been suppressed, and there were not wanting many thoughtful men who would, had they been able, have put down the similar

demand which sprang up anew now. The cry, however, which broke out at this period was too loud and persistent to be disregarded; and if the agitation did not end in London as in Paris with a revolution and the erection of a "Column of July," this was owing in a good measure to King William the Fourth, who had wit enough to see the imperativeness of the popular demand, and to concede it. There are still surviving some who have a vivid remembrance of those days, and the accounts they give all confirm the statement of a historian that *the nation had never before been so much in earnest since the days of the Long Parliament.*

The remark is a trite one, but it is true, that history goes by cycles. If from 1789 we date the commencement of the modern era in Europe, we may with equal justice affirm that a new page of life was opened for Scotland about 1830. Then a tidal wave began to be visible, which is not yet perhaps wholly spent; and in tracing the career of a public man who lived through the generation that followed, and took a leading part in the direction of events, it is impossible to proceed without stopping occasionally to survey his surroundings. With this in view, therefore, it may be useful to say a word or two, at this point, on the subject of the turning of the political tide.

The Revolution in France affected so sensibly the elections which took place in England during the autumn of 1830, that when Parliament met in November its progressive character was made apparent at once. The Tory Ministry under the Duke of Wellington was beaten in the first testing vote, and the Whigs came into power with Earl Grey as Premier. After a short prorogation, the House of Commons met again in February 1831; and on March 31, Lord John Russell's Reform Bill was carried by a majority of *one*. But the Liberal leaven had not gone very deep into the Parliament then sit-



ting, and when the Bill began to be mangled in committee, the Ministry refused to go forward with it, and made an appeal to the country. The new Parliament assembled in June, and was soon discovered to reflect more perfectly the mind of the nation, for the second reading was now carried by a majority of 136. But all was not then gained. The measure had to run the gauntlet of the House of Lords, and there, as was fully expected, its progress was arrested; the Peers, by a vote of 199 to 158, declaring emphatically that, in their opinion, there was no need for any change. The House of Commons, however, refused to bow to the deliverance. By a fresh vote it reaffirmed its former judgment; and when it met anew, in December, after the recess, the Bill was reintroduced and sent up to the Lords once more. The story of the career of the Reform Bill in the Upper House is one of the most exciting in Parliamentary history. Nothing could be more distasteful than it was to many of the hereditary legislators; and several expedients were resorted to with a view to its suppression, or to the removal of its most objectionable features. For one, the plan was tried of allowing it to pass a second reading, and then extracting its sting in committee. But the Whigs refused to accept the composition. Then the duke was asked to resume the reins of office, and to introduce a Reform Bill of his own, which might take the wind out of the enemy's sails; but Sir Robert Peel, the leader of the party in the House of Commons, declined to support the arrangement. And at last there seemed nothing for it but to cut the else impracticable knot. The consent of the king was got to the creation of as many new Peers as were necessary to secure a majority, and the Lords, alarmed at the prospect thus opened up of the degradation of their order, most reluctantly succumbed. The opponents of the Bill would not consent to vote for it, but a sufficient number

of non-contents stayed away to allow it to pass; and it accordingly became law in the month of June 1832. And the change in the spirit of the country appeared at once. The first Reformed Parliament met on the 29th of January 1833, and among the first measures which it passed were one for the abolition of slavery in the West Indies, and another for the protection of young people in factories; the latter of the two being introduced by Lord Ashley, afterwards and still (1877) the Earl of Shaftesbury.

But the quickening of the national life at this time did not tell only on the philanthropists. It also affected more or less all the ecclesiastical societies of the kingdom; and in particular it gave, in Scotland, a distinct impulse to two movements, both of which had their springs or fountainheads in the far past, but which, previously to the Reform agitation, had been proceeding, the one almost like a stream underground, the other with such unobtrusiveness that it had failed to awaken on its behalf anything like enthusiasm. We refer, on the one hand, to the fierce agitation which sprung up for the abolition of the connection between Church and State; and on the other, to that struggle for popular election within the Church, which resulted in 1834 in the passing of the Veto Act.

These movements, we repeat, did not originate with the Reform Bill, or with the commotions which preceded it. The principles of Voluntaryism had been virtually adopted by a section of the Seceders so long before as 1795; and although they were not all at once pressed to their practical consequences, there can be no doubt that during the interval their significance was always becoming clearer, and their hold on the minds of those who professed them more and more firm. When Dr. Marshall of Kirkintilloch, therefore, sounded his note of defiance in his famous Glasgow sermon in 1829, the response it evoked was in his own denomination instan-

taneous, and a controversy afterwards began which compelled the adherents of the Establishment to fight as for their hearths and altars. It is equally true that the demand made within the Church on behalf of the people had a far deeper spring than the democratic instinct of the period. The claim which was then put forward was itself as old as the Reformation; and formed, indeed, an article in the Church's constitution. And, besides, events of a more recent date had been operating with tremendous force in the direction of the overthrow of Patronage long before the political cry for Reform had become articulate. We refer, of course, to the Ecclesiastico-Evangelical movement which, under Andrew Thomson and Thomas Chalmers, had begun to tell everywhere on society in Scotland. At the same time, while keeping these things in view, we must admit it to be a fact, and in its way a not uninteresting fact, that both movements were contemporaneous with the political revolution which marks the commencement of the strictly modern era in the civil history of Scotland, and that that revolution had not a little to do in quickening even the ecclesiastical currents that were then running through the land. And we may think of this without any discomfort, whatever be our personal opinions on the subjects controverted in these days. For although there was then a great deal of false political economy abroad, and the people deluded themselves with foolish hopes that could never be realized in the way they expected, yet what was at the root of the agitations was always a more or less intelligent demand for "*justice*,"—a desire that the *good* God had given might be shared by as many of his creatures as possible, and a determination that privileges should be enjoyed only by those who deserved them.

It helps us to realize the more vividly the electric character of those times, to observe the effect they seem to have had

even on theological thought and general literature. Mr. Campbell of Row was ordained in 1825, and he had not been two years in the ministry when it became plain to all who heard him that he was leaving the beaten tracks. A keen controversy at once sprang up in the pages of the *Christian Instructor* and elsewhere, and at last ended in a trial for heresy. The case came first before the Assembly of 1830; but it was then remitted to the Presbytery of Dumbarton to proceed by libel, and the issue was the deposition of Mr. Campbell in 1831.\* The movement, however, which he inaugurated, did not end at this point. No thoroughly earnest man was ever long left without followers in those exciting days; and among the men who drank of the charmed spring on the Gareloch, and then struck out new and still more extravagant paths for themselves, were Edward Irving, and Principal Scott, afterwards of Owen's College, Manchester. Mr. Scott's name was erased from the list of the Church's probationers in 1831; and if the proceedings taken in the case of Mr. Irving were conducted more slowly, this was owing to the circumstance that he had become a minister in London, and was thus "furth" of the kingdom. But Mr. Irving, though let alone at first, did not hide his light under a bushel. We have been seeing that from 1829 onwards the feeling of the country was at fever heat in the matter of politics. It may be said, with equal truth, that during the same period the religious world of Scotland was as much excited on the subject of theological doctrine. Like all men

\* "I hold and teach," said Mr. Campbell, "that Christ died for all men; that the propitiation which he made for sin was for all the sins of all mankind; that those for whom he gave himself an offering and a sacrifice unto God for a sweet-smelling savour were the children of men, without exception and without distinction." Further, and as a corollary from that, he thought that pardon was the gift of God to all, and that saving faith was just the individual realization of the fact that God is so reconciled to men. In short, Mr. Campbell's view of the gospel was substantially that taught later in the day by Maurice.

of strong convictions and fervid mind, Mr. Irving was an eager propagandist; and from the beginning of the year indicated he made the whole country ring with his teaching. Not only from his own pulpit of Regent Square, but in the pages of a periodical started for the occasion—*The Morning Watch*—and in his public lectures in Edinburgh and elsewhere, he delivered a series of bold and unprovoked attacks upon the orthodoxy of the country. Such a course could not but lead to judicial action. His views of the Atonement and of Christ's human nature, and his acceptance as divine manifestations of those extraordinary "tongues" which were heard first at Row, compelled his mother-Church to interfere; and in March 1833 he was cut off from its communion by the Presbytery of Annan. These bald facts and dates, however, give no idea of the commotion which he created. To have any conception of that, one must realize the man, his piety, his sincerity, and his eloquence; and one must listen to those survivors who can tell of hearing his lectures on Prophecy delivered to crowds at six o'clock in the morning. There are very many fewer "heresy trials" in the Church history of Scotland than her enemies imagine. But it is a significant fact that during 1830–34 there were more such than ever occurred in any former period; and we note it here, not so much as proving the increasing fidelity of the Church, but as illustrating the revolutionary character of the time. An intense spirit of inquiry was abroad, and the old ecclesiastical landmarks were not, any more than the political, respected by the innovators of the age.

We may close these references to the times upon which Mr. Buchanan was now entering as a public man, by giving one more proof of the fact that they denoted in many ways the commencement of a new historical era. Mr. Stopford Brooke, in his Macmillan Primer on English Literature,

says that after Cowper there was no longer any large wave of public thought or feeling that could awaken poetry. But he goes on to say : "With the Reform agitation, and the new religious agitation at Oxford, which was of the same date, a new excitement, or a new form of the old, came on England, and with it a new tribe of poets arose, among whom we live. The elements of their poetry were also new, though their germs were sown in the previous poetry. It took up theological, sceptical, social, and political questions. It gave itself to metaphysics and to analysis of human character. It carried the love of natural scenery into almost every county in England, and described the whole land."

Mr. Brooke thinks that the wave is spent; that the impulse given in 1832 is exhausted. "Within the last ten years," says he, "the impulse given in '32 has died away. The vital interest in theological and social questions, in human questions of the present, has decayed, and the same thing which we find in the case of Keats has again taken place. A new class of literary poets has arisen, who have no care for a present they think dull, for religious questions to which they see no end. They too have gone back to Greek and mediæval and old Norse life for their subjects. They find much of their inspiration in Italy and in Chaucer; but they continue to love poetry, and the poetry of natural description."

In these thoughtful remarks Mr. Stopford Brooke has only England in his mind, but they apply in spirit to Scotland as well. It is unquestionable that appearances are a good deal in favour of the idea that the "slack" of the tide has come. At the same time, it is very doubtful, indeed, whether we have really yet reached the close of the epoch. All the religious movements of the Reform period have effloresced into energetic associations, and the ends for which they

were called into existence remain as yet unaccomplished. It is more than probable that the tendency is still onward, and that what is to be seen at present is not the final ebb of the wave, but only its momentary subsidence ; for the history of the Ritualism into which the Oxford movement developed is obviously not yet finished, and the providential reasons are still to be made more clear for the forced formation of a new and powerful Protestant Church, as the very unexpected issue of the Scottish ecclesiastical revival of 1834.

## CHAPTER IV.

### SETTLEMENT IN GLASGOW.

WHEN the Tron Church, Glasgow, became vacant in 1814, by the removal of Dr. MacGill to a Professor's chair, the appointment of a new minister was regarded as a very serious business indeed. Mr. Chalmers of Kilmany was named by some as a suitable candidate, but there were others who had no hesitation in pronouncing him "mad;" and a fierce contest arose for the securing of the votes of the thirty-one Town Councillors, with whom lay the power to nominate to the office. In those days the patrons had no notion of transferring their privileges to the people more immediately concerned. As a matter of fact, they had a civil right conferred upon them—the right to say who should have the cure of souls in a certain district of the city—and they allowed themselves to become, with reference to it, the objects of a canvass as keen as if the coveted post had been that of Provost or Town-clerk. "I have this instant," writes good Dr. Jones of Edinburgh, when all was over, "received the accounts from Glasgow, that the battle—the great battle—has been fought, and the victory won. For Chalmers, 15; for M'Farlan, 10; for Maclean, 4; and 1 *non liquet*. Heaven and earth, and all the principalities and powers in high places, have been moved: from the great officers of state at St. James's, and the Court of Aldermen in King Street, and the Crown



lawyers in Edinburgh, down to the little female pieties, who were taught to squall what they did not understand,—‘No fanatics!’ ‘No Balfourites!’ ‘Rationalists for ever!’ No small stir, I’ll assure you, has been in that city; and no such stir has been there since the days of John Knox, it is said, about the choice of a minister. And oh! *miserabile dictu*, tell it not in St. Andrews! the fanatics have prevailed, and prevailed against one of the most numerous and well-appointed armies which ever took the field on such an occasion.”

Things had very considerably changed from this when, in 1833, the Tron Parish became again vacant, by the translation of Dr. Dewar, the successor of Dr. Chalmers, to the Principalship of Marischal College, Aberdeen. By that time the Reform Bill had passed, and although the municipal arrangements remained as before, and the patronage of the city churches was still vested in the Town Council, it was no longer considered superfluous to ask such congregations as happened to want ministers whether they had any preferences of their own. Anyhow, the Town Council of Glasgow intimated to the congregation of the Tron Church, which was again large and influential, that if they could agree upon a man, he would at once receive a presentation at their hands. A meeting was accordingly called, and a committee of forty persons appointed to look out for a minister. The choice of this committee fell first upon Dr. Barr of Port Glasgow; but, after some hesitation, he declined their invitation: and, at the suggestion of Dr. Black of the Barony, who was acting as Moderator of Session, they then turned their eyes in the direction, first, of Mr. M’Lagan of Kinfauns, and finally, of Mr. Buchanan of Salton. Mr. Buchanan was asked to assist Dr. Black at his communion; and upon his consenting to do so, arrangements were made for his being heard by as large a number of the Tron people as possible.

"The committee," writes one of their number, who yet survives, "had agreed that, while the congregation was dismissing on the Monday, each member should try to learn the sentiments of as many as he could as to Mr. Buchanan's acceptability, and that they would meet immediately after and compare notes. They met accordingly, and the report each member had to give for himself and for those he consulted being identical,—that all were satisfied,—a minute and memorial were adopted on the spot, and transmitted to the Town Council. Thereafter a presentation was issued in Mr. Buchanan's favour, and he was settled with the unanimous concurrence of the congregation."

Another surviving member of the old Tron remembers having heard Mr. Buchanan preach, about the same time, a charity sermon in St. George's, and she thinks that that also constituted a part of his unconscious "trials." But, in any case, his way into Glasgow was made wonderfully plain; and when, on the 22nd of August 1833, his formal induction took place,—Dr. Lorimer of St. David's preaching and presiding on the occasion,—he had good grounds for believing that his removal from the quiet of an out-of-the-way country parish, to the bustle of a great and populous city, was a step in his life-history on which he was warranted to expect the Divine blessing.

His new sphere was as different as possible from those in which he had laboured at Gargunnoch and Salton. The old Tron Parish is bounded on the north by the Trongate, on the south by the Clyde, on the west by Stockwell Street, and on the east by the Saltmarket. At present, its condition is not excessively pitiable. The pressure for room in so great a commercial centre has driven away the population, and so many of the dwelling-houses have been turned into places of business, that, within the compact square just defined, there

are now probably not more than two thousand people. When Mr. Buchanan, however, became minister of the parish, it was inhabited by some eight thousand souls; and in the three Wynds which ran through it, there were very many who had no connection with any church whatever. It has been seen how the subject of these notices addressed himself to genuinely pastoral work in Salton,—how he was not content with preaching as faithfully as he could on the Sabbath, but took a real oversight of all the families of the flock; and it may well be supposed that it was his determination to be not less thorough as a parochial minister in a region which had so recently been under the graciously revolutionary care of Chalmers.

When Dr. Dewar was appointed to the parish in 1818, he found himself in a wilderness in more senses than one. The Wynds were still unevangelized; but that was not all: the army that had been gathered together to subdue them was in a state of disorganization. Dr. Chalmers had moved to St. John's, where he expected to be able to carry out his economic and other schemes untrammelled, and "the workers" of the Tron had gone with him almost *en masse*. Even the kirk-session was threatened with dissolution. That it did not become extinct altogether, was due a good deal to the circumstance that two of the elders were Moderates in principle, and had all along opposed themselves to the innovations of the Evangelicals. They had objected to the settlement of the "wild" minister of Kilmany at the first, and they consistently remained unaffected when he took his departure for another although a neighbouring sphere. That the successor of Dr. Chalmers had thus great difficulties to contend with may be easily imagined, and it is greatly to his credit that he so soon and so successfully built up again the walls that had been broken down. By his preaching, which was at once sound and earnest, he attracted a new congregation to

the Tron, and so filled up its emptied pews. Quietly and wisely, he introduced into the kirk-session good men to occupy the places and carry on the work of those who had transferred their services elsewhere. And when, in 1833, he himself left, he was able to commit to Mr. Buchanan a charge which not only had become important for its size, but towards the ordinary equipment of which nothing was now wanting.

One change only is noted in the kirk-session minutes of the period as having been proposed by the new minister in the parochial organization. The Sabbath schools of the parish had, up to the time of his settlement, been under the superintendence of a "Sabbath-School Society." Whether that society was strictly congregational, or had a wider basis, we do not know; but to Mr. Buchanan it seemed desirable that the schools should be brought into closer connection with the session, and not many weeks after his induction he made a formal motion to that effect. The result was the appointment of a committee, whose report, given in on the 21st of October 1833, was as follows. We read it with interest, because it shows incidentally that Mr. Buchanan applied himself to his ministerial work at once; and that in Glasgow, as in Salton, his very earliest efforts were on behalf of the young:—

#### THE TRON SABBATH SCHOOLS.

"While your committee are fully satisfied that the New Wynd and Princes Street School Society, in its present state, has been the means, under the Divine blessing, of diffusing, to a very considerable extent, the inestimable benefits of religious instruction among the children of the Tron Parish, and that they are well entitled to the grateful acknowledgments of the kirk-session for the labour of love which they have so faithfully prosecuted, your committee are, at the same time, persuaded that the permanence, the complete efficiency, and the adequate extension of Sabbath-school instruction in this parish, can be secured only by such a measure as that with reference to which your committee were appointed.

"They would therefore beg to submit the following as regulations, on the adoption of which by the present Sabbath-Schools Society, in addition

to the rules which form their present constitution, the kirk-session should agree to extend to these schools that active superintendence and that cordial encouragement and support which such an institution deserves and requires:—

“1. That the New Wynd and Princes Street Sabbath-School Society shall henceforth be called the Tron Parish Sabbath-School Society.

“2. That the minister of the parish be recognized as the president of the society.

“3. That four members of the kirk-session, appointed as their sub-school-committee, shall be *ex officio* members of the society, entitled to deliberate and vote in all meetings connected with the management of its affairs.

“4. That when any member of the society intends to propose a new teacher, he shall send a notice to that effect to the secretary, stating, at the same time, the name and designation of the person he has in view, at least a week before the meeting at which the teacher is to be proposed; and that the secretary shall thereupon transmit a copy of the said notice to the president.

“5. That the account of the society be submitted once a year to the kirk-session for their inspection.

“The report above engrossed having been read and duly considered, the session unanimously approved of and adopted the same, and instructed the clerk to send an extract thereof to the Secretary to the Sabbath-Schools Society, to be communicated to the society.”

Mr. Buchanan's settlement in Glasgow synchronized with the commencement of that “Ten Years' Conflict” of which he himself became the historian. The celebrated measure of THE VETO had been introduced into the Assembly of 1833 by Dr. Chalmers. On that occasion it failed to carry; but the Evangelical party was in no way daunted by its want of success. The diminishing majorities of the long dominant Moderates showed unmistakably that the tide was turning; and during the winter of 1833–34 there was heard throughout the whole country the din of preparation for a renewal of the attack. That the minister of the Tron watched the course of events with eager attention is certain; but he was not a member of the Assembly of 1834, when at last, on the motion of Lord Moncreiff, the Church adopted the principle of Non-Intrusion, and he thus did not happen to

be in the advanced band which actually took the responsibility of crossing the Rubicon. But he assumed his place in the ranks some months later. Before being finally passed, the Veto measure was sent down to Presbyteries for their opinion, in terms of the Barrier Act; and when it came to Glasgow for adjudication, in February 1835, Mr. Buchanan was one of *thirty* who gave his vote in favour of it. Principal M'Farlan proposed its rejection, and Dr. Forbes its adoption; and it is strikingly significant of the progress which Evangelical principles had made in the west by that time, that the Principal could only secure a following of *five*.

It would be superfluous to rehearse once again here the whole story of the struggle which issued in the Disruption. To do so in the present volume, indeed, would be even worse than superfluous. It would be something like positive impertinence; for Dr. Buchanan himself has told the story, and his "Ten Years' Conflict" remains as in a manner a portion of his autobiography. Of the experience there described he could say with truth, "*Magna pars fui*;" and for a consecutive narrative of the events of the period we must be content to refer to the volumes in question. It is essential, however, to our getting a clear idea of his life, that we should notice the course of public events at various points; and meanwhile it may be remarked that the Church contest, beginning, as it did, concurrently with his ministry in Glasgow, necessarily affected in many ways the whole character of that ministry. For one thing, when it was made plain to his brethren that he was a man of affairs, a man with business gifts,—one possessing in an unusual degree the administrative faculty,—it naturally and necessarily came about that talents which in ordinary circumstances would have been expended exclusively in the cultivation of his own corner of the great vineyard, were called into exercise for the public good. The excitement in the eccle-

siastical courts caused the breeze to blow more freshly through the whole framework of society. There was stir and bustle everywhere. Reform, alike in Church and State, became the order of the day. Glasgow took the lead in many of the movements that were then inaugurated. And in the front rank of not a few of these we find the young minister of the Tron. So early as February 1835, he gives in a report to his Presbytery as Convener of the Church Accommodation Committee; and in the March following he appears as occupying a similar office in the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr. And, indeed, so rapidly did he rise to a place of prominence in the eye of the Church, that when the claims of the Scottish Establishment to additional endowments were recognized in the king's speech at the opening of the Parliament of 1835, he was selected, along with others, to proceed the same year to London as a deputation to lay the case of the Church before the Government.

That his devotion to public business in these times did not involve any neglect of his own parish, was demonstrated by the unanimity with which his congregation put the seal of their approval to his conduct in 1843. But, as a matter of fact, it was only after the excitement of the Disruption was over that he was able to address himself with great effect to that work in the Wynds in which he appeared most characteristically as the parochial minister; and previously to that the main interest of his history lies in noticing the part he took in the various endeavours put forth by the awakened Church of Scotland to adjust itself to the new conditions in the midst of which it found itself existing. Instead, then, of attempting to follow him step by step through the successive years, we shall simply give two or three outline sketches of the history of the time, and indicate the part which he took in the leading movements which distinguished it.

## CHAPTER V.

### EDUCATIONAL REVIVAL.

AMONG the many subjects brought under the notice of the famous Assembly of 1834, was a complaint of the parochial teachers. The Act of 1803 was felt by them to be oppressive and defective, and they contemplated asking the newly-reformed Parliament to make some changes in their favour. In order to the successful prosecution of their appeal, they knew that it was necessary to carry the Church along with them; and they were allowed to be heard by counsel at its bar. It is not necessary now to note all they wanted, but it is interesting on various accounts to hear that one thing for which they pressed was the right of appeal from Presbyteries to the higher ecclesiastical courts. This petition seems to have raised the question in some minds of whether the education of Scotland was under the best possible superintendence; and among those who were led to discuss that subject with special earnestness were Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Alexander Dunlop. Indeed, this appeal of the schoolmasters appears to have been the means of bringing together two men who from this early date became fast friends, and who lived to fight together through all the battles of the period.

Mr. Dunlop, a son of the Laird of Keppoch, was born in 1798 at Greenock. Becoming a member of the Scotch bar, he devoted himself at first wholly to the duties of his profes-



sion. But private and public events changed the currents of his life; and from 1832 to 1870, when he died, he took so distinguished a lead in the great ecclesiastical movements of the time as fully to realize the ideal picture of the characteristically Scottish patriot—" *All for the Church, and something less for the State.*" So early as 1831, he was named in the Assembly as one of the candidates for the Procuratorship; and although he was not successful in this quest, his leanings must by that time have been known sufficiently to lead to his having been thought of professionally when cases came up for discussion which required some acquaintance with the law and history of the Church. His earliest great effort in this line was made in 1833, when he was heard from the bar of the Assembly in support of the petition of the chapel ministers. His speech on that occasion must have surprised all who heard it. It was no mere piece of special pleading, got up by a clever advocate in obedience to instructions given to him in his brief. It carried on the very face of it evidence of the fact that it was the fruit of large reading and of deep thought; while in the principles which it laid down the key-note was struck on the Evangelical side of that great controversy about spiritual independence which was by-and-by to shake the Church to its foundations. This oration, with other things, concentrated public attention on Mr. Dunlop. He came to be regarded as one of the coming men of the period—one of the leaders whom those who were earnest would be safe to follow in a critical time; and in the middle of 1834 he was persuaded to undertake the conduct of a publication which had been started a year or two before to aid in the revival of religious life in Scotland. This publication was the *Presbyterian Review*. It was started by a few of the Edinburgh divinity students: Mr. Turner (afterwards of the Gorbals Parish, Glasgow), Mr. Omond (of Monzie), Mr. (after-

wards Professor) MacDougal, and Mr. Grant (of Pettie). These acted in the first instance together as an editorial committee. But by-and-by the *Review* fell into the hands of Mr. Omond alone, and by him it was transferred to Mr. Dunlop. And one of the first persons to whom Mr. Dunlop applied for literary assistance appears to have been Mr. Buchanan.

How Mr. Buchanan came to be so deeply concerned about the question of the *superintendence* of the parochial schools as he seems to have been at this time, we can only guess. But it is easy enough to account for his interest in the subject of education generally. On this point, as on others, the soul of Chalmers had been stirred within him when he went to Glasgow. Among the poorest classes, many children were growing up without any education; and still more of them with a very imperfect and comparatively useless education. To meet this evil, he had at once addressed himself to the erection of new schools suited to the circumstances of the people. And when the new minister of the Tron entered on his duties, he found a strong tide already flowing in the direction of an extension and improvement of the means of instruction. With such a movement he was prepared to sympathize from the first. He had taken a special interest in education, even in his country parishes; and to his eminently practical mind it was immediately made plain that, without a general elevation of the standard of intelligence, the Church must fight its battle in Glasgow with one of its hands tied. Mr. Dunlop had heard of Mr. Buchanan's convictions in this connection, and of a public address which he had delivered upon the subject; and he wrote to him, asking that his views might be given to the world through the pages of the *Review*. Mr. Buchanan's reply was as follows. We quote it chiefly because it contains a curious foreshadowing of the educational conflict which we have only recently seen ended: the ecclesiastic, as was

natural, maintaining the claims of the Church ; the layman, with a freer mind, advocating the broader system, which has since been actually established among us.

SUPERINTENDENCE OF SCHOOLS.

(To Mr. A. Dunlop.)

“ RICHMOND ST., GLASGOW,  
“ November 27, 1834.

“ It may be necessary to make you aware that it [the address] was not written as a mere treatise on the abstract question of Church Superintendence, but with a special reference to the superintendence actually vested in the Church of Scotland. It was no part of my object to speculate on possible improvements, but to vindicate, at least in its principle, the soundness of the existing system. Such being the case, I was not led to the consideration of any such questions as those to which you refer,—concerning the expediency of appointing an Educational Board, and giving it power to review the sentences of Presbyteries in all cases connected with schools and teachers. I have, however, turned over the idea in my head since receiving your letter, without being able to satisfy myself that such a Board would work. In order to be in a condition to have frequent meetings, the members of the Board would require to be chosen from the same neighbourhood ; and to preserve a central character, would probably need to have their seat at Edinburgh, the metropolis of the country. In other words, the Presbytery of Edinburgh, or a committee chosen out of it, would, in all likelihood, constitute the Educational Board. Now, the Presbytery of Edinburgh have already, from their peculiar position, as much of this kind of extra authority and duty as they can efficiently discharge, for I am induced to think that an *archiepiscopal Presbytery* may become as practically useless as an archiepiscopal pastor. Either the Board would be a mere name, or it would absorb more of the time of its members than they could or ought to give from their other and more immediate duties. To give it the power of reviewing the sentences of Presbyteries, would be to create a jurisdiction which our own ecclesiastical constitution does not recognize, and to open a door for innovations, by which that time-tried and time-honoured constitution might in these days, when men are peculiarly given to change, be utterly subverted and destroyed.

“ Unless I greatly mistake, when the subject of the schoolmasters' petition to Parliament was brought before last Assembly, a disposition was generally expressed to give the teachers a right of appeal from the Presbytery to the higher courts ; and this I am disposed to regard as a safer and more satisfactory expedient, than to give the authority in question to an Educational Board. Perhaps something might, however, be done in the

way of preserving a more efficient inspection over the state of education, were the Synods instructed to demand that special reports should be given in, at their regular meetings, by each of the Presbyteries within their bounds ; the Synods themselves being required to send up annual reports to the General Assembly. I throw out this idea for your consideration. It would carry the inspecting power more into the different districts of the country, and would at least have the effect of leading to a discussion of the interests of education twice a year in every province. This itself would be a great stimulus ; for in every Synod some minds would take it up in good earnest."

The aspirations of the period took shape in Glasgow in the establishment of an "*Educational Association*," which commenced work in 1834, Mr. Buchanan being one of its original and most active members. The fruit of the labours of this Association can be spoken of as nothing less than magnificent. Like all the other societies of the time, it began by issuing pamphlets. The first had rather a startling title : "*Scotland, a Half-Educated Nation* ;" for the country had been asleep, and this was one of its dreams, that its people were, in intelligence, ahead of all others. But the author (the Rev. G. Lewis, then Editor of the *Scottish Guardian*) had indisputable statistics to sustain his statements, and a profound feeling of anxiety and alarm began to overspread the land. It was proved, for example, that in the Highlands and Islands one-sixth of the whole population were unable to read ; and that in Glasgow the proportion of children attending school was not a fifth, as it should be, but a fifteenth. Out of 7529 persons, also, who were found in 1831 to be residing in the Tron parish, only 500 were ascertained to be receiving any instruction, either through the day or in the evening. It was high time something should be done ; and the Glasgow Association addressed itself to the prosecution of two objects. One was the extension of the parochial system, and the other was the improvement of its efficiency. For the attainment of the first end they were mainly dependent on Parliament, and

they petitioned that body accordingly ; but the other matter was more under their own control, and hence the second paper issued by the society was entitled, "*Hints towards the Formation of a Normal Seminary.*" From this paper we learn what were the earliest steps taken toward the organizing of that system to which Scotland has since owed so much. A sub-committee—composed of Sir Daniel Sandford, Professor Ramsay, Rev. R. Buchanan, Rev. J. Gibson, D. Stow, Esq. ; J. Leadbetter, Esq. ; Henry Dunlop, Esq. ; and Rev. G. Lewis—was appointed "to select, from amongst the existing parochial schools in Glasgow and suburbs, a juvenile and an infant school, to be presented to public attention as model schools." The schools so distinguished were St. John's, Annfield, under the care of Mr. Auld ; and St. Andrew's Infant School, Saltmarket, under the charge of Mr. Caughie. It was agreed to give additional pecuniary aid to these schools, so as to enable them to comply with the suggestions of the Association ; and arrangements were at once made to annex Normal classes to them, under the oversight of a competent director.

It was felt, however, that if this scheme was to be thoroughly successful, it must receive the sympathy and support of the whole Church. When the Assembly of 1835, therefore, came round, and Dr. Gordon, in room of Principal Baird, who was absent, gave in the Education Report, first Dr. Welsh,—who, because of his special acquaintance with the Prussian system, had been all along in close consultation with the Glasgow Society,—and then Mr. Buchanan, expounded the whole subject perfectly to the brethren.

Education thus came to be the subject of Mr. Buchanan's maiden speech in the General Assembly ; and it is interesting to read how one who, at the age of seventy, became a member of a modern School Board, spoke of the instruction of the people forty years ago :—

“Next,” he said, “to what affects the preaching of the gospel itself, I know not any question which has a higher claim to occupy a prominent place in the deliberations of this Assembly than the question how we may best increase the number and improve the character of the parish schools of Scotland.

“No one, sir, in this Assembly, can be so uninformed in regard to the history of the Church to which we have the honour to belong, as to need to be told the fact that the cause of the education of the people is a cause with the advancement of which our Church has been identified from the very first hour of her history.”

Having shown this at some length, he proceeded :—

“I ought to apologise for alluding to circumstances with which the members of this House must in general be familiar, but I have done so, not merely to remind this House, and through this House the community at large, how *entirely* Scotland owes her educational institutions to her National Church, but I do so, further, for the purpose of bringing to the minds of my fathers and brethren around me, that if we would not dishonour in this case the Church to which we belong—if we would not be unfaithful to the question which that Church’s history tells us she has deemed it a first point to advocate—if we would not leave her unworthily to follow when she has ever been accustomed nobly to lead—if we would not put in peril the Christian character of the system of our national instruction,—then we must put forth all our energies on the important objects contemplated by the propositions now before us on increasing the number and improving the character of the parish schools of Scotland. Within the last fifteen or twenty years the Church has been gradually awakening to the enormous evils resulting from allowing our parishes to outgrow the superintendence of that pastoral and educational agency which was devised by the wisdom of our forefathers. As far as the increase of pastors and churches is concerned, I believe the Church is now at length fairly aroused, and that a movement in that direction has already begun which is likely to go on, until the good news and the glad tidings of salvation shall again, as of old, be brought to every dwelling within the length and breadth of the land. But, sir, we must not forget that the teacher and the school is almost as important and essential a part of this moral machinery as the minister and the church. I believe, sir, that the movement for the increase of churches and ministers, which, under the auspices of Dr. Chalmers, has been for some time going on, has suffered most materially from the very name by which it has been characterized ;\* a name which has held up before the public mind the mere stone and lime of the places of worship, instead of

\* The *Church Accommodation* Committee, was the name first given to the Committee for Church Extension.

holding up before their minds the living pastor, who is to go forth and bring in the multitudes now wandering as sheep without a shepherd, and to lead them back to the Shepherd and Bishop of souls. I rejoice that the injury our cause has thus sustained is about to be removed; but I desiderate still more than this, that the people shall be made to understand not merely that we want more churches and more pastors, but that we want an extension of the parochial system in all its entireness and in all its efficiency."

Mr. Buchanan concluded by informing the House that the Glasgow Association had advertised for an educational missionary to examine the Normal Seminaries of London and the Continent; and were already in possession of a guaranteed income of £400 for three years, to secure a fair and thorough tried Master for the Institution which they proposed to establish. He hoped that they would thus establish a claim for support not only on the Church, but on the State itself.

Principal M'Farlan proposed the adoption of the Report; and in terms of it the Assembly agreed to enlarge the sphere of the committee's operations, and to petition Parliament for means to carry through the improvements which had been suggested. The feeling of sympathy expressed was unanimous and cordial; and the *Scottish Guardian* of the day, in summing up the results, gives it as its opinion that at this date—May 26, 1835—"the improvement and extension of our National Schools was placed alongside the extension of our National Church, as part of that parochial system whose revival and extension is now imperiously demanded."

## CHAPTER VI.

### AGITATION FOR CHURCH EXTENSION.

BUT for the new life infused into it by the Evangelical revival, the Scottish Establishment might, as the century wore on, have died of sheer inanition. One is positively startled to hear of the progress made within so short a time by Dissent. That which, in 1733, seemed scarcely bigger than a man's hand, had grown in 1833 to dimensions which enabled it to measure itself, on not unequal terms, with the great Church from which it had separated. In Edinburgh, for example, its bulk had become such that there were considerably more sittings in its places of worship than in all the parish churches of the city put together; and although it was certainly too big a boast which one of its deputations made to Lord Brougham, that there were already more people outside the Establishment than within it, yet the fact that that assertion did not sound absolutely ridiculous, speaks most significantly for the rapidity with which the process of depletion must have been proceeding. As to the causes of this consumption, these were patent enough. Something may have been due to the spread of those principles of religious equality, with the origination of which the first French Revolution had so much to do; and something also to the natural increase of the population, leading to the formation of congregations in localities of which the Establishment could not



take the full and active oversight. But the deepest explanation of the quiet and steady and portentous efflux from the Church lay undoubtedly in the fact that Moderatism was triumphant, and had failed to satisfy the religious wants and aspirations of the country. It seems more than probable that, if the slumbers of the period had not been broken in upon by the trumpet-calls of Thomson and Chalmers, this state of things would have continued indefinitely, and some fine morning in the year of grace 183— or 184—, the parochial clergy of Scotland might have wakened up to find that they were almost the sole occupants of a framework which had been raised for the benefit of the nation, and which it behoved the Government of the day, from a sense of decency, now to remove as superfluous.

The Moderates sadly failed to discern the signs of the times when they threw every sort of obstacle in the way of the execution of the policy of the Evangelicals. With the proposals of Chalmers for the extension of the Church, or at least for an appeal to the State to help towards that object, they so far sympathised, for they would have been glad enough to see the extinction of Dissent. But they bitterly disliked the excitement which he caused; they protested earnestly against what was essential to the *bona fide* expansion of the Church—the application of the principle of Presbyterian parity to all the new congregations; they persisted in standing up for the rights of the patrons as against the claims of the people; and they crowned their fatuity by demanding anew that the Queen should be recognized as possessing supreme authority in all causes civil and ecclesiastical. At what cost they succeeded in their resistance to the new life-currents in the Church, is matter of history. With the help of the secular arm they drove the truest friends of the Establishment into exile; and having made a desolation, they called

it peace. But now that a sort of parody on the old story of the Sibyl has been again in course of repetition among us, one wonders whether any of the modern defenders of the old oppressions ever allow themselves to speculate on what Scotland might have been this day if the Chapel ministers had been left unmolested, if the Veto Law had been suffered to remain in force, and if the Church's independence had never been called in question. God, in allowing things to take the course they did, had, we may well allow ourselves to believe, higher ends to serve than even the complete organization of the most effective National Church Establishment in the world. But the ideal which Chalmers had in his mind was in itself a magnificent one; and it is only right to keep alive the recollection of the fact that the responsibility of having prevented the realization of that ideal rests mainly with those to whose successors the truly poetic justice has been rendered of having had bestowed upon them, as a reward, boons which their fathers would neither accept for themselves nor suffer others peacefully to enjoy.

So early as 1828, the need for more adequate church accommodation was formally recognized by the General Assembly, and a committee was appointed to look after the matter. The population of the country had doubled since the framework of the Establishment had been set up, and in all the great cities and in many of the provincial towns the number of persons living in a state of practical and in a manner enforced heathenism had become enormous! In Glasgow alone, 60,000 people were found to have no Church connection whatever. Under these circumstances, the real state of things required only to be looked fairly in the face, in order to the conscience of the Church being aroused. Year after year the tide of feeling grew higher and higher, until the cause of Church Extension became literally what

it was afterwards called by Mr. Buchanan,—“the darling object of the Church.”

It was in 1834 that the scheme began to bulk in all its magnitude before the public eye. Then two events of high importance occurred. One was the proposal of Mr. William Collins to build twenty new places of worship in Glasgow; the other was the appointment of Dr. Chalmers to the Conventership of the Church Extension Committee. Mr. Collins's idea was to erect *Parish Churches*—churches in connection with which there should be a “defined territory,” and of which the ministers should be on a footing of entire equality with their brethren. He was also quite opposed to the arrangement whereby, according to the then existing law, the patron of a parish became the patron of every additional church that happened to be planted in it. For the execution of his plan, therefore, certain incidental reforms needed to be effected; and it is worth noting here that it was in considerable measure through the pressure brought to bear upon Church and State by the launching of this purely benevolent enterprise, that the reforms required were on the whole so readily assented to. The summer of 1834 saw in Parliament the passing of a Bill abolishing the titles of patrons to present to *quoad sacra* churches, and in the General Assembly the definite acceptance of the principle that Presbyterian ordination carries with it the right not merely to *teach* but to *rule*. Mr. Collins after this proceeded with his scheme, which implied the raising of £20,000 before a trowel was handled; and he not only succeeded in procuring the money desired, but in planting within six or seven years the whole of his contemplated twenty churches. In the meantime Chalmers was prosecuting a similar object on a larger scale, and that with an enthusiasm which speedily set the whole country on fire. “In appointing me Convener of the Assembly's Com-

mittee," said he, "for such a high object of Christian patriotism, I can truly affirm that, had I been left to make a choice among the countless diversities of well-doing, this is the one office that I should have selected as the most congenial to my taste." From this moment until the life of the Church was itself threatened by the Civil Courts, and a new direction was thus necessarily given to his energies, his whole heart and soul were occupied with the business of covering Scotland with what he himself called "a sufficiently thick-set Establishment." And in aiming at this object his motives were as pure and high as his own nature was guileless and unselfish. It was, perhaps, natural enough for the Dissenters to look askance upon the movement which he directed, and to see in it a scheme for the aggrandisement of the Church at their expense; but in the case of Chalmers, the ecclesiastic was completely sunk in the Christian philanthropist, and no suspicion was ever more unwarranted than that which saw in his zeal the heat of a partisan. One of the saddest and most painful episodes in his history, for example, is that which is known as "the contest for the Moderatorship." Some of his own dearest friends—Dr. Welsh, Dr. Gordon, Mr. Dunlop, Mr. (afterwards Lord) Cowan, and others—thought that Principal Lee had a claim to the chair, and named him for it. But the Principal was suspected of being cool in the cause of Church Extension, and that was enough to make him, in Chalmers' eyes, not merely an enemy of the Church, but so far almost of Christianity, and he opposed his nomination accordingly with a vehemence which now appears to us astonishing. The literature produced by this contest may be truly described as deplorable. The contest itself estranged the best men in the country from one another for years. And now to our cool indifferentism the whole thing seems *much ado about little*. But the episode has, in the present connection, an affecting

significance. It showed this, if nothing else, that Chalmers was for the time literally *dominated* by an idea, the importance of which seemed so great to him that to trifle with it was to be guilty of disloyalty to Christ. And Chalmers was thus only expressing, though in a form peculiarly intense, the spirit which was prevailing in the Church at large. The upholding of the Establishment as such, or the extinction of Dissent, was not much thought about; but a great and absorbing passion had seized men's minds to provide Christian ordinances for all the people, and the one test of parties alike in Church and State was their willingness or otherwise to help on the work that had been taken in hand.

The theory of the day was that the new churches should in general be built by private beneficence, but that an appeal should be made to the State to give a small endowment to each for the support of its minister. The first knock at the door of the Government was given in July 1834. Lord Melbourne and the Whigs were then in power, and they received the deputation from Scotland in a way that seemed wonderfully friendly; but the session was then too far advanced to allow of anything being done immediately, and they returned home for the time with nothing to show but good words and comfortable promises. Before another session opened, a change in the Ministry had occurred, resulting in the accession of Sir Robert Peel and the Tories; but the circumstance was not regarded as at all a discouraging one. On the contrary, the Tories were known to be more friendly to Church Extension than the Whigs; and Chalmers had very good cause to be hopeful when Sir W. Rae, the new Lord Advocate, wrote to him of his own accord, encouraging him to renew the application that had been made under the former Government. Sir William indeed showed himself to be so zealous

in the cause, that he was at pains to point out difficulties which he thought were certain to present themselves, and which he desired his correspondent to be prepared to meet. "Supposing," he says, for example—"supposing the Government willing to propose a grant for providing additional church accommodation and for the endowment of the ministers, *how will that be taken by the Dissenters?*" And the reply which Chalmers gave to that question is well worth remembering. "I do anticipate," says he, "a great outcry, though, I trust, a temporary one, on the part of Dissenters; but I am quite clear that it is the wisdom as well as duty of Government to brave it. On the other hand, *it is quite the duty of the Church to do all that is right for consulting the Dissenters, and if possible effecting a union with them. Our theology is substantially the same with that of at least nine-tenths of the Dissenters of Scotland.*" The advice, we may suppose, was received with acceptance; and when Parliament met in February 1835, and the claims of the Church of Scotland were expressly referred to in the King's Speech, the highest expectations were entertained of the matter being soon and satisfactorily settled. But the new Ministry speedily found that its own standing was too insecure to allow it to indulge in acts of generosity. From the very outset it was subjected to a series of more or less successful attacks on the part of the Whigs; and at last it was compelled, out of sheer self-respect, to resign. This made way again for Lord Melbourne, who resumed the reins of office on the 18th of April. The news of the change was not welcomed by the Scottish Church Extensionists. Still it was not forgotten that even the Whigs had spoken in a friendly strain to the deputation of the previous year; and the Commissioners for 1835 (of whom Mr. Buchanan was one) proceeded to London in good heart. They were not long, however,

in discovering that a change had come over the spirit of the Government dreams. That "great outcry" from the Dissenters which Chalmers had anticipated, had actually broken forth. Counter-deputations sent by them up to London had represented to Lord Melbourne and his colleagues that there was another side to the question—that, for one thing, the large number of unlet sittings in the parochial churches proved that the amount of spiritual destitution had been exaggerated; and the result was, not a vote of £10,000 a year, as was expected, but merely a *Royal Commission of Inquiry*. The feeling of disgust produced in the Church by this answer to its appeal was profound, and the irritation was still further aggravated—*first*, by the constitution of the Commission, and *next*, by the character of its instructions. "You have given us," wrote Chalmers, "a hostile secretary, and three hostile members, adverse, and known to be, to the extension of that Church whose pride and pre-eminence it is to be the Church of the common people; and *these three, it should be remarked, form a majority of all the real serviceable working Commissioners who reside in Scotland.*" And with regard to the instructions given to the Commissioners, these were specially offensive on account of their apparently trenching on the Church's spiritual independence, and because they seemed to be partial in their application, giving undue respect to the *amour propre* of the Dissenters. The issue of the whole may be told in a very few words. The Commissioners submitted their first report in February 1837, and the sum of it was alarming enough. It was to the effect that nearly one-third of the whole population of Edinburgh was living in entire neglect of religious ordinances; and the Government was asked if, after hearing such an account, it was not prepared at once to provide some remedy. No, was the reply; let us wait a little longer till we have all the

facts before us. All the facts were laid before Parliament by the end of the year. It was then announced, among other things as ascertained, that upwards of 60,000 persons, exclusive of children under ten, were not in the habit of attending any place of public worship in Glasgow. And with such statistics placed before them by their own Commission, the Ministry could no longer remain inactive. A Bill was drawn which proposed some benefits, although they were scarcely palpable, for the rural districts, but which offered nothing whatever to the great moral wastes of the large towns. It was felt at once that such a measure was a mockery, and strenuous efforts were made to induce the Government to deal with the Church in a more liberal spirit. But the appeals made to Lord Melbourne and his colleagues were all in vain, and the confidence of the Evangelical party in the Whig politicians became finally extinguished.

All along, Mr. Buchanan took the deepest interest in this movement. He heartily seconded Mr. Collins in his noble efforts to add to the church accommodation of Glasgow; and when, in 1836, another of the merchants of that city launched a scheme which was still larger and more liberal, he thus wrote about it to his friend, Mr. Dunlop:—

“I do not know if you have heard of a magnificent project of Mr. William Campbell of this city, to raise by one great effort £140,000 to build one hundred churches, the localities to be chosen and the funds managed by the Assembly’s Committee. He has corresponded about it with Chalmers, who, I understand, is delighted with it, and proposes to bring it under the notice of the Assembly. The whole scheme proceeds on a system of subdivision: each congregation to present the form of a pyramid, with a base of subscribers—numerous, of course—at 1s. 2d. to each of the hundred churches, and ending with one man at the apex, and subscribing one guinea to each. The scheme is worthy of serious consideration.”

Mr. Buchanan also took his full share of the work of agitating the Church and country on the topic of the day. He wrote



largely in the *Scottish Guardian*, a newspaper which the exigencies of the times had called into existence, and which, along with the *Witness*, did noble service in the Evangelical interest all through the conflict. His name, too, appears as one of the speakers in the debate which took place in the *pro re nata* meeting of the Commission of Assembly called in October 1835 to hear the disappointing report of the deputation of that autumn to London. And at a great church-accommodation meeting held in the Trades' Hall of his own city during the same summer, he delivered a defence of the Church Extension scheme against the assaults of the Dissenters, which was received with "enthusiastic applause."

Over this Trades' Hall meeting Bailie Gilmour (who, happily for Mr. Buchanan's argument, was a Whig) was called, on the motion of Mr. Smith of Jordan Hill, to preside. The motion submitted by Mr. Buchanan was as follows:—

"That the population of Scotland has, within the last century, more than doubled in amount, while its national religious and ecclesiastical establishment has been allowed to remain nearly stationary; that the fact, which does not admit of contradiction, that in this city and suburbs alone there are not fewer than 40,000 persons of an age to attend public worship who are living in entire estrangement from the ordinances of the gospel, in a state of practical heathenism, painfully demonstrates the danger of leaving entirely to private benevolence to supply the poor and the working-classes of the community with moral and religious instruction,—and impresses this meeting with a decided conviction that, unless the Legislature interpose their aid, the existing evils in the moral condition of the people must go on constantly and rapidly increasing, endangering the peace of civil society, and leaving thousands of souls to perish for lack of knowledge."

In speaking to this motion, he devoted himself almost entirely to answering the current Voluntary objections. These objections, he said, might be arranged under three heads,—*political, financial, and statistical*. First, it was common to affirm that the *Church Extension, was a Tory, movement*; but this, Mr. Buchanan pointed out, was on the very face of it

absurd, for the whole General Assembly was committed to the movement, and in that Assembly there was a Whig Commissioner, a Whig Moderator, a Whig Procurator, a Whig Leader (Lord Moncreiff), and among its most trusted men were the Whig advocates, Graham Spiers, John Shaw Stewart, Alexander Dunlop, and Earle Monteith.

“Besides,” continued the speaker, reserving his great hit till the last, “how does it happen, if this is a Tory conspiracy, that we have in the chair among us to-night the Whig magistrate, Bailie Gilmour?” This thrust told immensely, and was received with “enthusiastic cheering.” In regard to finance, a great difficulty had been made about the amount of money supposed to be required; but the pictures drawn in this connection were shown to be grossly exaggerated. All that was asked was £10,000 a year. And as for the Dissenting statistics, the whole sarcastic resources of the speaker were employed to pour ridicule upon them; one principle ruling them being, as he argued, this, that if it could be proved that there were unlet seats enough *in a province*, then the conclusion was inevitable that there was no need for any new churches *in any single parish in a province!* Thus Eastwood was admittedly deficient in church accommodation, but then *Jedburgh* had more than enough; and so, putting the two together, it was folly to talk of lack on the whole!

“I trust,” said Mr. Buchanan in concluding, “that not all the clamour and calumny by which we are opposed, were it even tenfold louder and fiercer than it is, will deter us from going steadily and stoutly forward, in a humble dependence on the blessing of God, towards the accomplishment of the work in which we are engaged. Amid all the earthly prosperity which has been fostering the genius and stimulating the enterprise of our city’s multitudinous population,—while our streets have been extended and beautified—while our factories, with their busy machinery, have been multiplying a thousandfold the materials of our commerce—while our ships have been searching every shore as a mart for our merchandise, and drawing from every clime the choicest of its treasures—while our merchants

have become princes, and our traffickers the honourable of the earth,—the truth can no longer be concealed, it has all the while been too much and sinfully forgotten that our city can be made truly and permanently to flourish only through the abundant and ‘faithful preaching of the Word.’ [Tremendous cheering.] The consequent and growing depravity of a spiritually-neglected populace has been gradually diffusing throughout the moral atmosphere in which we live the elements of a gathering storm. The once ‘little cloud,’ which few were then found to regard, has been progressively expanding its gloomy folds, and casting over our dwellings a deeper and more portentous shade. And now that we have been really awakened to the impending danger, shall we with reckless infatuation, or stupid indifference, sit with our hands folded until the tempest bursts upon our heads? Or, warned by the ominous mutterings of the yet restrained thunder, shall we not rather elevate toward heaven another and another spire, from another and another house of prayer, like lightning-rods, to pierce the storm-cloud’s bosom; to draw down safely and to bury in the earth the bolt of judgment, and to open a way for the Sun of Righteousness again to gladden, with his hallowed radiance, the many hearts and homes in our city that have so long been strangers to his blessed beams?”

The reverend gentleman resumed his seat amid the most enthusiastic applause.

Mr. Buchanan at this time had just been about eighteen months in Glasgow; and it is plain, from the ability of the speech itself, and from the manner of its reception, that he had already, and with good warrant, taken his position in the city as one of the recognized leaders of public opinion. Nor did the Church fail to take notice of his gifts, and of his manifest fitness, in various ways, to be of service to it during the then existing crisis. The succeeding Assembly chose him to proceed to London along with Chalmers, Dr. Patrick Macfarlane, and Dr. Simpson of Kirknewton, in order to press upon the Government the claim to endowments; and when the deputation came back with a good deal of the feeling in their hearts that they had been betrayed, no one felt more keenly the indignity that was put on the Church than Mr. Buchanan. In conjunction with others, he signed a requisition to Dr.

Thomson of Perth, who was then Moderator, to call a special meeting of the Commission, to consider the action of the Government; and when the Commission met in October, it was left to him chiefly to answer Sir J. Gibson Craig, who, along with two more members—both of them hailing from the Parliament House—undertook what at that moment must have been felt to be a forlorn hope,—the defence of Lord John Russell and the much-abused Whig Ministry. At a subsequent period, also, he addressed over his own name a long letter to the Earl of Minto, the Chairman of the Royal Commission of Inquiry, pointing out to him in strong language the grounds on which the terms of the Commission were objected to. It would serve no good purpose to quote from that letter at this time of day; but in his correspondence with Mr. Dunlop several points are discussed in a manner which is not a little suggestive, and some extracts from the letters thus written will be read with interest even now.

One thing in the Commission which gave rise to deep dissatisfaction, was the assumption which seemed to be made in it of a right inherent in the civil power to inquire into the way in which the Church was performing its spiritual functions. Any intention to trench upon the Church's independence was afterwards earnestly disclaimed; but even Chalmers was alarmed at first, and wrote warningly to Lord Melbourne on the subject; while Dean of Faculty Hope was moved to utter a protest which it must have been very awkward for him to remember at a subsequent period of his history, when he broadly maintained that the Church was a mere piece of State manufacture.

“The attempt,” said the Dean—“the attempt of the Crown (unconstitutional even by Act of Parliament, but by the Crown, whether on address of one House or not, a most flagrant attack on the Church) to inquire as to how the Church of Scotland performs its duty of affording religious instruction

and pastoral superintendence to the people, by Commissioners who are to visit your parishes and sit in judgment on you individually, taking evidence of all complaints, I suppose, which they may receive against individual members and against both the ministers and Church Courts — this attempt is not paralleled, I think, by anything in the reigns of James or Charles I.... I trust that the Presbyteries will unanimously resolve to refuse to acknowledge the *power* to institute any such inquiry, or to make any answers whatever to these Commissioners, now that the terms of the Commission are known..... On this subject my opinion as a lawyer is of little consequence; but you may quote it as decidedly formed that the Commission is illegal and incompetent, and the powers with which the Crown attempts to arm the Commissioners also illegal and ineffectual. I have stated to Lord Aberdeen that this visitation of the ministers by the Crown or by Parliament is utterly inconsistent with the Divine appointment of ministers, of the authority of the Church, and destructive of the principle and independence of Presbytery..... As a member of the Presbytery of Edinburgh, as our firm and well-tried Presbyterian champion, I trust your voice will be exerted upon this, as it seems to be the *commencement of the final fight for our Church.*”

Dr. Chalmers, to whom this warlike appeal was addressed, did not take quite so extreme a view of the Commission. Nor did Mr. Dunlop, who appears to have written at length on the subject. Mr. Buchanan, however, was one of those who looked at matters from the standpoint of Mr. Hope; and his reply to Mr. Dunlop was as follows:—

#### INDEPENDENCE OF THE CHURCH.

(To Mr. A. Dunlop.)

“GLASGOW, 17th Sept. 1835.

“It is not merely to bandy compliments, I assure you, that I now state the unfeigned respect with which I regard your opinion on such a question as the one at issue between us. It has driven me to examine over and over again the view of the subject which I had previously adopted; but whether it be due to the abundance of my self-esteem, or to the actual strength of my position, it has nowise shaken my convictions as to the soundness of the conclusion to which I had come. The main objection you urge against it appears to be this—that the very principle in virtue of which we hold the State entitled to *establish* the Church, binds us to recognize a right on the part of the civil power to inquire into the actual condition and working of what it has established; not, you say, with a view to prescribe what the

Church shall teach or do, but in order that it may know how to regulate its own conduct in continuing or withdrawing the civil sanction and support which the institution enjoys. Now, I do not dispute the right to inquire; that is obvious and undeniable. What I contest is simply its right to inquire through the medium of a *civil* tribunal—through any other medium than the Church Courts, to which alone the ministers and elders of our Church in matters spiritual are legally responsible. The very fact that the constitution of our Church concedes to the King a right to be present in her Synods, and to see that all things are transacted agreeably to those principles on which the compact with the State were formed, appears to me most unequivocally to indicate that through these ecclesiastical media alone is he at liberty to investigate the spiritual condition of the Church. In the discussion which took place in our Presbytery on the subject, Mr. Brown's great objection to this doctrine seemed to be that it of necessity shut up the State to an *ex parte* report. But, in the first place, let it be borne in mind that, in regard to the continuance of the Church's alliance with the State, the Church herself is powerless—she can do nothing to compel it; and for that very reason, as the weaker party in the compact, is entitled to the stronger protection against the *ex parte reports and proceedings of the STATE*. But further to oblige the State to make its inquiries through the Church Courts is by no means an *ex parte* proceeding in the same sense—in a sense by a hundredth part so unfair or dangerous to the *civil power*—as the allowing the State to conduct inquiries through Commissioners of its own would be unfair and dangerous to *the Church*. In the case of the former proceeding, the inquiry is conducted *in presence* of the State's representative, who may specify the points as to which he desires that investigation be made—it is his prerogative to lay the record of the Church's proceeding before the King's Council or his Parliament; and thereafter the State, having all the power in reference to the compact with the Church in its own hands, may legislate in the proceedings of the Church Courts as is thought fit. If the State can have it to say that, although the report be favourable to the Church, it was drawn up on a partial testimony, or in a manner that trampled on testimony, it may on that ground withdraw its support from an institution in which it can no longer have confidence. I cannot see, therefore, that the doctrine for which I contend is in the smallest degree unfair towards the State. But now to turn to the other case—the case of allowing to the State the power to inquire into the Church's spiritual condition through a Commission of its own. Here the danger to the Church, and the unfairness too, at once appear. The inquiry is conducted, so far as the Church is concerned, *in secret*—the persons making it may be her bitter enemies; and after collecting a one-sided and hostile view of her condition, the report is put into the hands of the State without any check or control on the part of the Church to guard herself against its misrepresentations being possible. And so the alliance may be dissolved on grounds

pregnant with the blackest injustice. I would not give a brass farthing, were this latter view acted on, for all the acts of security that may be found within the boards of the statute-book for maintaining our Establishment. The malice or caprice of the State would at any moment suffice to make a triumphant breach through them all. It may, to be sure, be said that the Executive of the State may do this at any rate—that if it choose to violate laws and compacts, it has the power to do so. Undoubtedly; but the difference lies in this—that by your theory it might indulge its malice *legally*, while, according to my view, it could do so only by an *avowed* violation of our constitutional securities.

“Although, as you will see from what I have written, my views both of the soundness and of the importance of the principle contended for at our *pro re nata* meeting of Presbytery remain the same, I am not, for that reason, insensible to the extreme danger of exhibiting division among ourselves in a meeting of the Assembly’s Commission on such a question. I communicated the substance of your views to the Moderator, and have just received a newspaper from him by Mr. Forbes, who returned last night from Perth, informing me that a meeting of the Commission is resolved on, and that he approves of your proposal about the Church appointing a Commission for herself.”

Another thing complained of was, that in the terms appointing the Commission undue partiality was shown to the Dissenters. In a letter to Mr. Dunlop, dated April 12, 1836, Mr. Buchanan says:—

“Of course you have seen the queries of the Royal Commission addressed to Dissenting ministers, together with the circular which accompanies them. Was there ever such a specimen of indecent partiality? They ask *us* everything about the financial state of our churches; and all the burdens on our chapel-churches will be revealed, so that our enemies may say the Establishment is at a discount—the benevolence of the people flows not her way—she is in difficulties, and verges to her fall. But observe the contrast. They put all the same queries, indeed, into their Dissenting list—but tell them with barefaced injustice that they need not answer them!—they are only intended to point out a line of information which those disposed may supply! Of course, when Voluntaryism has empty pockets and a ragged coat, the deponent will answer nothing. But when it happens to enjoy the sunshine of fortune in some wealthy district, we shall have its resources and its finery spread out in full view.

“Is this to be endured? It must be exposed some way or other; and the question is, How can we place it highest and most conspicuously in the pillory of public infamy? I have just written a long letter to Dr. Chalmers,

after conversing with several of my brethren on the subject, earnestly recommending that he should address a letter through the public papers to Lord Minto, pointing out the gross injustice to the cause with which the Commissioners have been intrusted which such a course of proceeding involves. I trouble you with this letter, just for the purpose of entreating you to second, if you approve, the proposal. Every paper in the country would transfer Dr. Chalmers' letter to its columns; and this, in such a case, is the thing to be gained. I know of no other way in which we could with the same certainty bring the Commissioners before the bar of public opinion with equal, or anything like equal, effect."

We give two more extracts, not because what they contain is of absolutely intrinsic value, but because they show the extraordinary keenness with which this investigation into the religious condition of Scotland was prosecuted, and are thus of some historical interest:—

#### THE COMMISSION.

"GLASGOW, *12th April 1836.*

"MY DEAR DUNLOP,—I am glad you think we are conducting the case before the Commission with something like proper spirit. Great pains have been used to make our statistical returns both full and accurate; and if the results be fairly combined and exhibited, I am satisfied they will present an irresistible case to Government. As far as I have been able to see, there has been no attempt to exaggerate on the side of the Church; while the Dissenters, in addition to any little truth they have bearing on the question, have been piling up 'wood, hay, stubble' unsparingly on the top of it. There are seldom fewer than eight or ten—sometimes fifteen or sixteen!—of their ministers, 'all in a row,' confronting the Commissioners, and ready to pounce on any weak point, real or imaginary, which they discern."

"GLASGOW, *10th May 1836.*

"MY DEAR DUNLOP,—The Commission has closed its proceedings here to-night, leaving some arrears only to be taken up by a Commission to be left behind or sent over from Edinburgh for that purpose. The Dissenters have been crowding in their surveys since *Thursday last*, at the very close of the Commission, when neither time nor opportunity remained for testing the accuracy of their statements. Indeed, the Commission commenced receiving them on that day *without notice given to a single Establishment minister* of any of the parishes to which the Dissenting surveys referred. And it was only on Mr. Gibson, who happened to be present, standing up and protesting against it, and referring to an express pledge he had received



from the Board that those surveys would *not* be received without full notice being previously given to the ministers of the parishes concerned, that they consented to stay further proceeding with those returns till next day. But as nearly all the parish ministers were in Edinburgh at the Communion, scarcely anything could possibly be done in the way of sifting the statistics thus hurried down upon the record of the Commission. My notion is, that the whole proceeding to which I have thus referred is disgraceful, and that if not exposed it may become the means of furnishing Lord J. Russell with the pretext he wishes to have for throwing the whole subject over the table. I have little doubt the Dissenting returns are materially at variance with ours; and if they are allowed equal weight, it is easy to see how an unfriendly Government will find in such discordant evidence an excellent reason for doing nothing at all. Now, what I wish to know is, whether you agree with me in thinking *that such a method of receiving evidence should be protested against?* The Dissenters knew that the Commission was coming here as soon as we did; they knew what it was to inquire about; and if they were disposed to dispute the allegation on the part of the Church that deficiency of means, &c., existed,—the allegation on which the Commission was issued,—they were bound to get their evidence ready to meet the Commission when it came. When the Commissioners arrived, they summoned all parties publicly and timeously when the case as to a given parish was to be tried. And what did the Dissenters do? They allowed the Establishment to make its statement, but made none whatever themselves; but then, after *hearing our case*, they were permitted by the Commission to go away and get up a case to meet it; and now they thrust in this counter-statement at the very close of the business, when, as I already said, there is neither time nor opportunity for testing the validity of their statements. Is this consistent with the principles which regulate the taking of evidence? If you think it is not, would you further think it wise that we should draw up a protest embodying a short statement of the objectionable proceeding, and have it signed by the Establishment clergy, and lodged as a testimony against it? If you do, be so kind as state in your more exact and legal phraseology the terms in which the thing objected to should be characterized.

“Of late, since the Commission broke up into fragments, things have been absurdly conducted. To-day, for example, receiving these Dissenting surveys, was the Procurator’s son—a boy—with Mr. Dick as his colleague, who, of course, did as he liked. How degrading to the Church of Scotland, that an inquiry of vital importance to her interests should be in the hands of a stripling hardly fit to be trusted with a case in the Small-Debt Court!”

The end of all this agitation,—so far, at least, as Government was concerned,—came at last in the spring of 1838.

Mr. Buchanan was again in London as one of a deputation from the Church of Scotland, and it so happens that we have a singularly full account of this visit and of its consequences in his own handwriting. We need make no apology for introducing the diary he kept *in extenso*; for although there are some things in it not relevant to Church Extension, there is nothing which, in the circumstances, does not possess an interest of its own.

*March 8, 1838.*—Left Glasgow, in company with Rev. Dr. M'Leod and Mr. Collins, at half-past nine A.M., by the steamer *Commodore*, being part of a deputation appointed to proceed to London on the Church Extension question.

The *Commodore* is a new and very fine ship, one hundred and ninety-six feet from stem to stern. Left Greenock exactly at twelve noon, passed Ailsa exactly at four P.M., being sixty miles in four hours, and continued at the same rate till we got into the Mersey, where a fog and ebb-tide together detained us above an hour. Dropped anchor abreast of Liverpool at five A.M. of the ninth. Left the ship at half-past five in a dense fog. Lost sight of everything before we were three boat-lengths from the steamer; the boatmen seemed not to know where they were, and we kept rowing hither and thither, grounding every now and then, for an entire hour before we got to the quay, from which at starting we were not two hundred yards distant.

By this delay we lost our chance of getting off by the first or half-past six A.M. train to Birmingham, and were obliged to remain in Liverpool till half-past eleven.

Drove to the rendezvous of the steam-carriages, got three places in the third carriage of the train, and at half-past eleven started from Liverpool. The carriages are large and handsome; each passenger has his own compartment, like an arm-chair, three on each side. The motion at first seems tremendous, giving one the sensation rather of flying than moving on the face of the earth. But nothing surprised me so much as the quickness with which one gets used to it, so that it seems nothing out of the way; and we got impatient if we were not skimming along at twenty-five or thirty miles an hour. The stages I marked were:—Newton, where the line goes on to Manchester, and at which we turned off towards Birmingham—Newton, 19 miles; Narford, 32; Crewe, 44; Whitmore, 54; Stafford, 68; Wolverhampton, 82½; Birmingham, 97.

We were detained half an hour at Newton, and five minutes at the other stages on the average. We started at half-past eleven, and reached the terminus at Birmingham at ten minutes past five; from which deduct one

hour, and we have four hours and forty minutes to travel ninety-seven miles,—being an average of fully twenty miles an hour. Several of the stages we ran at the rate of twenty-eight or thirty miles an hour. We were informed that the morning train goes faster, and loses less time at stages, accomplishing the journey in four and a half hours, everything included. Railway travelling is delightful for its ease and expeditiousness, but will never be resorted to by any one who wishes to see the country. The motion is too rapid to allow the eye to survey any one scene with accuracy or minuteness ; and, moreover, to secure a level, much of the railroad runs in lanes or cuts where the banks hide everything from the view.

BIRMINGHAM, *March 9.*—Mr. Collins got an inside place in the Mail, and started at a quarter to seven. Dr. M'Leod and I followed in the *Emerald* at eight (nominally at half-past seven). Night very cold ; two sulky, unsocial fellow-travellers beside us. Got to London about eleven A.M. of the 10th, and, after many petty interruptions, reached the Union Hotel, Cockspur Street, at a quarter to twelve.

LONDON, *March 10.*—As soon as we had dressed and ordered breakfast, ordered the day's paper. The *Morning Herald* was brought ; on opening which found, to our surprise and disgust, that last night, in the House of Lords, Lord Melbourne, in answer to a question from Lord Aberdeen, had given notice of a measure, in reference to Scottish Church Endowments, of the most insidious and dangerous description. In substance as follows :—1st, to give the Crown teinds to Highland parishes ; 2nd, to alter the Act 1707 anent unexhausted teinds, so as to make them accessible to the new churches built in parishes where unexhausted teinds exist ; and, *lastly*, to do nothing for the towns at all, unless where they may have landward parishes with unexhausted teinds. Obviously the design of the first part is to meet the clamour of the Dissenters about their vested rights ; in the Highlands there are *no* Dissenting churches, and therefore no money speculations to injure by cheap seat-rents. The second is a torch of discord thrown between the Church and the heritors. And the third leaves the towns to radicalism, Dissent, and infidelity, and consequently secures them as nurseries for liberalism !

Anything more barefaced and shameless never was proposed by a Government. They know the Law of 1707 will not be altered, but they basely make use of it to avert the storm from their own heads, and to turn into an engine against the Church herself, by stirring up the jealousies of Scotch heritors and of English tithe impropiators. And then, to leave out the towns, which contain nine-tenths of the destitution of Scotland, and which are, in fact, the only points of the case as to which their own Commission have reported !

Having read this report, we instantly resolved to abandon the intention we had previously formed of waiting immediately on the Lord Advocate

to announce our arrival, and seek through him to learn the designs of Government. Government having announced their plan,—and such a plan!—we felt it impossible to hold any intercourse with official men till the whole deputation had come, and that we had further instructions from home.

Before communicating what we had thus learned from the newspapers to Dr. Chalmers, we were anxious to see some of our Parliamentary friends, in order to learn in what light they regarded the proposition of Government. For this purpose we visited the houses of Mr. Pringle, Sir William Rae, Mr. Hope Johnstone, Lord Aberdeen, and called at the House of Commons. The first was out, the second not in town, the third at an election committee, the fourth just going out. We next called at the Carlton Club in search of Scotch members. None within, but met there with Sir George Clerk, who had a long conversation with us, and made us aware that Lord Aberdeen had put his question in consequence of the vagueness and ambiguity of the answer Lord John Russell had given to Sir Robert Peel—*purposely* so, every one believed. He was satisfied this movement on the part of Government was the consequence of the danger they had found themselves in from the late proceedings of the English and Scotch radicals. He had reason to believe they had intended something better, but the love of place tempted them to soothe the radicals at this price.

Met Sir George Sinclair on the street; found him in high indignation at the measure, which he attributed to the same circumstance.

Met Mr. Hope Johnstone returning from House of Commons; had a long conversation with him. He took the same view, and regarded the proposed measure as a complete betraying of the whole cause.

Both he and Sir G. Clerk concurred in thinking we should call up the rest of the deputation, and endeavour to force the Ministry to a disclosure of their plans, so as to report it to the Assembly. This the more needful, as Lord John Russell says his measure will not be brought on till after Easter.

Wrote this evening, to Dr. Chalmers, a letter to be read at the meeting of Committee to be held at Edinburgh on Monday, explaining the position of affairs, and entreating them to send the other deputies immediately, and that Dr. Chalmers himself should come if possible; also a private letter, more minutely describing what we had seen and heard.

*Sabbath, March 11.*—Went to Swallow Street Church, and found it was their Communion Sabbath. Assisted at the tables, and preached the evening sermon.

*Monday, March 12.*—Were visited after breakfast by Mr. Hope Johnstone. Told him of a proposal we entertain of a public meeting at Exeter Hall. He highly approved of it.

Wrote a long letter to Dr. Chalmers respecting the public meeting, entreating him to come up immediately, to have meetings with members

of Government first, and then the public meeting. Proposed to have the meetings with Government next week, and the public meeting on the week following.

Had a message from Lord Aberdeen. Dr. McLeod went to see him, and fixed an interview for to-morrow at eleven.

Were visited by Lord Tweeddale, who held a confidential conversation with us; stated that he had had a great deal of communication on the subject of Church Extension with a member of the Cabinet; signified his conviction that the ministers had been misinformed as to the facts of the question; and expressed a wish that I should accompany him to call on the Cabinet Minister to whom he alluded, and explain some points of the case to him. After consultation, I said there could be no objection to that, if it were distinctly understood that I went, not officially on the part of the deputation, but merely as a private individual. This, Lord Tweeddale said, was exactly what he wished, as he thought it possible that information presented in that private way might influence them when they came to meet the deputation formally. He accordingly went away to arrange a meeting.

Meanwhile Mr. Colquhoun and Mr. Pringle came in. To them we mentioned what had passed between us and Lord Tweeddale. They entirely approved of what was proposed to be done; and the more, that they had just come from Sir Robert Peel, who had recommended that the Church deputation should exhaust every means of conciliating the Government before coming to a rupture with them. To these gentlemen we also mentioned what Lord Tweeddale had intimated as to the reluctance Government had to meet Dr. Chalmers, whom they professed to regard as a violent political enemy. Lord Tweeddale wished that, to avoid giving them any pretext for taking offence, Dr. Chalmers might not be with the deputation when they had their interview with the Government. Messrs. Colquhoun and Pringle concurred in thinking it would be as well to agree to this, so that every ground of complaint might be taken away. At the same time, both expressed their conviction that Government would concede nothing—simply because they dared not; that they were hemmed in by the Radicals to the position they had assumed in reference to the Church Endowment question, and that, whatever their own feelings or wishes might be, following their present policy, they would not venture to propose an extension of Church influence in the great towns.

I accordingly appended a note to the letter I had prepared for Dr. Chalmers, openly laying the whole matter before him; entreating him to send up Dr. Muir and Dr. Simpson *this* week, and to come himself the following week, as, if he should think it best in the circumstances not to accompany the deputation to wait on the Government, we would rather he did not arrive in town till the interview was over. To be in town, and yet not to accompany us, might be misunderstood by the Church and the country.

Lord Tweeddale returned, and appointed to call for me to-morrow at a quarter to two p.m., to take me to the Board of Control to see Sir John C. Hobhouse, the Cabinet minister to whom he alluded.

*March 13.*—At a quarter past ten this forenoon the deputation had an interview with Sir Robert Peel at his house. Lord Aberdeen and Mr. Pringle were also present. After some general conversation, Sir Robert Peel intimated that he and his friends were most anxious and resolved to bring on a discussion, in reference to the Government plan, in the two Houses of Parliament, but that he thought it quite necessary that, before doing so, the deputation should have seen the Government and obtained their ultimatum. He was deeply convinced that every means should be employed by the deputation to induce the Government to abandon the objectionable parts of their plan; that it was an unnatural thing for a Government to be at war with an Established Church, and should be avoided if possible.

Lord Aberdeen strongly concurred in the same view, and urged, as did Sir Robert Peel, that we should have an interview with Lord Melbourne *immediately*. His lordship said there was such a pressure on Government at present, that no one could tell whether or not Lord Melbourne might not any evening commit himself still further on the question; more especially as Lord Brougham was taking every opportunity, when presenting petitions against the grant, to bring on discussions in which Lord Melbourne might find it very difficult to avoid mingling. His lordship further stated that he had seen Lord Melbourne yesterday, had talked with him on the subject, had told him a deputation from the Church was in town, and expressed his hope that he (Lord Melbourne) would be prepared to listen candidly to their statements. His lordship admitted that Lord Melbourne had said very decidedly, "At all events I won't give any more." But Lord Aberdeen thought that he might be induced—the thing was so absurd and monstrous—to abandon the idea of excluding the towns from any share of what he was to give. When thus urged both by Sir Robert Peel and Lord Aberdeen to ask an interview with Lord Melbourne *immediately*—this very day—we suggested that we were but a part of the deputation, and that we were disposed to shrink from the responsibility of holding such an interview without the other members of the deputation having arrived. They said: "The case does not admit of delay. It is for the interest of the cause that you see Lord Melbourne immediately." In short, both Sir Robert Peel and Lord Aberdeen made a point of it; and as we felt that we could not, in the circumstances, refuse the advice of those who were so well able to judge, we agreed, but we did so in the full conviction that, from the urgent letters we had written on Saturday to Edinburgh, the remaining members of the deputation must be in town before the day when an interview will be granted to us. Wrote Dr. Chalmers on this subject.

(Copy Letter to Lord Melbourne.)

“ UNION HOTEL, COCKSPUR STREET,  
“ March 13, 1858.

“The Rev. Dr. M'Leod, Rev. Mr. Buchanan, and Mr. Collins of Glasgow beg leave respectfully to inform Lord Melbourne that they have arrived in town as a deputation from the General Assembly's Committee on Church Extension in Scotland; and to solicit the favour of his naming a day when they may be allowed the honour of an interview with his lordship in reference to that subject, as they are anxious to have an opportunity of submitting certain important facts and considerations, which they venture to hope may not be disregarded in any decision to which Her Majesty's Government may come regarding it.

“THE RIGHT HON. LORD MELBOURNE.”

INTERVIEW WITH SIR JOHN CAM HOBHOUSE,  
*President of the Board of Control, and a member of the Cabinet.*

A few minutes before two p.m. Lord Tweeddale called, and drove me down to the Board of Control, a large building in Richmond Terrace, in a narrow street—an out-of-the-way sort of place. But I had neither time nor inclination to examine it then, being too much occupied with the approaching interview. We were shown along the gallery into a small side-room, and the servant went to announce us. On coming back, he said Sir John was extremely busy to-day, and he was afraid could not see us. “Has he forgotten his own appointment?” said Lord Tweeddale. “I don't suppose he has,” replied the servant; “but he is much occupied.” “Go and tell him that we are here by *appointment*,” said the marquis with emphasis. He soon returned, and asked the marquis to follow him; and in a few minutes came and requested me also to enter the apartment of the official dignitary. Lord Tweeddale had told me to remember to present to him as forcibly as possible the political consequences of the plan Government proposed; that it would make the Church of Scotland their perpetual opponents, and that not out of mere political enmity or party spirit, but from a sense of duty.

Having passed through a large outer room, like a great hall in some baron's castle, I entered, by a door in the corner of it, the private room of the Cabinet minister, and was received with much frankness and cordiality of manner. Sir John is rather a little man, with a brown wig, a high nose, and intelligent, agreeable countenance,—older than I supposed. He very soon introduced the subject. I directed my chief attention to the towns—which the Government proposed to do nothing for—and showed him they contained the great proportion of all the religious destitution of Scotland. The unlet seats I found to be his *pons asinorum*, and proceeded

to expose the fallacy of the argument which was raised on that foundation. I showed him that out of twenty-seven churches it was vain to expect that there would not always be unlet sittings, from the age of some of the ministers and consequent failure of their powers, or from a deficiency in popular talent, &c. ; but that the fact was, taking the Commissioners' Report in his hand, he would find that the twenty-seven Established churches of Glasgow had an average attendance of 1055 hearers—as many as any minister ought to have.

I then explained to him the difference between the congregational and parochial systems; showed how the former could penetrate a certain way down through society, and where it must stop. Its high seat-rents would leave out the poor, and its absence of parochial superintendence would leave untouched the multitudes who cared for none of these things. I gave him examples—the new parish church of Bridgton, with all its five hundred cheap sittings let in ten months, and only one hundred and seven of the dear ones; the Congregational Dissenting church, opened at the same time, with only forty sittings let—and already *for sale*. I then asked, respectfully, upon what principle of equity or consistency they could propose to exclude the towns—the very places their own Commission had described as in so deplorable a state. With great candour he said, “I confess I cannot answer that question.” He added, with a significant look, “Put that question to Lord Melbourne;” and continuing, he added further, “I acknowledge that your claims are the legitimate claims of a National Establishment; and I own, if we refuse them, I think we are falling practically into Voluntaryism—a principle which I know every member of the Cabinet repudiates. But still these seem to be the two alternatives; I can see *no middle* term between them.”

I then took advantage of these admissions to show him what an impression a measure like that would produce in Scotland—how inevitably many of their own friends would be alienated, and the Church, as a Church, *forced* into a state of permanent hostility to them, not out of party or political enmity, but from a sense of duty. When he spoke of the power of the Dissenters, I told him I thought he unduly estimated their power; that its apparent strength arose from their being associated with all those Churchmen who were friends of the present Government.

The interview lasted at least three-quarters of an hour. I rose and offered to retire more than once, knowing how much his time was occupied; but he would not allow me. The Chairman of the India House was kept waiting in an outer room at least twenty minutes,—all which seemed to indicate that the subject of our interview was felt to be an important one. Lord Tweeddale supported my statements manfully, and with his usual decision of manner. Lord Tweeddale, at the close of our interview, asked Sir John if he could not arrange a similar interview for me with Lord Melbourne, so that the Premier in the same private way might have a full



statement of the facts of the case before he met the deputation formally as a body. Sir John seemed to think this highly desirable, and said he would endeavour to do so, and engaged to let Lord Tweeddale know the result. Meanwhile, Sir John urged that the deputation should immediately send to Lord Melbourne an application for an interview, and, curiously enough, stated the very same reason for doing so that had been pressed upon us by Lord Aberdeen and Sir Robert Peel—namely, that there was a great danger lest Lord Melbourne should be tempted in the House of Lords to commit himself still more strongly on the question.

Went at five o'clock, all of us, to dine with the London Presbytery in the London Coffee-house, Ludgate Hill. Found my friend Mr. Burns, as Moderator, at the head of the table, and a large party of thirty or forty people, chiefly elders of the different Scotch churches. Great speechifying after dinner. Took advantage of the opportunity to pave the way for our proposed public meeting, by enlisting the gentlemen present in the scheme, and preparing them to aid in its objects.

*March 14.*—No communication from Lord Tweeddale on the subject of the private interview with Lord Melbourne.

Wrote the Provost of Glasgow, suggesting the propriety and importance of a petition from the Town Council in favour of endowments, as being fitted to show the Government in what point of view a large portion of the constituency of that city regards the question, and as a good set-off to the rabble petition of the Voluntaries.

In the afternoon went out to visit Mr. Colquhoun at Putney Heath. The road we took crosses the Thames at Putney Bridge, at the north end of which is Fulham, and at the south Putney. The heath is a mile further on, though no heath could I see; nothing but an immense common covered with furze, intersected with numerous roads of a yellow sand, skirted with plantations, and numerous villas studding it here and there.

Had much conversation with Mr. Colquhoun on the subject of our mission. Agreed that it would be most desirable to get private audiences of Lord Lansdowne, Lord John Russell, and Lord Melbourne, as the influential members of the Cabinet; also, to see Duke of Richmond, if possible. Mr. Colquhoun suggested that we must be prepared for an evasive answer from Lord Melbourne. He would probably say the subject was under consideration, and stave off the thing till after Easter. Agreed that we should ask decisively whether Government were disposed to abandon any part of the plan they had announced; and if so, what part.

*March 15.*—On coming into town at ten A.M., found a letter from Lord Melbourne's secretary to Dr. McLeod, announcing that he would grant us an interview this day at three P.M. in Downing Street. Regret extremely that the other members of the deputation are not arrived.

A letter from Dr. Chalmers, intimating that, at the meeting of the Committee in Edinburgh on Monday last, the deputation had been confirmed,

and that the meeting had adjourned till the next day (Tuesday) to consider the instructions. Regret that there should have been a division.

Resolved that at our interview with Lord Melbourne to-day we should begin by ascertaining distinctly what the Government plan is, and then state our objections to it. And also, that before leaving him we should make him aware that, by a communication from Edinburgh this morning, we are informed that the head Committee were to have a meeting on Tuesday, when the Government's plan would be considered, from which instructions will no doubt emanate, and that we may therefore find it necessary, when the two other members of the deputation join us, to solicit a second interview with the Premier.

Called this forenoon on the Duke of Richmond at his house in Portland Place; sent in our cards, with a written request that he would grant us an interview, or name a time convenient to himself for seeing us. Were immediately invited to walk in. The Duke is a tall, handsome man, apparently about forty-five years of age, dark hair, intelligent countenance, frank and unreserved in his manner. We stated the object of our visit—that we were anxious to know what his grace thought of the proposed plan of Government. He condemned most decidedly the notion of meddling with the teinds, as in truth downright spoliation; that the English lay impropiators would take the alarm, and that he had no doubt it never could pass. We then directed his attention to the towns. He agreed with us in thinking they were the chiefest part of the case, and assured us he would be ready to support these views when the subject should come to be discussed in Parliament. He recommended us to get a second interview with Lord Melbourne, after he should have had time to consider our representations and to consult with his colleagues.

#### INTERVIEW WITH LORD MELBOURNE.

Precisely at three P.M. were at the Treasury. Found Lord Melbourne had not come from a Cabinet meeting; were shown into an ante-room, and after waiting about fifteen minutes were told his lordship was ready to receive us.

On being introduced, we found his lordship standing with his hat in one hand and his stick in the other. He bowed, invited us to sit down (rather stiffly, I thought), and remained silent. I began by observing that, as we might have gathered an erroneous notion of what Government intended from the public papers, I was anxious to state what we had been led to believe the Government plan really was. He assented to the propriety of this; and I accordingly proceeded in substance to describe the plan as follows:—1. That the bishops' teinds should be given with a view to provide for the destitution of such Highland and other rural parishes as have no unexhausted tiends. 2. That an alteration should be proposed of the Law of 1707, with a view to facilitate the application of the unexhausted teinds

to relieve the destitution of the parishes to which they belong. 3. That nothing should be done to relieve the towns; that they should be left to themselves. Having heard my statement, he said, "That is quite correct; that is an accurate view of our plans." I then proceeded to point out the two leading objections we had to the scheme. *First*, In reference to the alteration of the Act 1707, I distinctly stated, that as to the propriety or righteousness of such a measure, it belonged to the Legislature to decide. It was a civil, not an ecclesiastical question. At the same time, I mentioned it as the feeling which was exhibited by men of all parties in the General Assembly last year, and particularly by Lord Moncreiff and Mr. Monteith, when the subject was incidentally discussed, that these teinds never could become a fund for the purposes of Church Extension. The only point of view in which, therefore, the Church was entitled to consider the question, was a *practical* point of view; and our fear was that these teinds would never really be laid open to us. *Second*, Our second objection was to the leaving out of the towns. This was our leading and insurmountable objection. We explained to him that the towns contained five-sixths of the whole case; and to prove this, proceeded to lay before him some of the facts which the reports contained. His only answer to these facts was,—“Indeed!—is it so? I have never read these reports yet.” Having explained to him the facts and principles of the case, it was mentioned to him that we had this morning had a communication from Edinburgh, informing us that the Assembly’s Church Extension Committee had met on Monday, and adjourned till Tuesday; that the subject of the Government’s plan was before that meeting, and that some additional instructions would in consequence be sent us; that two other members of the deputation, who had been at these meetings, were coming up immediately, and that on their arrival we would solicit another interview with his lordship. This, he said, he should be most ready to grant.

At the close of the interview I addressed his lordship respectfully but firmly as to the painful consequences that must result from the Government adhering to this plan. If the Church of Scotland had recently appeared to assume an attitude of hostility to the present Government, it was merely because of the Government’s supposed resistance to this question,—and, therein, to the religious interests of the people and the great principles of our religious Establishment; that I had little doubt that, were this question amicably settled, the great body of the Church would be found retiring from the political arena, and meddling neither with politics nor parties. But that the Church of Scotland, being as she was a *national* Church, could not and dared not be indifferent to the religious destitution which so extensively prevailed. And if Government should determine to do nothing to relieve it in the great towns, where it chiefly existed, they would force the Church into a state of permanent hostility; that we would feel it to be our duty to agitate the country, to press the question again and again upon

Government, and to employ every constitutional means to have the evils in question met by some adequate remedy.

During the interview his lordship kept very much on the reserve; preserved his usual air of *insouciance*, for the most part, though he seemed to be following the leading features of the case.

On coming home wrote to Dr. Chalmers a full account of the entire day's proceedings. Went down at six to the House of Commons. Saw Mr. Colquhoun; told him what had passed at the Treasury. He went forward to Sir Robert Peel, and communicated it to him. On returning, he said Sir Robert entirely approved of what we proposed. Recommended that, in writing to ask our next interview with Lord Melbourne, we should recapitulate what we understand to be the Government plan, and express a hope that his lordship would inform us whether the Government were resolved to adhere to it; that when we came to the interview, we must insist on knowing their ultimatum, that we may repeat it to the Committee at Edinburgh that sent us, and that we may communicate with our friends in Parliament, that they may decide on the course it may be necessary for them to take.

*March 16.*—Post here, and no letters from Edinburgh; conclude from this that the other members of the deputation will be here to-day, as on no other supposition can Dr. Chalmers' silence be explained. Dr. M'Leod called this morning on the Bishop of Exeter, who took him to Apsley House, assuring him of the vast importance of enlisting the Duke of Wellington. The Bishop saw the Duke, and came down saying the Duke was full of the subject, and had appointed to see the deputation on Wednesday next, the 21st, at twelve noon. The Bishop also engaged to secure an interview with the Primate and the Bishop of London, who would easily see that it is truly the question of Establishments,—and that this would tell powerfully on English members. He went off to do so.

I wrote letters in the course of the forenoon to ministers in the towns of Perth, Dundee, Aberdeen, and Ayr, requesting them to employ means immediately to get influential individuals among the constituencies of these places,—friends of Government, and at the same time friends of the Church,—to besiege their respective members with private letters complaining of the Government plan, condemning especially the proposal to exclude the towns from the benefits of it.

At five P.M. Mr. Colquhoun called, and showed us a letter from Mr. Cunningham of Edinburgh, announcing that Dr. Muir and Dr. Simpson had left Edinburgh on Wednesday. As it is nearly certain, therefore, that they will be in town to-night, we agreed to send a note to Lord John Russell, requesting an early interview. Mr. Colquhoun concurred with us in thinking that it were most desirable that we should see Lord John Russell before going to get our ultimatum from Lord Melbourne.

*March 17.*—Read over the whole record of our proceedings to Drs. Muir

and Simpson, who entirely approve of everything we have done. Resolved that, now the deputation is complete, we should call on the Lord Advocate,\* and hear what he has to say.

He immediately assumed the defensive. Asked in *seriatim* what observations we had to offer. It was stated to him plainly and courteously what our objections to the proposed Government scheme were, especially in reference to the towns. He seemed to know nothing of the facts reported by the Commission—at least, he took a note of the amount of destitution when we mentioned it, as if he had never heard of it before. He made no attempt to vindicate the Government plan; but seemed very much excited and out of humour, though the deputation spoke to him with the utmost calmness and courtesy. At the end, he said if we had any documents to lay before him, or representations to offer in writing, he would be glad to attend to them. It was replied that we desired nothing more than that he should direct his attention to the Royal Commission's Report. He asked if we would refer him to pages. We said the leading facts stood broadly out, and all that we were anxious for was that Government should realize their own expressed purpose to grant relief if the destitution was proved.

The interview was very unsatisfactory.

Called immediately after on Mr. C. Fergusson.† Found him in the Judge-Advocate's office, and though very unwell, very kindly disposed to converse with us on the subject of our mission. He seemed to us to feel that it was an unsatisfactory arrangement which the Government proposed. He attempted to argue that the Parliament were entitled to have the unappropriated teinds first applied. We were at pains to remind him that as for the source whence the supply should come, it was not for us to decide. But it was plain that, even if these teinds were made accessible, it would only be to churches built in parishes where these teinds were found; and that the towns, where no such teinds existed, were, therefore, upon every supposition, fairly excluded. That Lord Melbourne, indeed, had openly avowed this. He seemed much vexed and annoyed at the state of matters, but, of course, begged us to understand that he could not pledge himself to any particular course in reference to the question.

There was a great contrast between this gentleman and the Lord Advocate. The latter was really uncivil. When Dr. Muir was urging upon him, as an evidence of the interest taken in this question by the people of Scotland, the fact that "so great a demonstration"—"of kindness to the Government," interrupted the Advocate insolently. "Permit me," said Dr. Muir, "to finish my sentence;" and, with the utmost politeness, stated the immense sum the people had contributed and the number of churches they had built. In reference to the churches, the Lord Advocate said he believed they had sold their shares in these churches to good advantage.

\* John Archibald Murray, afterwards Lord Murray.

† Afterwards Sir Charles Fergusson.

This we did not understand ; it seemed to be so impossible that he could believe what he said. We told him, however, that no pecuniary return was *allowed in our new churches*.

We learned then that this Government scheme was concocted by Mr. Ellice, jun., at whose house there was a meeting of nineteen Scotch Government members and some of the Government ; and the virtue of the plan, for which Mr. Ellice specially commended it to their attention, was that in fact it would appear to be doing something for the Establishment, while in truth it was doing nothing, and that it would please the Dissenters by serving their interest in towns.

*Sabbath, March 18.*—Preached in the forenoon in St. Andrew's Scotch Church, Philpott Street, Stepney Parish—Dr. Crombie, minister. The congregation was originally formed under a Nonconformist minister in the reign of Charles I. The present church, fourteen years old. Had only 15 communicants and 40 seat-holders ; now above 200 communicants. There seemed to be a respectable attendance, 500 or 600 people. It contains 750 sittings.

Heard Dr. Crombie in the afternoon, and in the evening went to Regent Square Church and preached. Passed through Smithfield on the way. A shocking neighbourhood about—men fighting in the streets—shops open in multitudes. Regent Square Church very handsome ; enormously large. The 700 or 800 people in it looked like a handful.

*Monday, March 19.*—Received letters from Dr. Chalmers of the 15th and 16th. He is most anxious that we should have the public meeting ; thinks it will be of the very highest importance, both as relates to the raising of money and to an impression on the public mind ; but, at the same time, states the absolute impossibility of his taking part in it, owing to the state of his health. Entreats us to prolong our stay to the uttermost.

No answer from Lord John Russell.

(*Letter to Lord Melbourne.*)

“UNION HOTEL, COCKSPUR STREET,

“*March 19, 1838.*

“The Rev. Dr. Muir, Convener of the Deputation from the Church of Scotland, begs leave respectfully to inform Lord Melbourne that the deputation being now complete, they will feel much obliged if his lordship will now grant them the interview he was so kind as to promise to those of their number who had the honour of waiting upon him on the 15th inst. From what passed on that occasion, the deputation understand the plan proposed by Her Majesty's Government in reference to the question of religious instruction in Scotland to be as follows:—

“1. That the bishops' teinds should be applied in providing for the religious destitution existing in certain Highland and other rural parishes having no unexhausted teinds.

“2. That an alteration should be made of the Act 1707, respecting the division of parishes in Scotland, so as to afford increased facilities for the application of the unexhausted teinds in the hands of private proprietors to relieve the destitution of such rural parishes as have unexhausted teinds belonging to them.

“3. That nothing should be done for the towns—that no grant should be made from any source to provide additional means of religious instruction for them.

“Dr. Muir ventures to hope that Lord Melbourne will grant the interview on as early a day as may be consistent with his lordship’s convenience.”

The deputation resolved to transmit the above letter to Lord Melbourne in the course of this day, without waiting longer for an answer from Lord John Russell.

Had an interview by appointment with Lord Haddington, at twelve noon. His lordship heard our views at great length, and went most cordially into the subject. Assured us how eager he and his friends were to take up the question in the House of Peers, but that they must do so in concurrence with Sir Robert Peel, as they must beware of doing anything in the House that might prove prejudicial to the question in the other.

His lordship having started the question of Patronage, and asked what the feeling would be in Scotland if Government were to propose an endowment on condition of retaining the patronage, we assured him, with one voice, it would be fatal to church-building—that not only would the new churches already built decline an endowment offered on such terms, but we should never be able to raise another. His lordship most kindly said that, though his own feeling was strong in favour of Patronage, he would cautiously avoid mixing up in public discussion what he feared would be an element so injurious to our cause.

At the close of this interview Drs. Muir and Simpson went to Lord Aberdeen’s, by appointment.

Lord Aberdeen mentioned to Dr. Muir that he had seen and conversed with Lord Melbourne since our interview,—that he had told the Premier the deputation could not believe the Government were serious in the plan they had proposed—to leave out the towns. Lord Melbourne said,—“I won’t give any more.” “Well, but,” said Lord Aberdeen, “you will surely make an equal distribution over town and country of what you do give.” “Well,” he answered, “perhaps so.”

It is impossible to know what to think of this.

At night found a letter from Lord John Russell, fixing an interview for Thursday, 22nd, at two p.m.

*March 20.*—This morning a note from Mr. Colquhoun, intimating that the Bishop of London is to see us at eleven this forenoon.

A letter from Dr. Chalmers, expressing his satisfaction with our proceedings.

INTERVIEW WITH THE BISHOP OF LONDON.

Went to London House at eleven, accompanied by Mr. Colquhoun. Found the Bishop in his library. He is a good-looking, gentleman-like man—bald, a round prominent forehead—clear, intelligent countenance—and but for that absurd-looking piece of Episcopal dress, the black apron, he would be a fine-looking man.

Entered at once on the subject. He showed himself thoroughly and intelligently acquainted with it. He had been making his notes on his copies of the Edinburgh and Glasgow reports. Stated strongly his conviction that the Establishment principle was at stake in the present question, and that he and the heads of the English Church were as much interested as we were in resisting the proposed plan of Government. He suggested that the subject should be brought on in the House of Peers by Lords Aberdeen and Haddington, and that then the Primate and himself should follow it up, and show the feeling they entertain upon this subject. We explained that this was precisely what we wanted.

Had a long conversation with Mr. Colquhoun afterwards as to the public meeting. He is strongly of opinion that it must not be till after the subject has been discussed in Parliament—to hear Sir Robert Peel's opinion on this point.

Dr. M'Leod called on the Bishop of Exeter this forenoon. The Bishop stated that he had written the Primate, pressing the importance of our question upon him, and asking him to appoint a time for our calling on his grace. The Bishop expects that by Friday his grace will be able to see us.

*Wednesday, March 21.*—After breakfast a note arrived from the Bishop of Exeter to Dr. M'Leod, intimating that the Primate would be glad to see the deputation either on Thursday or Friday first, at eleven A.M. Dr. M'Leod sent notice both to the Bishop of Exeter and to the Primate, accepting the interview for Thursday.

INTERVIEW WITH THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON.

A few minutes before twelve we were at the gate of Apsley House. The servants seemed to have received intimation of our visit, as we were admitted without a question being asked. We were shown into a sort of ante-room looking into the park. There was a table in the centre of the room, with writing materials laid out. A handsome cupboard with glass doors, occupying one side of the room, was filled with the celebrated Dresden china presented to his grace by the King of Prussia, which I remembered having seen on his grace's table on the 18th of June 1835, as laid out for the annual Waterloo dinner. In other parts of the room there were cases of the same kind filled with books,—among which



I noticed Bourrienne's Memoirs, Fouché's, Rovigo's; The Wars of the Peninsula; Sieges in Spain, &c., &c., all French—probably sent to his grace by the authors. I did not see any English work on these subjects. After we had waited about ten minutes, a door at the upper corner of the room was opened, and the Duke appeared and requested us to walk into the inner room, which was the library—a very large and elegant apartment, the floor of which was occupied to a great extent with writing and other tables, on which lay a multitude of books, papers, &c. His appearance every one knows. The large aquiline nose, the high-arched eyebrow, the clear, penetrating blue eye, small mouth, rounded and prominent chin, would be recognized at once by everybody who has seen any one of the ten thousand engravings scattered through the bookshops of all the towns and villages of the kingdom. Nothing could be more simple and unostentatious—nay, more kind and familiar—than his manner in receiving us. Instead of calling his servant to set our chairs, or leaving us to do so ourselves, he busied himself lifting a package from one chair and a picture from another and drawing them forward until he had accommodated us all; and then, advancing his own chair close to the little circle we formed, he sat down almost in the midst of us.

Dr. Muir commenced the conversation by stating the grounds on which we had been desirous to have the honour of an interview with his grace. He had no doubt, he said, that we might reckon on his grace's sympathy and assistance, even had our case no other claim on his grace's attention than what belonged to it directly and intrinsically as the case of the Church of Scotland seeking the means of religious instruction for the destitute of her people. But that we felt convinced, as we were glad to find were also the heads of the Church of England, that our case was virtually the case of Church Establishments all over the empire; and knowing as we did his grace's sentiments on that subject, we ventured to hope that he would be disposed, when the question came on for discussion in the House of Peers, to give our cause the benefit it must derive from the public expression on such an occasion of his opinion regarding it.

We had agreed that it would be inexpedient, as it was unnecessary, to trouble the Duke with any of the statistical details of the question, and accordingly Dr. Muir confined himself for the most part to a statement of the great principles involved in the question. To that statement he listened calmly and attentively; and when it was made, expressed his entire concurrence in it, and his conviction that the bishops of the Church of England could but feel that in this matter the interests of their Church were identified with ours. "For," said his grace, "if religion be overturned in Scotland, it will not stand here." "To set up," he continued, "in Glasgow and Edinburgh, and the great towns in general, what they call the system of Voluntaryism" (and as he uttered this word in a tone of peculiar emphasis, his eyebrow shot up into its highest curve, while his eye sparkled, and his

month curled with a most comical expression), “is the most monstrous thing that was ever heard of—totally inconsistent with the peace and good order of society. Why,” said he, speaking with great force, “I think Old Popery was bad—very bad; but this Voluntaryism would be forty times worse. Independent of the religious interests of the people, which would be sacrificed, it would be impossible to govern society with such a system prevailing.”

Dr. Muir took occasion to refer to the unlet seats, the Duke having mentioned what he understood Lord Melbourne to have affirmed, that there were plenty of places of worship in the towns of one kind or other. On this subject Dr. Muir noticed the unprincipled absurdity of reckoning as church room Popish chapels and Socinian meeting-houses, and the practical consequences in which the ministers of the Establishment would be involved if all the unlet Dissenting sittings were to be counted in settling this question; that, in short, he, an Establishment minister, must set himself to assist in persuading his parishioners to go and fill them. “Why,” said the Duke, “as for these Dissenting churches, the ministers of which have no charge over the surrounding population, and whose doctrines may be altogether unsound, they might as well be as many mosques;” and here he took occasion to lay down, in very clear and emphatic terms, his notion of an Establishment: “That the Government were bound to provide church accommodation and religious instruction for the whole people, *according to the truth*. But unfortunately these gentlemen” (referring to the Government and their supporters), he continued, “seem to leave ‘the truth’ out of sight. Their belief of the true doctrine—if they have such a belief—seems to be left out of the question in dealing with this subject.”

We expressed our deep satisfaction at finding his grace prepared to advocate the cause of Establishments on this high and only sure ground.

He said it would not, of course, become him, unconnected as he was with Scotland, to take the lead in our business, but he would certainly take an opportunity of following up the statements that would, no doubt, be made regarding it by Lord Aberdeen and Lord Haddington.

Towards the close of our interview he said, with that striking decision of tone and manner so peculiar to him,—“Gentlemen, you will get nothing. That is my opinion. I am sorry for it; but so you will find it. You have two parties against you—the Radicals, with Lord Brougham at their head; and the Government, who are really as much opposed to you as the Radicals. I believe,” he said, “they will not be able, or at least it will be with great difficulty if they succeed, to carry through the grant of the bishops’ teinds. They are part of the consolidated fund; they will need an Act to get them out; and I doubt if they will obtain it from the Commons. The other part of their measure, altering the law as to the unexhausted teinds, and which affects the rights of property, I think they will get through the Lower House. There is some robbery to be committed by that part of their plan,”

he said, with a sarcastic smile, "and that is a great recommendation to any measure in present times. But my firm conviction is," he again repeated, "that you will get nothing. The real question which now divides this country, and which truly divides the House of Commons, is just this—Church or no Church. People talk of the war in Spain, and the Canada question; but all that is of little moment. The real question is Church or no Church; and the majority of the House of Commons—a small majority, it is true, but still a majority—are practically against it. It is a melancholy state of things, but such appears to me to be the critical position in which we now stand."

It is not easy to describe the energy of voice and manner with which he expressed these sentiments. The whole interview was conducted on his part with a simplicity and ease that not only relieved us from all those restraints which state and ceremony commonly impose, but which almost tempted one to forget that the man who addressed us with so much familiarity was the hero of Waterloo—the man who had wielded the power of the confederated armies of Europe, and had driven Napoleon from his throne.

At the close of our interview, as we were about to take leave, Dr. Muir acknowledged in becoming terms our gratitude for the honour he had conferred upon us in granting us this interview, and expressed his deep conviction that the kindly reception his grace had given the deputation from the Church of Scotland, and the sentiments so entirely in accordance with high and sound principle which he had expressed in reference to the question we had brought under his grace's consideration, would add throughout our Church and country to the veneration with which his grace was universally regarded. In the most cordial manner he shook hands with Dr. Muir at the close of this address. It was most gratifying to observe the state of vigorous health the Duke seems to enjoy.

#### INTERVIEW WITH LORD MELBOURNE.

Were at the Treasury a few minutes before five o'clock, and were shown into the usual waiting-room. A gentleman who had gone in before us was sitting there waiting for an audience. On the table of the ante-room there were several books and pamphlets, among which we noticed a book dedicated to Lord Melbourne, entitled, "Brief History of the Church of Scotland, and of the bearing of the Endowments on the Interest of the People"—or something to that effect—by Alex. Fyfe, Member of the Royal College of Surgeons, Edinburgh, published in 1836. The book seemed to be full of the grossest and most virulent and vulgar attacks upon the Established clergy. There was also on the table a number of the "Old Monthly Magazine," in which there was an article in the same strain with Mr. Fyfe's book. The gentleman whom we found in the waiting-room having had his audience, we were told the

Premier was ready to receive us, and we accordingly entered his apartment. He received us with his customary nonchalance of manner. As soon as we were seated, Dr. Muir, as had been agreed upon, requested respectfully to know if in the written statement we had sent to his lordship we had correctly described the Government plan in reference to the question of religious instruction in Scotland. His lordship answered, "I think you have; so far as I recollect, I think you have." Dr. Muir then said, "I have here, my lord, a copy of what we sent to your lordship,"—at the same time handing it to him, and saying that, as we were most anxious to avoid misapprehension or mistake, we should be glad if his lordship would cast his eye over it. Lord Melbourne then read it aloud, slowly and distinctly, and said, "Yes, it is quite correct; you have correctly stated it." And what showed that he was reading with care and attention, he noticed that the word "no" had by a clerical error been omitted; and remarked that, putting in the word *no*, the paper which he returned to us had accurately described their proposed scheme.

Dr. Muir then proceeded to observe that the *third* particular in the plan,—namely, the leaving the destitution of the towns totally unprovided for,—was the feature of it to which we cherished the strongest and most insurmountable objections. He and other members of the deputation pointed out by various arguments and illustrations the inconsistency and injustice of such a mode of dealing with the question. His only answer was a reference to the unlet sittings. We explained to him that, in the first place, of the twenty thousand of these in Glasgow, fifteen thousand were in Dissenting churches. Would he have the ministers of the Establishment bound to send their people into these? He admitted that this would be unreasonable; he would not ask that. Well, then, as to the remaining five thousand, it was to be borne in mind that all that were *unlet* were not, in the Establishment, *unoccupied*; and, moreover, that unlet sittings, with a high seat-rent upon them, were no accommodation to the poor. "But," said he, "the sittings are very cheap; there are plenty of unlet sittings very cheap—not more than one shilling; every man can pay a shilling." This extraordinary statement was promptly met by a reference to the Report, in which it is declared that out of all the sittings in Dissenting churches, only the small number of two hundred and seventy-seven are at so low a price as *two* shillings, and that there are none at one shilling; and that things were much the same in the Established churches. But the misfortune was, that while he was evidently in a state of profoundest ignorance as to the facts of the case, it appeared to be of no manner of use to give him information, as it made no manner of impression. He did not know whether three reports or four had been given, or what the last one referred to; in short, evidently knew nothing upon the subject. Dr. Macleod mentioned the striking case of the destitution of eleven thousand adult Highlanders in Glasgow, not one of whom has a sitting in any church, and of the proved inefficacy of the Voluntary system to reach

them, as shown in the fact that the Dissenters once established a Gaelic place of worship, and were forced to abandon it on the ground which they avowed, that the people were not able to pay for the ministrations of the gospel. But Lord Melbourne's only remark on this part of the case was, "Are many of these Highlanders Roman Catholics?" And when told "very few;" he added, "Indeed! I thought there were many Roman Catholics in the Highlands." It is also a curious circumstance, when I alluded to the Roman Catholics in Glasgow, he inquired what were their numbers. I answered, By an accurate domiciliary survey, the Presbytery of Glasgow had ascertained them to be twenty thousand,—about *one-half* what their bishop had represented them to be. He asked if these Roman Catholics had a sufficiency of chapels? I of course told him the facts as described in the Report,—that they had something more than four thousand sittings; but that, of course, we could not honestly or consistently wish them to be in such places of worship at all. Here Dr. Muir struck in for the purpose of enforcing the great principle that it is the duty of a Protestant Government to provide the means of instruction in the truth for the people; and that as the doctrines of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, and of the Confession of Faith of the Church of Scotland, were what we could alone regard as the truth, that it was only in so far as means were provided for teaching these sacred doctrines we could be satisfied. When Dr. Muir spoke of holding these doctrines to be exclusively "the truth," he said, "Oh yes; that is what every Establishment and every sect says"—meaning, of course, that any one had as much reason to say it as any other; in short, giving expression to the common sentiment of infidels. After we had spent a reasonable time—about half an hour—in arguing the question, as his lordship showed no disposition to yield,—in fact, neither admitting nor denying the force of our statements, and preserving an air of the most perfect indifference,—we rose; and after expressing the grief with which we received such an announcement as the ultimatum of Her Majesty's Government,—namely, that the destitution of the great towns was to be left totally unprovided for, so far as they were concerned,—we distinctly told his lordship that this ultimatum we regarded not only as a manifest departure from the pledge plainly implied in the terms of the instructions given to the Commission of Inquiry, but as an unequivocal renunciation of the Establishment principle in the towns of Scotland. He said, in answer to this, "That is your inference. I cannot, of course, admit that conclusion." To which it was replied, that we had no doubt the inference we had drawn was the inference that would, in point of fact, be drawn by the Church of Scotland, and, as we ventured to think, by the Church of England too, as it was impossible to deny that, according to the determination to which Government had come, they were resolved henceforth no longer to recognize or carry out the principles of a religious Establishment in the great towns.

As we were preparing to leave the room, he said he would consider what we had said. Upon this Dr. Simpson immediately remarked,—“Then, my lord, are we to hope that, in reference to the idea of leaving out the towns, there is some chance that you may still change your plan?” To this he replied very distinctly and emphatically, and in a tone not to be misunderstood, “*I think we shall not.*” We then took our leave, informing his lordship that we should inform the Church of Scotland of this determination.

In the course of the interview there was a reference made by a member of the deputation to the insinuation that had been thrown out by the Lord Advocate—without, of course, naming the Advocate—that the new churches were made matters of speculation, “in which some individuals had sold their shares to good advantage.” Lord Melbourne said twice over, and explicitly, that he had never heard nor imagined such a thing to be the case. The real state of the matter was explained to him,—that the Assembly would not *give a constitution* to a church, the subscribers to which were to receive any pecuniary return.

In the evening had much anxious conversation as to the course we should recommend our Parliamentary friends to pursue in consequence of the Government’s determination, and as to what the next Assembly should do. The crisis is important and solemnizing, and calls for much Christian wisdom and much earnest prayer.

Towards the close of our interview with Lord Melbourne, Dr. Muir made an impressive appeal to his lordship on the subject of the proposed plan of Government, which he characterized as one of the worst and cruelest blows that had ever been dealt to the Established Church. To all which his lordship only replied,—“Why, you won’t be any worse, at any rate. You may not be any better; but, hang it! you won’t be any worse!”

#### INTERVIEW WITH THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

*March 22.*—In proceeding to Lambeth, according to appointment, we drove round by Hyde Park, hoping to see the Queen, who was expected to accompany the Duke of Wellington to review the Guards, who are about to be sent to Canada. The day being cold, the Queen did not appear; and as we had only a minute to spare on the ground, we did not see the Duke either. We reached the archiepiscopal palace of Lambeth at a few minutes past eleven. The entry into the inner court is by a great gate, under an ancient tower, the oldest part of the building. The greater part of the palace is a modern building, half baronial and half ecclesiastical in its character. After waiting a few minutes in an ante-room, and sending in our cards, we were shown into the Archbishop’s private library,—a large and elegant apartment, looking out into the grounds connected with the palace, and which in that direction stretch down to the river. The fitting up of the room—and indeed of all the rooms we had an opportunity of

examining—had a character of simple elegance: nothing glittering or gorgeous, but all pervaded with a sobriety, both in the colouring and ornaments, which harmonized well with the ecclesiastical character of the edifice. The wood-work in the rooms and corridors was chiefly of oak, and most of the carpeting, curtains, &c., of crimson or brown.

The Archbishop\* received us with the utmost kindness. He is an old man—turned of seventy—very thin, and about the middle size. His countenance is full of meekness and benevolence. He had heard of our interview with the Duke of Wellington, and began the conversation by a reference to it. And when we told him how much we had been gratified to find the Duke taking up the question of Establishments on the high Scriptural ground, he remarked that a man's arriving at right views of such a question depended more on the state of his moral nature than on the force of his intellect; that a man who had a love of truth could alone appreciate its full bearing on such questions. And though we did not understand him to mean that he considered the Duke to be under the influence of personal religion, he seemed to have a favourable view of the present state of the Duke's mind, and distinctly said that some years ago the Duke's views of the Establishment question rested on much lower and less Scriptural grounds than they do now.

We explained to him at great length the nature of our case, into the consideration of which he entered with great cordiality, and in discussing which he discovered a most intelligent acquaintance with the great principles it involved.

At Sir Robert Peel's in the evening, the Archbishop mentioned to some of us a curious circumstance,—that while there are records in the palace of all the archbishops back to the time of Becket, and of a long series before that well-known prelate, there is no record of Becket himself. His archiepiscopal incumbency forms the only blank in the annals of the see.

#### INTERVIEW WITH LORD JOHN RUSSELL.

At two o'clock went to the Home Office, and after being detained about five minutes in an ante-room, were shown into the presence of Lord John, with whom we found his under-secretary, Mr. Fox Maule.

Dr. Muir stated, as briefly as possible, the circumstances in which we had waited on his lordship,—that we had had an interview yesterday with Lord Melbourne, to whom we had previously transmitted a written statement of what we understood the Government plan to be,—that at the interview we had put a copy of the same statement into his lordship's hands, and that after reading it over the Premier had acknowledged the accuracy of the representations which it gave,—that as Lord Melbourne, after hearing our views, had intimated his determination and that of the Government to adhere to the plan in question, we felt it was now almost

\* Dr. Howley.

unnecessary to obtrude ourselves on Lord John Russell's attention, or to occupy his time, we of course taking it for granted that the mind of Government was definitively made up. Lord John then said he had not seen our letter to Lord Melbourne, and that he should like to know exactly what its terms were. We therefore produced the copy which Lord Melbourne himself had read over, and whose accuracy he had affirmed. On reading it to Lord John, he objected to the word "rural" in the second article, as a limitation in the case of the unexhausted teinds which was not intended by them, as they meant that part of their plan to apply to parishes, whether of town or country, which happened to have such teinds, and at the same time to need additional means of religious instruction.

He stated further that the same remark applied to the first article, as the bishops' teinds were not to be alienated from town parishes having such teinds and needing a parochial application of them; and he instanced the Barony as an example, in which the bishops' teinds *would be* applied locally. At the same time, his lordship laid down no principle according to which the distribution of these teinds was to be regulated, so as to determine when they would be alienated from their own parishes and when they would be restricted to them.

Having made these remarks, he proceeded to take a copy of the first and second articles as given in our Statement, leaving out the word "rural" in the second; and having done this he said, holding up his own manuscript, "I should say this was the whole of the Government proposition. Your third article is a mere inference." We admitted that the two articles did contain everything *positive* in the Government plan; but the third was essential, and Lord Melbourne had distinctly admitted it in order to give a just view of the real nature of their plan. It was explained to his lordship that, independent of the fact that several towns having unexhausted teinds would derive no effectual relief from these teinds though they were made accessible, the amount being so very small,—such as Dundee, which, with its five unendowed churches and its immense mass of religious destitution, had only £48 of unexhausted teinds,—that independent of this objection, it was written on the very face of the measure that for towns having neither bishops' nor private teinds, it was to make *no provision*,—that, in short, from the very outset, it was thus to be laid down as a rule, that for a certain part of our population no additional means of religious instruction were to be supplied, whatever their destitution might be. His lordship insinuated that we were scarcely entitled to draw this conclusion,—observing, in language very vague and indefinite, that though this particular measure went no further than to the classes of cases above noticed, it did not follow that some way or other at a future period something might not come their way. To this observation, which seemed to be made for the purpose of mystifying the question, and preventing us from exhibiting in its true character the objectionable nature of their plan, it was answered



at once that the observation would certainly have had force had the classes of cases to be benefited by the measure been the *only cases*, reported, now under the consideration of Government, and for which they were called to legislate. But the fact being nearly the contrary of all this, a great part of the destitution reported on being in circumstances to which the provisions of the Government plan could *never* have any application, we were not only entitled but bound to hold that it was a *part* of the Government plan, as Lord Melbourne had candidly admitted, to exclude the towns.

We concluded by intimating that we would report the statement as acquiesced in by Lord Melbourne, with the note upon the word "rural" made by his lordship, to the Church of Scotland as the ultimatum of the Government, and repeated what we had said at the close of our interview with the Premier,—that we could not but regard the measure as a surrendering of the principles and obligations of a National Establishment in towns. He admitted the towns were to be left out, but would not admit that it was a just inference that this was a blow at the Establishment principle. In vindication of this argument, he referred to the Bishop of London's new churches, and said that no one thought of accusing the Government of renouncing the Establishment principle because they had not endowed these new churches. But his lordship was reminded that the case of London had never been brought as yet under the notice of Government, and of course no one could, in these circumstances, found an accusation on a case that had no existence.

## DINNER AT SIR ROBERT PEEL'S.

The company consisted of the Marquis of Tweeddale; the Archbishop of Canterbury; the Earls of Aberdeen and Haddington; Lord Lyndhurst; the Bishop of London; Sir Robert Bateson, M.P.; Emerson Tennent, M.P.; Sergeant Lefroy, M.P.; Sir D. Wilkie; Mr. Plumptre, M.P.; Mr. J. C. Colquhoun, M.P.; Mr. Gladstone, M.P.; Mr. Menteith, yr., of Carstairs; Principal M'Farlane; Mr. G. Houstoun, M.P.; Mr. Coke; and the deputation. The Archbishop and Bishop I have already on other occasions described. The former, the more we saw of him the more we found to esteem and love. The title of Archbishop is wont to call up to the mind the idea of lordliness, and state, and ceremony. Nothing could be more opposite to the reality as exhibited in the person of the Archbishop of Canterbury. His slender figure glided through the room like a spirit, his head slightly bent forward, with a benevolent smile on his face; and anything surpassing the meekness, humbleness, and gentleness of his demeanour I have never met with. He engaged much in conversation with the members of the deputation in the course of the evening, speaking on every subject with the utmost good sense, and with a spirit at once most amiable and pious. He pressed us to dine with him on Thursday the 29th with a degree of kindness and urgency we cannot forget, and which made us deeply regret that our de-

parture from London, putting it, as it did, out of our power to accept his invitation, would deprive us of the opportunity of cultivating further the acquaintance of so truly estimable a man. We all remarked it as singular that the Episcopal dress, which seemed grotesque in the Bishop of London, was perfectly becoming in the Archbishop of Canterbury. This might be from the circumstance that the wig, the age, and the attenuated figure of the latter gave one almost the idea that he was some relic of another age. He looked like an old picture, in short, more than a being of flesh and blood. The Bishop, on the other hand, with his bald head, his vigorous frame, his coat open, exhibiting the black apron in its whole length, involuntarily suggested the idea of some sturdy sutor, who had put on his apron above his Sunday clothes.

The Earl of Aberdeen is a man of middle size, dark hair, plain-looking, but with a most intelligent and amiable countenance. His manner is grave. He speaks with great precision and emphasis in giving his opinion. He wore a star, and the blue ribbon of the order of the Garter. Lord Haddington is a man of livelier conversation and greater frankness than the "travelled thane, Athenian Aberdeen." Both seem three or four years turned of fifty. Lord Lyndhurst is a very different-looking person from either. He is tall, and handsome both in figure and countenance. But his expression is not pleasing. His eyebrows are overhanging, his eyes penetrating, his mouth indicative of great force and energy of character. But there is something sinister about the whole aspect of his countenance. He wants the open look which invites confidence,—he does not look one in the face. Mr. Plumptre, the excellent and pious promoter of the new Sabbath Bill, struck me as much resembling, in the upper part of his face, Charles the First. Mr. Gladstone I did not happen to come much in contact with; but I was struck with his thoughtful air, and staid sobriety of deportment, harmonizing as it did with the accounts commonly given of him among Parliamentary men, as of all others the likeliest *leader* at some future period of the Conservatives. Sir David Wilkie is tall, reddish-haired, with a fine eye and a manly Scotch face; quiet in his manners, but ready to converse, and especially on his own art, which seems to engross his mind. I observed that in talking to him of various historical events, he uniformly contemplated them with the eye of a painter. At the same time it was interesting to notice, as the indication of a superior order of mind, that it was uniformly *moral* effect, or the effect of *mind*, in some way or other, which he seemed to aim at illustrating by his art. It was not mere physical nature that appeared to interest him. It was some development of moral or intellectual power which appeared to be the object of his search, in considering what he could turn to account by his pencil. He told me he was urged at present to paint a companion to his "John Knox Preaching at St. Andrews." He was inclined to select for his subject the same remarkable Reformer dispensing the Sacrament at Torphichen, as it

would furnish him with an opportunity of presenting the fire and energy of that extraordinary man softened, subdued, and solemnized by the power of devotion; and at the same time to exhibit the great and the humble, the stern warrior and the gentle female, the gray-haired sire and the manly youth, the prince and the poor man, all on a level—all yielding to a common influence, which took away for the time all earthly distinctions, and imbued all with one sentiment and spirit. He inquired at me if I thought any minute particulars of the scene in question could be traced; which I greatly doubted, from the fact that there were various places—such as Finlayston and Castle Campbell—which claimed the same distinction of having been the first places where the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was celebrated by Knox; a fact which seemed to imply that no very exact information regarding the event existed. He had been directing his attention to another incident connected with the Reformation, in Italy. It related to Savonarola, who had become a reformer at Florence, and who had induced one of his pupils to embrace the same opinions. This pupil was imprisoned for seven years—the Reformation being crushed—and was all the while deprived of his pencil. At length it was restored to him, and he became the well-known Fra Bartelomeo, so distinguished for his Madonnas. I referred him to Dr. M'Crrie's work on the Reformation in Italy, which he had not read.

In the course of the night we had a good deal of conversation on the subject of our mission, especially with Sir Robert, Lords Aberdeen and Haddington. I showed to Sir Robert the Paper we had submitted to Lord Melbourne, and which, after reading it, he had admitted to be an accurate statement of the Government plan; and also explained to him how Lord John Russell had been trying to get rid of the third article, as an *inference*, stating the arguments by which we had repelled his attempt. Sir Robert then mentioned to us the singular and striking fact that Lord John had that evening (subsequently to our interview at the Home Office) requested him (Sir Robert) to put a question to his lordship to-morrow night in reference to the Scotch Church question, as he (Lord John) would then be ready to give full information regarding it. Sir Robert remarked that it was a most unusual thing for a Minister to pursue such a course—to request that he might be interrogated by a member of the Opposition side of the House; that he had determined to do nothing till he had seen us; and now he was resolved, after what we had stated, to decline putting such a question. He was satisfied Lord John had an insidious design in making such a proposal, as it would enable him (Lord John) to say anything he liked, and to leave it there, as no debate could properly arise in such a case. It appeared to us that the fact just stated was one of the clearest proofs of what we had had a specimen of at our interview—of Lord John's anxiety to mystify the whole question, and so to prevent us from carrying home a definite statement of the plan to our constituents in Scotland.

We learned in the course of the evening that the Government, having no confidence in the Lord Advocate, had sent to Scotland for the Solicitor General,\* to give them his opinion and assistance in reference to the unexhausted teinds.

*Saturday, March 24.*—At eleven A.M. went by appointment to Sir Robert Peel's, and after a lengthened and interesting conversation as to the best manner of proceeding with our question in Parliament, it was suggested by Sir Robert, and cordially acquiesced in, that steps should be taken to have the subject immediately introduced into the House of Lords. This might be done by petition; but there was a better, because a more deliberate, way of doing it,—by a motion for the production of additional papers, which the Teind Report would easily furnish materials for doing. By giving notice of this motion, the attention of the House would be aroused, and the Government would feel themselves obliged to enter into the exposition and discussion of their plan. It would never do to make in the Peers a motion on the merits of the plan itself, as that would damage seriously the interests of the question in the Commons. Any motion of that kind would be regarded practically as pointing at a money grant, and the jealousies of the Lower House, of which Lord John Russell would be eager to take advantage, would be immediately aroused; and thus, apart altogether from the real merits of our question, an adverse decision of the Lower House might be obtained. Sir Robert Peel's view was that every important purpose would be served by the course he proposed. It would bring out the Bench of Bishops on the common ground of the Establishment principle, and enlighten the public mind on the real nature and merits of the Government plan. In this view he was strengthened by the consideration that such a discussion would put the General Assembly at its meeting in May in a position to found strong resolutions on the Government plan, and to petition Parliament, all which coming *before* the discussion and the vote on the question in the Commons, could not but be most beneficial.

We were much struck and deeply interested by a declaration Sir Robert made while referring to the importance of drawing out the Bench of Bishops. Independent of rousing the English members and England generally to the importance of our individual question, he thought it was of the highest moment that the English and Scotch Establishments should unite in these days on the common ground of the Protestant faith in resisting the encroachments of Popery. "It is impossible, I think," he said with great earnestness of tone and manner, "to look at the progress Popery is now making, and the efforts it is putting forth, without anxiety and alarm. The re-establishment of the order of the Jesuits in most of the countries of Europe, the movements in Prussia and Belgium, the increase of Popish chapels and seminaries in our own country, show us too clearly what we

\* Andrew Rutherford, afterwards Lord Rutherford.

have to dread. And I am persuaded," he continued, "that we shall ere long see a struggle arise, in which again we shall have to determine the question whether Popery or Protestantism is to have the ascendancy."

At the close of our interview he assured us in the kindest manner of his anxiety in every way to assist us in our great cause, of his readiness at all times to give us his best advice, so that we need never scruple to apply to him. "For," said he, "I assure you I feel as sincere an interest in the welfare of the Scottish Establishment as if I myself were a member of it."

As he recommended us to go immediately to Lord Aberdeen and state to his lordship what had been thus agreed on, we went directly to Argyle House, accompanied by Messrs. Colquhoun and Pringle, who had been with us at Sir Robert Peel's. Lord Aberdeen, after some consultation, and going over the whole matter carefully, entered entirely into our arrangement, and undertook to give notice of the motion on Monday; and he thought for certain the discussion might be brought on on Thursday the 29th. It was agreed that we should send notice of this arrangement to those members of the House of Peers with whom we had been in communication, and who were favourable to our cause.

*March 26.*—Occupied the whole day preparing a statement of our case, to be circulated among Members of Parliament. The statement, being approved of by the other members of the deputation, was immediately sent to press.

In the evening dined at Lord Aberdeen's, at Argyle House. This house was built by the famous John, Duke of Argyle, who figured in the reign of George I. The company consisted of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Duke of Richmond, the Earl of Ripon, the Earl of Haddington, Sir Robert Peel, Hon. Captain Gordon, M.P.; Hon. Mr. Gordon, Mr. Gladstone, M.P.; Mr. Colquhoun, M.P.; Mr. Pringle, and the deputation.

Was very much struck with Mr. Gladstone, with whom I had a good deal of conversation. The extent and accuracy and minuteness of his information were remarkable, and the calmness, clearness, and dispassionateness of his reasoning.

The Duke of Richmond I was glad to find quite resolved and intelligent upon our question, both as to the unexhausted teinds, and the leaving out of the towns. He has not the look of the statesman, like Sir R. Peel or Lord Aberdeen; but is quick and active. He wore his star and ribbon, as did Lord Aberdeen.

Lord Ripon,—the former Chancellor of the Exchequer, Robinson,—is a frank, cordial-looking person, fair-haired, apparently about fifty-two years of age, rather short and stout in figure.

Sir Robert Peel's manners at table are quiet and grave,—converses freely with those around him, but in a subdued tone of voice.

The Archbishop had been making a speech before dinner in the House of Lords, on the subject of the Indian Government countenancing idolatry.

The worthy old man seemed much interested in the question. The discussion seemed to lead to no result. Lord Glenelg stated that the Government at home had sent out instructions to cure these evils, and regretted they had not been acted on. Returned home about eleven, very much gratified.

*March 27.*—In the morning corrected the proof of our Statement; altering some words so as to exclude the idea of our either countenancing or condemning the proposal in reference to the unexhausted teinds.

At eleven A.M. went to see the Duke of Sutherland's house and splendid collection of pictures,—having obtained permission through the Marquis of Tweeddale. The “upholsterer and groom of the chambers,” a very intelligent, well-bred-like person, conducted us through the house, and explained everything to us. The house is on a scale of magnificence surpassing anything I had ever seen or imagined. The whole centre part of the immense mansion is occupied by a saloon about fifty or sixty feet square, and reaching from the ground-floor to the roof of the dome, a height of seventy-two and a half feet. The grandeur of this saloon it is impossible to describe. The walls are lined with scagliola, a species of composition exactly resembling polished marble. It is formed into enormous panels; the centre parts of the panel being imitations in scagliola of Sienna marble, with a narrow margin of gray granite and a broad belt of breccia round all. This gives an air of solidity and massiveness to the saloon which adds greatly to its effect. The staircase ascends from the centre of the floor by a broad flight of steps leading towards the middle of one side of the saloon. From this first landing-place, the stair divides to right and left, bends upwards along the two side-walls, and lands upon a gallery which runs round three sides of the saloon. From the inner ledge of this gallery there spring, on two opposite sides, tall fluted Corinthian columns, lined with the same scagliola, resembling a dark-green mottled marble. Immediately opposite the first landing-place, on the wall where the stair divides, there are two splendid Murillos,—the one, the “Prodigal Son;” the other, “Abraham Meeting the Three Angels.” The “Prodigal Son” is particularly fine. The rags, exhibiting the tattered remnants of his former finery; the squalor and humility which appear in his face; the benignity of the father taking him in his arms; the little dog recognizing the “lost son,” and jumping up upon him; the servants bringing forth the robes, the ring; a lad leading in the fatted calf,—all present the most vivid idea of the Saviour's beautiful parable.

The number of pictures in the house is immense: the Stafford collection has long been celebrated. Among those which we noticed in the different apartments, we were much struck with Dombey's “Passage of the Red Sea.” The hosts of Israel have reached the shore, and are marching onwards, led by the pillar of fire, the effect of which is quite extraordinary. The pillar is like a transparency. After examining it long, one could hardly believe that mere colouring could have produced such an effect.

Moses, on a projecting rock, is stretching out his rod, and the waters are rushing down on the chariots and the horsemen of Egypt. The sky is dark and tempestuous; and over the distant coast of Egypt there is a red lurid streak, gleaming under the darkened heavens, which adds powerfully to the effect, reminding one that it is a day of judgment on Egypt.

There was a picture by a French artist, La Roche—modern—of Strafford, on his way to execution, kneeling under the window of the prison in which Laud was confined, to receive his blessing. The archbishop's hands are seen protruded through the grated window, indicating that he is in the act of pronouncing the benediction, while the soldiers are looking sternly on. But it is impossible to enumerate; with so many to see, it was difficult to fix attention on any one.

The style of grandeur and magnificence of the fitting up and furnishing of the apartments far surpassed anything I have ever seen. The walls of some of them were of French white, with the richest gilt mouldings and panellings; others of fluted silk, or satin damask,—one of green, another crimson, another pale yellow. The drawing-room was most especially gorgeous. The furniture was covered with the richest purple satin, with a brilliant pattern of a gold-coloured leaf running through it. The tables were of various kinds,—some of rich blue velvet let into a frame of gold, with rich gilt carvings. The room was fifty-four feet by twenty-eight. Nothing but some of the scenes of Oriental splendour described in the "Arabian Nights" could come up to what was here realized before our eyes.

After we had seen most of the house, the Duke, after being made aware that we were there, most politely came out and walked with us over a good part of the house again, directing our attention to whatever was most worth seeing. He is a tall gentleman-like man, hair inclining to gray, high nose, mild expression—apparently about forty-seven years of age.

At present they are forming a suite of state apartments upstairs, which seem to run round most of the building. One immense room, one hundred and six feet long, is to be the picture-gallery. The roofs are in the richest stucco fret-work, gilded; and the effect, when the pictures are up, must be magnificent.

Worthy Mr. Collins' remark was,—“Here are we fighting to get a paltry fifteen or twenty thousand pounds, and now we are under the roof of a man who spends as much on a single room.” It is indeed melancholy to think that there should be such mines of wealth in the country, and yet so much difficulty in getting a pittance to expend on the moral and religious improvement of the people.

At one o'clock, went to Lord Aberdeen's with Messrs. Muir and Simpson. Gave him a copy of our Statement. He was most anxious to possess himself thoroughly of its great facts and statements, in order to be able to do justice to the case on Friday, and took notes of what seemed to him to be chiefly of consequence. He requested us to see him again on Thursday at

half-past twelve. By that time he will have studied our Statement, and if he finds any further information necessary, he will be able to acquaint us with the points as to which he needs any explanation. His deep and most intelligent interest in the question is truly gratifying.

At two o'clock went to Apsley House to see the pictures of the Duke of Wellington,—a privilege the Marquis of Tweeddale had also procured for us. The apartments, though very splendid, were greatly less so than those we had just seen in the Duke of Sutherland's, with the exception of the magnificent apartment which I had seen before in 1835, when laid out for the anniversary dinner of Waterloo. The row of windows which look into the park are covered within by mirrors of a corresponding size, which slide into and occupy the spaces, leaving the room to be lighted solely from the roof. This gives a better light for the pictures, and at the same time adds greatly to the beauty of the room, which is fifty or sixty feet long, and twenty to twenty-five in breadth. Among the pictures we noticed particularly the famous Vandyke,—“Charles I. on Horseback.” The foreshortening of the horse is very fine. A Correggio of “Christ in the Garden,” a small picture, is considered the gem of the collection. In an inner room was a fine full-length of Buonaparte; and in an outer room a half-length of the same, with another of Josephine, and another of Princess Pauline Borghese. Josephine's countenance is sensible and sagacious—a very quick eye. The princess is like what she was.

In one room, among many portraits of persons of the Duke's own circle, was a very striking picture of the late Lady Lyndhurst, by Wilkie. A dark, deep, designing eye, handsome countenance, but an expression which harmonized with her character, which was none of the best.

In the evening went to dine at London House, James's Square, the residence of the Bishop of London. It is a large commodious mansion, though not on the scale of splendour of some of the mansions I had lately seen. The company consisted of the Bishop, his wife, and eldest daughter, a young lady of eighteen; Lord Bexley; the Bishop of Lincoln; Sir George Sinclair; Mr. Gladstone; Mrs. Colquhoun; Mrs. Walter Long; Miss Powis; the Bishop's private chaplain; and the Deputation: as Dr. Muir said, a snug *manse* party. Lord Bexley (Chancellor Vansittart) is an old man, apparently of seventy or so, but lively and talkative. He is short of stature, and has nothing *noble* about his appearance.

In the course of the evening the Bishop of London, in speaking of Mr. Gladstone, expressed the same opinion I have met with everywhere—namely, that he is one of the most rising men in the House, and destined some day to be a great statesman. He is not twenty-seven years of age. His countenance is full of fine expression; his eyes rather small, but dark; his mouth full of meaning. He is modest and gentle in his deportment. In figure tall, dark hair—decidedly good-looking.

The Bishop of Lincoln is a little man—fairish hair inclining to gray—



seemingly about fifty-three or fifty-four years of age. His name is Kay. He was formerly Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, and is considered a first-rate Greek scholar. He and the Bishop of London are not only the best Greek scholars on the Bench, but among the best in England. He is a quick, intelligent, and agreeable man.

Sir George Sinclair noticed after dinner the announcement Lord J. Russell had made that evening in the House of Commons relative to the Irish Church question. The plan seems exactly that of Mr. O'Connell, as addressed some time ago in a letter to the clergy of the Irish Church—namely, to pay the tithes into the Consolidated Fund, after deducting fifty per cent., and then that the clergy should receive their incomes out of that fund; in other words, converting the Irish clergy into stipendiaries of the Government. The Bishop of London seemed much annoyed that Sir Robert Peel, instead of reserving his opinion till he had considered the project, had not at once condemned what he held to be so dangerous a principle, as he feared the effect would be to impress the friends of the constitution throughout the country with the conviction that at least *ex facie* there was nothing very objectionable in the measure.

The Bishop's chaplain, a man about forty-eight or fifty years of age, seemed a good and intelligent man, very frank and conversible, and anxious to get information as to the state of religious parties in Scotland.

The only thing remarkable about the Bishop's table was a magnificent piece of silver plate, which occupied the centre. It was about three feet high; and consisted of three beautiful figures—Faith, Hope, and Charity—supporting the upper part of the ornament, which terminated in a sort of basket filled with splendid artificial flowers. On the sides of the pedestal were carved in relief some of Raphael's cartoons, exquisitely done. This magnificent piece of plate cost £800, and was a present from the parishioners of Bishopsgate to the Bishop at the time he ceased to be their minister.

Mr. Gladstone mentioned an extraordinary instance of Sir R. Peel's memory. Sir Robert had told a mutual friend that he could listen to a two-hours' speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, containing the Budget, and that he could repeat it sentence by sentence.

Sir George Sinclair mentioned that O'Connell had called him across the house one night lately to say the Dissenting deputation had been with him, and that they were a fine set of fellows!!!

*March 28.*—In the course of the morning dispatched a number of copies of the Statement to various peers and bishops, to prepare them for Friday. At twelve, called on Lord Lyndhurst at his house, 7 Gt. Hanover Square. Were shown into his own room, to which we entered through a double drawing-room, in one of the divisions of which we noticed a portrait of the same Lady Lyndhurst we had seen at Apsley House, but the costume was quite different.

After waiting a few minutes Lord Lyndhurst made his appearance.

The impression his appearance made on me at Sir R. Peel's was quite confirmed on seeing him in daylight. His countenance is most intelligent and expressive, but not amiable. Having given him a copy of our Statement, he put a few questions, with great clearness, to ascertain what the points were on which it furnished him with information, and which of these we considered to involve the strength of our case. In a very few minutes he showed himself master of the great features of the question, and fastened at once on the vitals of the subject. Having explained to him the object we had in view in getting a discussion in the House of Lords, he at once saw the importance of it, and undertook that the Government should not escape without being brought to the point, so that the country and the Church of Scotland might know exactly what the plan was. He said, with regard to the unexhausted teinds, they could afford to say,—that is a question of law of which the House will judge when we know precisely what your plan on that point is; but that the real defect to seize on and hold up was the consideration of leaving out the towns.

Went to call on the Marquis of Tweeddale, to ask him to preside at the Church Extension breakfast to-morrow morning. On my return, observed a crowd gathering at the gate at Hyde Park corner. On inquiring, ascertained that the Queen was in the Park; and having never seen Her Majesty, I determined to wait a little and take advantage of the opportunity. Just when my patience, amid the whirl of carriages and horsemen, had been nearly exhausted, I observed a movement among the people in the West Walk. A couple of servants dashed forward, not in the royal livery, simply in black or dark gray frock-coats, black hats, and cockades. In consequence, few of the people about the gate knew them as attendants of the royal cortege. I overheard them giving directions to the police to keep back the crowd; and, moreover, what was of more consequence, heard the police asking which gate Her Majesty would pass out by. The centre gate being named, I got close in to it. The royal party was by this time at hand, and I had the very best opportunity of seeing her both close at hand and without distraction or confusion. The party consisted of ten or twelve, of whom four or five were ladies; but as my attention was concentrated on the Queen, I paid little attention to any one else. She rode, of course, at the head of the party, with a gentleman on either hand—the one, I believe, Colonel Stovin, the other Lord Conyngnam. She was dressed very simply and plainly, in a dark-blue riding-habit and black hat. She did not wear a veil, so that I could see her countenance distinctly, not being more than a couple of yards distant from her. What struck me first and most strongly was her girlish and youthful appearance. Her figure is small and slight; she did not look as if she had been more than sixteen years of age, though she is nearly nineteen. The people were requested not to cheer, lest they should frighten the horses, but they crowded around. I thought she looked modestly around, and withdrew her eyes as she saw every face turned

towards her,—making a slight inclination with her head to acknowledge the salute which was made by the bystanders, who uncovered as she passed. She is not so good-looking as the pictures in the print-shops represent. She has a large eye; a well-marked eyebrow, rising upwards towards the outer edge of the forehead; a rather long nose. Her complexion seemed to me rather dark. When she addressed the gentleman on her left hand, he uniformly raised his hand towards his hat as he replied. The utmost decorum was maintained by the people.

In the afternoon Lord Tweeddale called, and in talking of her he took an opportunity of mentioning an anecdote he had lately heard of her. She did not use to go very regularly to church. The Archbishop of Canterbury spoke of it to her; and she excused herself by saying she had a private chapel, which she had regularly attended. The Archbishop reminded her that it was one duty to attend family worship, and another to be present in the place of public worship. She then spoke of the cold (it was during winter). “But,” rejoined the Archbishop, “your Majesty does not find it too cold to go frequently to the theatre.” It seems she has been attending it this winter rather more than enough.

I must say that, on looking at the little girlish-looking creature before me, with all my loyalty, which is sufficiently strong and decided, I had some difficulty in just persuading myself that she could possibly be the Queen of the mightiest empire in the world. And yet, young as she is, she can maintain all the state and ceremony of her station with great strictness and propriety. God grant that she may be led more and more to feel whose servant she is, and that she may seek wisdom to rule this so great people.

This evening the extraordinary division took place on the Spanish question. It was an adjourned debate,—was expected to last till one or two in the morning,—and members had come from great distances, as it was expected to exhibit the relative strength of parties. After the ordinary routine business had been gone through, the Speaker put the question; everybody was talking, and no one listening, and before any one was aware the form of putting the question had been gone through, and the consequences were irrevocable—the House must divide. The division was seventy to sixty-two in favour of Ministry. Never was anything more ridiculous. It seems to be considered as an accident; but somehow the accident, as has happened before, has been in favour of Ministry. The Speaker has a weak voice. They have escaped the cutting speeches that were awaiting them from Sir R. Peel, Lord Stanley, and others.

*March 29.*—Attended a Church Extension breakfast at eight o'clock this morning in the London Coffee-house, Mr. Hamilton of Cheapside in the chair. There were about fifty or sixty gentlemen present—all the ministers of the Presbytery of London, except Dr. Crombie, who seems quite fretted about our movement to get money in London, as it will interfere with their local efforts to get the debt on their chapels relieved. It is to

be regretted that a man of his good sense should have been so led away. It was evident that several of the other ministers cherish not a little of the same spirit, though it was restrained at the meeting. Their ambition to have admission into our General Assembly seems to be their absorbing concern; and because their wishes on this subject are not complied with, they look on us with jealousy and wounded pride. It certainly would be most desirable to gratify them, if it can be done constitutionally; but they are really quite unreasonable. The breakfast went off very well, to all appearance. The speeches were good, and seemed to be responded to with cordiality. What will come out of it remains to be seen. A committee was appointed to make arrangements for circulating Dr. Chalmers' projected Appeal, and preparing for a subscription.

At eleven A.M. went, accompanied by Mr. Hope Johnston, to see Lord Stanley. His lordship is looking remarkably well. His countenance is very youthful; his eye, keen and penetrating; an aquiline nose; a mouth full of expression, and which, while it can beam with a smile, can also curl with a sarcasm of the most biting edge. He entered with great cordiality into our question, the great features of which he seemed quite to understand, and spoke of the Ministerial measure with a tone which indicated the delight he would feel to have an opportunity of exposing its absurdity.

At half-past twelve called, agreeably to his own request, on Lord Aberdeen, whom we found busy preparing for to-morrow night. He had mastered our Statement, from which he had been extracting such conclusions as seemed to him best fitted to impress the House. Minute statistical expositions, he said, they would not bear. It was impossible not to admire and feel grateful for the anxiety he displayed to do justice to the question.

In the course of our conversation he mentioned that he had seen Lord Melbourne at the Palace last night, and had had some conversation with him on our business. Without saying what Lord Melbourne's words were, he indicated their substance by remarking,—“I wish Lord Melbourne were at liberty to follow his own convictions. I am sure they are as much on your side as mine.”

To be sure, this was small consolation; and it is but an additional illustration of the meanness of the present Ministry, who are contented, for the sake of place and power, to submit to govern the country on principles in the teeth of what they themselves privately believe to be the best for the people.

Dr. Muir called on Lord Haddington, and found him similarly occupied with Lord Aberdeen—busy with his speech.

In the evening, went out to Putney to visit Mr. and Mrs. Colquhoun.

#### PUTNEY.

*March 30.*—Walked out in the morning to examine the neighbourhood. Mr. Colquhoun pointed out the house and the windows of the room in

which Pitt died. The house at present belongs to Mr. Eden, a brother-in-law of Lord Brougham. The *heath*, as it is called, is an immense common, which, together with Wimbledon Common, which it joins, extends several miles in length. It consists almost entirely of a yellow gravel, covered with a very thin coating of soil. Its surface is overspread with furze. There is very little heath. The persons having fens round the common are entitled to pasture their cows on it. The lord of the manor, Lord Spencer, has the right of *turbury*, as it is called—that is, of cutting the turf—and also of digging the gravel.

Came into town at ten by an Esher coach. As we came along, were struck to see in a garden the gooseberry bushes quite green. How pleasant is the approach of spring!

The concluding portion of Mr. Buchanan's journal is occupied with an account of the discussion in the House of Lords, to which so many of the entries have been seen to be pointing. It is scarcely possible to avoid smiling now and again while reading the review, the *animus* is so hearty and so *naïve*. But the whole thing is as significant as it is fresh, and we are sure it will, for various reasons, be perused with interest.

#### DISCUSSION IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Before the discussion of our question began, we had an opportunity of hearing the royal assent given by commission to certain Acts of Parliament. The commissioners were the Lord Chancellor, the Primate, and the Earl of Shaftesbury, all in their robes—the Primate not in the ordinary dress which he wears in the House, but in a white fur cape and scarlet silk gown, with a broad stripe of white fur down the middle of it. The commissioners took their seats together on the Woolsack—the Chancellor in the centre, and the Primate on his right hand; and after the royal commission had been read, the Clerk proceeded to read the titles of the several Bills, when the royal assent was given to each separately in the usual words, *La reine le veut*, which were pronounced by an official at the table.

Thereafter a number of petitions were presented, chiefly by Lord Brougham, the greater number of which referred to the Slave Apprenticeship. As soon as Lord Brougham had got his petitions disposed of, he left the House; not seeing, very probably, any course he could pursue in reference to our question likely to promote the object he has at present in view, of detaching the Dissenters from the Government and forming them into a party for himself. His hair is now of a dark gray, hanging straight down on all sides of his head, and completely covering his forehead, which gives him a very peculiar appearance.

The attendance of peers was not great; not only because it was a Scotch question, but because it was known there was to be no division. On the Ministerial bench were Lords Melbourne, Holland, Glenelg, Minto, and Rosebery,—who all, with the exception of Lord Holland, remained till the close of the debate. The only other Scotch nobleman on their side of the House was Lord Breadalbane, who went away before the discussion was half over.

On the Episcopal bench were the Primate, the Bishops of London, Lincoln, Exeter, Chichester, Bangor, Chester, and several others, whom I did not know.

On the Conservative side were the Duke of Wellington, Lords Ripon, Wharnclyffe, Harrowby, Haddington, Aberdeen, Douglas, Tweeddale, Lyndhurst, Bexley, Duke of Richmond, &c.

The debate was opened by Lord Aberdeen in a speech of great clearness, propriety, and ability, in which he showed himself thoroughly acquainted with the subject. If he did not bring out the case with all the skill and fulness of a practised Church Extensionist, at all events he brought out its main features in such a way as most triumphantly to establish the justice and necessity of our claims. He dwelt chiefly on the case of the towns, and exposed the absurdity, inconsistency, and bad faith of the Government measure, in excluding them from the benefits of the proposed grant. His manner was calm, manly, and straightforward, rising, however, at times to a tone of energy and force which commanded the deepest attention. He was followed by the Premier,\* in one of the weakest and most contemptible speeches I ever heard. Logic it had none, for it was self-contradictory to an extent absolutely ludicrous. Information it had none, for the ignorance of the whole subject which it discovered was deplorable; while the sentiments which it did contain were of the most unsound and reckless description. He fairly committed himself and the Government to the plan he had admitted in his communications with us, and denied emphatically, with great vehemence of manner, striking the table with violence, that the Church had any claim upon the State to provide the means of religious instruction adequate to the wants of the people. At one time he denied that there was any destitution proved in the towns; and then, some time after, said the destitution brought out in the reports was so great, that if the same results appeared in the other towns of Scotland, and were followed out also in England and Ireland, the case would be of an extent so enormous that the resources of the country would be unequal to meet it!

The Primate spoke next—with his usual mildness, but at the same time with a degree of *point* and plain-speaking which I had not expected. He exposed the inconsistency of the Premier's statements with irresistible effect,—showed that as to claims from England, the Premier well knew, for he was himself a party to it, that a plan was in operation for relieving

\* Lord Melbourne.

her wants by resources of her own; and as to Ireland—has the Premier, asked the Primate ironically, ceased to speak of a surplus? This was a home-thrust which elicited loud cheers at the expense of poor Lord Melbourne. At the close of his speech, the Primate expressed himself in terms of great respect for the sister Establishment, the Church of Scotland, whose ministry he characterized in language of the utmost respect and affection.

Lord Rosebery then rose on the Ministerial side, and, in a speech of a most disingenuous kind, endeavoured to dilute the case as much as possible by an attempt to show that the destitution was not nearly so great as Lord Aberdeen had described; and, what was still worse, tried to hide the iniquity of the Government measure by hazarding the utterly unfounded assertion that the Church of Scotland herself was not united in asking for endowments; citing, forsooth, some case of a political meeting which an Elder had presided over, and from which an opposition to endowments had emanated. The speech was altogether paltry in its character and discreditable in its spirit.

He was followed by Lord Haddington, who delivered his sentiments upon the question in a style which did honour both to his head and to his heart. He spoke with fluency, energy, and precision: keeping mainly to the great principles of the question, with great propriety he remarked, in the language of Mr. Canning, how easy it was in a *vivâ voce* debate to practise a juggle with figures, by which they might be made for the moment to support contrary conclusions. But he would hold the Government to this—that, be it less or more, a case of destitution had been proved, which the Government now avowed a determination utterly to disregard, and this notwithstanding of their own Commission's Report, and of all the professions and promises they had made that if a case were made out the remedy would undoubtedly be provided. Both he and Lord Aberdeen brought out, in a way that must have made Lord Melbourne ashamed of himself, the true theory of his monstrous plan—namely, that the Dissenters would not allow him to help the towns where their interests might suffer, but had no objection to make him free to deal as he liked with the Highlands, where Dissenters had no “vested rights or party objects” at stake.

The next speaker was the Earl of Minto, the chairman of the Religious Instruction Commission; and such a performance as he made it has seldom been my lot to witness. In the outset he charged Lord Haddington with being afraid to encounter the arithmetic of the question, and announced with great pomp that he would follow a different course. Some one had certainly supplied him with various statistical details, into which accordingly he plunged; but the labyrinth was too profound. He floundered about for a little from one statement to another, without sense or order, till he became at length perfectly bewildered, turned his manuscript from side to side in the most hopeless and pitiable confusion of mind, and finally broke

down. The only thing discernible through the thick impenetrable shade of utter obscurity in which he contrived to involve both his subject and himself, was the shameful artifice of counting the very new churches we had built to supply the destitution, and for which we are now seeking endowments, as proofs that no destitution existed.

When he sat down Lord Haddington rose to explain, and in two or three pointed and pithy sentences exposed the gross unfairness of Lord Minto's charge that he had shrunk from the figures of the question. "I know nothing of the figures of the question," he said, "but what I find in the reports of the noble earl's own Commission. And what are these figures? Why, that in Edinburgh there are 45,000, and in Glasgow 55,000 individuals destitute of the means of religious instruction; and, moreover, that in the latter city there are actually 18,000 families of which no member has a sitting in any place of worship of any denomination whatever. These are some figures," said Lord Haddington, "which the noble earl will find it difficult to dispose of."

The next speaker was the Bishop of London; and it was altogether not only the most finished and effective speech in the debate, but one of the best speeches I ever heard. Both Lord Rosebery and Lord Minto had attempted to draw the attention of the House away from the proper subject by dwelling at great length on the unexhausted teinds,—affecting great liberality on that subject, which they could do at little sacrifice, as they well knew the proposal to appropriate these teinds would never pass the House. The Bishop brought back the question to its proper basis, seized on the objectionable sentiments of the Premier's speech, and held them up to strong and merited condemnation. He protested with especial emphasis against the declaration the Premier had made—a declaration which he denounced as in the very face of the solemn obligations under which Her Majesty held the reins of government, and under which they themselves had become bound to serve her—that the State was not bound to supply, to whatever extent it might be needed, to the Established Church the means of providing for the religious instruction of the people. As this protest was loudly cheered, it evidently made Lord Melbourne very uneasy, and he accordingly rose hastily, interrupting the Bishop, and saying, "I never said it was not the duty of the State to provide the means. No, no! I only said the Church had not the right to demand it." This miserable attempt at a shuffling evasion was scornfully repelled by the ironical cheers of the Conservatives, and instantaneously met and torn to pieces by the pointed question of the Bishop, "And is not the *right* of the Church to demand co-ordinate with the *duty* of the State to give?" Poor Melbourne shrank under this cutting exposure like a whipped schoolboy. Another of the Premier's atrocious sentiments, which received a similar castigation, was his truly infidel sneer at pastoral superintendence. Lord Melbourne in his speech, by way of discrediting that parochial system which it is the



object of our present movement to revive in the overgrown parishes of Scotland, talked of the domiciliary visits of a parish clergyman in the most contemptuous and insolent strain, as an intrusion into men's families that was not to be endured. The Bishop gave an admirable exposure of this extraordinary sentiment, showing that that very domestic intercourse which the Premier repudiated was the crowning excellence and chiefest beauty of the economy of an Established Church. He concluded by expressing his cordial concurrence in those sentiments of high esteem and respect the Primate had uttered in reference to the Church of Scotland.

After a spirited speech from the Duke of Wellington,—in which he brought out most successfully the characteristic feature of the policy of the present Ministry, as a policy which, to state it in its lowest form, indicated a determination “not to encourage the Established Churches of the empire,”—the debate was closed by Lord Aberdeen. Lord Lyndhurst and the Bishop of Lincoln were evidently disposed and prepared to have spoken, but the limited number of speakers who appeared on the Government side of the House rendered it impossible to continue even the form of a debate any longer. In his closing speech, Lord Aberdeen, with great firmness and dignity of manner, declared the plan of the Government to be a manifest breach of faith on their part with the Church and people of Scotland. He pointed to the sums that had been subscribed, and the churches which had been built, in the confidence that Government would redeem its pledge to grant a remedy if religious destitution were actually proved; and said that, even after all that had taken place this evening, still he found it almost impossible to believe that the noble viscount would persist, in a manner so inconsistent with his usual candour and high sense of honour, in breaking a deliberate and solemn engagement.

The Premier, smarting under the castigation he had received—the more bitter and intolerable that his own convictions must have been all on the side of the cause he had consented to occupy the degrading position of opposing—started at this appeal from Lord Aberdeen, and with a vehemence which approached almost to fury, stretching out his clenched fist towards Lord Aberdeen, striking the table again and again with the utmost violence, his voice raised to the highest pitch, and gesticulating with a furiousness of manner that approached almost to madness, he declared that he had broken no faith, that he had entered into no engagement, that he was not bound to do anything in consequence of issuing the Commission, and that no man was entitled to bring any such charge as Lord Aberdeen had urged against him.

To this Lord Aberdeen replied, with calmness, but with great firmness, energy, and dignity of manner, that he must repeat in the most positive manner, notwithstanding the disclaimer now made, that there had been a breach of faith; that if the Commission—as many would now be disposed to believe—had not been a deception from the beginning, there was in the

conduct about to be pursued by Government a most manifest breach of faith with the Church and people of Scotland.

Lord Melbourne was silent. He did not venture, when thus boldly confronted, to utter another word.

The debate commenced at six in the evening, and lasted till near eleven o'clock.

After this there remained for the deputation nothing but to pay their farewell visits; and, in view of what was to follow in the course of another year or two, it is not a little edifying to hear how highly esteemed at this stage of the history were the two statesmen through whose management the Scottish Establishment was destroyed.

*March 31.*—Were occupied most of the day in paying farewell visits and making our acknowledgments to those peers and bishops who had so zealously advocated our cause—namely, Lords Aberdeen and Haddington, the Duke of Wellington, the Bishop of London and Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Marquis of Tweeddale. We found the Earl of Aberdeen at length thoroughly convinced—a conclusion he had been most reluctant to arrive at—that the Government *never* meant to do anything effectual for the cause of the Church of Scotland. We leave London with sentiments of the highest respect for Lord Aberdeen, and of gratitude for his kind and unwearied attention to us and to our cause.

In the course of the day we had an interesting interview with Sir James Graham, who had read the debate of last night, and expressed himself highly satisfied with the position in which our question now stood in the face of the British public. He showed himself thoroughly acquainted with our case, and augured much good from the strong declarations made regarding it by the heads of the English Church, which would arrest attention upon it throughout England.

There is something extremely attractive about Sir James Graham's manner and conversation—frank, generous, and gentlemanlike in all his sentiments, while he clothes them in the elegant and felicitous language of an accomplished scholar. He is a fine specimen of a high-minded English gentleman, imbued with the principles of religion. He will be a powerful advocate of our claims, when the case comes before the House of Commons.

Mr. Hope Johnston, who had to the last been willing to hope the Government would do justice to our cause, and therefore had on former occasions been willing to give them time, is now thoroughly satisfied that they have been intending to deceive us, and that now there can and must be no terms kept with them on this question. He looks on their conduct

as false and contemptible in the highest degree, and hopes the Church will in unambiguous terms let them know at next Assembly what she thinks of their wretched measure.

*April 1.*—Preached in the forenoon in Mr. Lorimer's Scotch Church, River Terrace, Islington; a snug, neat little chapel, with a respectable though not very numerous congregation.

In the afternoon went to St. James's Church to hear the Bishop of London. The service was read by the rector, and the Bishop preached. I confess I was disappointed with his sermon. It was very ordinary as an intellectual effort, and though serious and faithful in its tone of application, it was very deeply tinged with Arminianism. There was a large attentive audience. What is very creditable to him, he preaches every Sabbath afternoon in St. James's Church, which is the church of the parish in which he resides.

In the evening preached in London Wall Scots Church for my friend Mr. Burns. A very good congregation.

*April 2.*—Held our final interview with Sir Robert Peel, at which were present, besides the deputation, Lord Aberdeen, Messrs. J. C. Colquhoun and A. Pringle.

After some conversation, Sir Robert put the case in the form of the three following suppositions:—

1. Should Lord John Russell show no disposition to bring forward his measure after the Easter recess, and before the meeting of the General Assembly, then he was clearly of opinion that he (Sir Robert) ought not to interfere in the way of provoking them to bring it forward; both because this would lose whatever benefit the Assembly's remonstrance may carry in it, and because a defeat on a motion which a party has itself *forced* on, is a defeat in the worst possible circumstances.

2. Should Lord John, on the other hand, *produce* his measure before the Assembly, then he (Sir Robert) would hold himself bound both in honour, and policy, and consistency to move an amendment embodying the objections which his side of the House cherished against the plan, and let it go to a division, *coûte qui coûte*.

3. Suppose Lord John should not bring it forward till after the Assembly, and, moreover, should indicate an intention to allow the session to slip by without taking any further step in the matter, then he (Sir Robert) must suspend his judgment as to what course it might then be wisest and most becoming for himself and his friends to take. It was, he confessed, an open question whether it would not be better for the cause to allow even another session to pass away without anything being done at all (which would itself become an important accusation against Government, and a means of rousing still more the indignation which their conduct had provoked), rather than to force on a discussion, and by being beaten, commit the Government and the House of Commons fully and finally against us.

Thus ended all hope of help from Downing Street as long as the Whigs remained in office. For a little while longer the subject continued to be discussed in Scottish ecclesiastical circles, but by-and-by it dropped out of sight there also, amid the press of other matters. The time was to come when the Church of Scotland was to learn another bitter lesson; namely, that Tory politicians were just as little to be trusted. But, in the meantime, it did seem that Sir Robert Peel was as a statesman better than Lord Melbourne; and we need not wonder, therefore, that at this period of his history Mr. Buchanan was strongly inclined to Toryism. Indeed, it appears from his correspondence with Mr. Dunlop that very little had prevented him from openly committing himself to the party even at an earlier date. When Sir R. Peel came to Glasgow to deliver an inaugural address in connection with his appointment as Lord Rector of the University, advantage was taken of the occasion to invite him to a great banquet, which was to serve the double end of doing honour to him and of furthering the political cause which he represented. Mr. Buchanan was invited to be present at the banquet, and expressed himself as not unwilling, on certain conditions, to accept the invitation. What these conditions were, he does not state. It is probable that they involved a pledge on the part of the expectant Prime Minister to follow a certain course in reference to the Church. Sir Robert, in any case, refused to commit himself; Mr Buchanan was equally obstinate; and the demonstration took place with only Principal Macfarlane and Dr. Macleod present as representatives of the Glasgow clergy.

Mr. Dunlop writes with great anxiety about the narrow escape made by his friend from a political entanglement. He himself was a Whig, and party feeling may have had something to do with the satisfaction he expressed when he heard

that the temptation was past. But it is more than likely that he was already beginning to see how little the Church had to expect from hanging on in the ante-chambers of ministers of State, and was glad that one whom he looked on as a leader had been preserved from even seeming to identify a Christian enterprise with the fortunes of a party. One is surprised, indeed, to notice how slow men were then in discerning a sign of the times which to us now, as we look back, seems so prominent and striking. "As the ear of the Government seemed to close," says Dr. Hanna, "*the ear of the country seemed to open.*" "Dr. Chalmers," he says again, "had been much struck by the effect of a tour made by Dr. Duff in 1835 through the towns and parishes of Scotland, which had awakened the Church and country to much greater missionary zeal, and had drawn forth an enlarged liberality.....This power [that of the living voice] he resolved to employ on behalf of his favourite scheme." While time and temper were being lost in discussions with Dissenters at home, and deputations to London were breaking their hearts in contentions with the politicians, the Church Extension Committee was busily engaged in making its appeals directly to the people. And what were the results? From Downing Street, after all the knocking, there came absolutely *nothing*; but from the country there came a response which astonished even the most sanguine. Within less than seven years a sum of over £300,000 was contributed, and an addition by this means made of two hundred and twenty-two churches to the number of the parochial places of worship in Scotland. Such an experience might prove nothing in logic. It did not establish either that it is not the duty of the State to endow the Church, or that it is not the duty of the Church to ask endowments when it needs them. But the experience did prove something in the sphere of practical economics. It showed

that the Church would have been nearer its purpose if it had earlier ceased to put its trust in Princes, and placed a heartier dependence on its own people and on such resources as it had within itself. That lesson came to be learned at last ; but it was only after years of conflict, and at the cost of sufferings, to the thought of which we can reconcile ourselves only by reflecting on the greater good which we have reason to hope has followed.

## CHAPTER VII.

### THE VOLUNTARY CONTROVERSY.

ON the evening of the 9th of April 1829, a sermon was delivered in Greyfriars' Church, Glasgow, before the Association for Propagating the Gospel in connection with the United Associate Secession Church. The preacher was Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Andrew Marshall of Kirkintilloch, and his subject was "*Ecclesiastical Establishments Considered.*" One of those who heard this sermon was Dr. Heugh; and concerning him, at this stage of his history, his biographer makes the following note:—"At the conclusion of the sermon, and in the hearing of those to whom it was addressed, Dr. Heugh took immediate occasion to declare, respecting the principles enunciated by Dr. Marshall, that the time had come when those who held them should justify their convictions to the world." Dr. Heugh so far judged correctly about the times. The state of the public mind was, as events proved, favourable to the entertainment of new ideas in regard to the relations of Church and State; and with the publication of the discourse referred to, the Voluntary controversy may be said to have begun.

At first the Church was slow to answer the challenge of the Dissenters. From the tone assumed by the *Christian Instructor*, we gather that, to begin with, Dr. Andrew Thomson was rather disposed to condemn the attack, as too insig-

nificant for serious notice ; but another reason for the delay was revealed afterwards in the course of *Lectures on Church Establishments*, which was delivered by the Glasgow ministers in 1835. "So seldom," said Mr. Buchanan, who gave the opening lecture of that series—"so seldom in the whole past history, not only of this country, but of the Christian world at large, had the principle of Church Establishments ever been matter of dispute, and so little, accordingly, had it come before the minds even of those who are most given, from profession or inclination, to the study of such questions, that when the controversy, about two years ago, was so suddenly and unexpectedly raised, most men on the Church side of the question felt as if taken by surprise. The Seceding party, as it now appears, had, on the contrary, for a period of nearly forty years, been secretly arraying themselves for the conflict. In the Secession Church, the Voluntary spirit had been at work from about the time of the first French Revolution.\* And although then, and for long after, so studiously veiled and disguised as in a great measure to have escaped the notice of the public eye, the divisions to which it gave rise among the Seceders themselves show how clearly its real character had been perceived by those faithful men, whose position and circumstances brought them more closely and immediately into contact with the party who were nursing it into life and strength. Within the two years, however, which have elapsed since the Voluntary was openly declared, it has been sufficiently proved that if Churchmen, from the suddenness and unexpectedness of the onset, were at first for a moment placed

\* We give here and elsewhere throughout this chapter the actual words which were spoken, even although, as in this instance, they seem to involve an *unjust* charge against the Dissenters. Mr. Buchanan came by-and-by to understand his opponents better, and to give them all the credit that was their due. But it would deprive his after testimony of much of its significance, if we were here to conceal or extenuate the fact that at this time his devotion to the Establishment was too entire to admit of his seeing much good in those who sought its destruction.



at a disadvantage, it was from no lack of argument wherewith to defend their cause. The armoury had been locked up, and the weapons of this warfare had been covered with the rust of forgetfulness. But their endless variety and their ethereal temper have since been well proved in many a stricken field."

The boast here made was really not an empty one. It so happened that on the Church side at this time there was an amazing number of men of first-rate ability as controversialists; and as the campaign wore on, and they became more familiar with their weapons, they fought, many of them, with a skill and a courage which, apart altogether from the merits of the question in dispute, fill one with admiration. Glasgow enjoyed special advantages in those days. Not only were its pulpits filled by such men as Charles J. Brown, Nathaniel Paterson, and Robert Buchanan, but it had a publisher—William Collins—who was always ready to place his printing-press and the resources of his business establishment at the disposal of those who, on the lines of his great friend Thomas Chalmers, were seeking to further the interests of the National Church and of evangelical religion in Scotland.

Among the courses of lectures which it was the fashion at that time to deliver in connection with every subject of public interest, the one to which reference has been made on *Church Establishments* was in many respects the most notable. The lectures themselves were remarkably able; they were listened to by immense and excited crowds; and they told, there can be no doubt, very materially on the issue of the conflict. Mr. Collins published them in a cheap form immediately after their delivery, and they were scattered broadcast over all Scotland. Those who had already adopted Voluntary principles were probably not much affected by them—for it is wonderful how few converts are made by controversy—but they unquestion-

ably satisfied the great mass of Established Church people, and made them more than content to remain as they were.

The subject assigned to Mr. Buchanan was "*The Nature and Importance of the Question at Issue*;" and that subject was discussed by him in a way which gives to his lecture some historical interest.

For, first of all, we gather from it that the Voluntaries were understood by him and others to be in the habit of misstating the points in debate. "Much pains," says the lecturer, "have been taken by our opponents in this discussion, to mix up [the Establishment] principle with a thousand other things which have no necessary connection with it at all; and, in consequence, they have often succeeded in obtaining judgment against it on grounds altogether irrelevant. It has been very common with them, for example, to identify the principle with a denial of the Headship of Christ as the sole and sovereign King of his own spiritual body the Church.....And this they have done.....by studiously confounding what is accidental with what is essential." Again: "Another method by which it has been not unusual with our opponents to hide from the public eye the real nature of the question at issue, has been by striving to make it appear as if the Church Establishment principle must go unavoidably to the confounding of the great distinction between truth and error, and as if the advocates of that principle were bound by it to justify the civil authorities of a nation in supporting and propagating any religion, however false or foul, which has gained the ascendancy over their own minds, or which happened to prevail among the people at large.....All that we contend for is, that it is the duty [of rulers] to lend the sanction of civil power to *the true religion*."

On the other hand, it is made plain in the lecture what that "Voluntary principle" was, against which the batteries of the

Establishment were directed. Thus, Mr. Buchanan understood his opponents to hold, that kings and rulers ought not, in their public and official capacity, to profess themselves to be servants of the Lord Jesus Christ;.....that a man may and must be one thing as an individual, and another thing as clothed with the public office of a civil magistrate: that in the former he may be, and ought to be, a Christian; that in the latter he must profess no faith whatever. Now, he goes on to say: "The deep importance of the Church Establishment doctrine, as involving a great principle of Christian morals, may be shown, not only as it affects individuals, but as it affects nations. If, with the Voluntaries, we reject this principle, then we must deny that there ought to be any national recognition of, or national connection with, God. This I apprehend to be a view of the subject of a very grave and serious kind. When God the Father is proclaiming the honours to which his Son should be exalted on his mediatorial throne, in right of that well-ordered covenant whereof he had become the Surety, he declares, in the language of the prophet, 'That nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted.' But how can a kingdom or nation, *as such*, serve the Lord Jesus, but by professing its allegiance to him through the medium of its legislature and its laws,—the only channels through which the mind of a people, in their collective capacity, can be expressed? According to the Voluntary doctrine, however, this is expressly forbidden."

"In a word," he concludes, "if the Church Establishment doctrine were rejected, and the doctrine of Voluntarism adopted in its stead, no bond could be formed between a nation and Him who is the God of nations. It is in this view of the Voluntary system that its atheistical spirit and tendency unequivocally appear. For if God's authority and

truth are not to be recognized by the king upon his throne, by legislators in the senate, by judges on the bench, by the statute-book in its laws, is it not manifest that the nation, in that case, is placed in the position of practically disowning God? Civil government is expressly declared in Scripture to be God's own ordinance, and rulers are there pronounced to be his ministers for good unto the people; and yet, according to the Voluntary theory, civil governments must disown the very Being from whom its own authority is derived—rulers must disclaim all subordination to that King of kings and Lord of lords whose servants they themselves are. In a word, according to the Voluntary system, God must be virtually excluded from the government of his own world."

We cannot read all this now-a-days without seeing either that the *status questionis* as between Voluntaryism and its opposite must have undergone very considerable modifications since 1835, or that the dust of controversy was then so dense that the combatants failed to judge fairly of each other's positions. It was very galling to evangelical Church Establishment men such as Mr. Buchanan to hear themselves made responsible for Erastianism and Concurrent Endowments; and it is beyond doubt that there were some among his adversaries who were just as little satisfied with *his* definition of their principles and of the consequences to which they logically led.

In any case, it is important to note what it was that the good men of those days believed themselves to be engaged in overthrowing. It was not the political theory that a State has no warrant to use its material resources for the support of the Christian Church, but a principle which cut far deeper—a principle which (in fact) was, *as they viewed it*, essentially atheistic, and which, on that account, awakened the deepest repugnance of the Christian heart.

Apart from the question of fundamental principles, a great

deal that was effective could be said in support of the practical utility of the Scottish Establishment; and this was done by Mr. Buchanan with special clearness and force. "What is it," he asks, "that a religious Establishment does, but just to provide servants to fulfil the command of the great Master of the feast—to go out into the streets and lanes, the highways and hedges, and compel men to come in? And will any man be so insane as to deny, that had the Government of this country, acting up truly to the Establishment principle, erected and endowed a church and two or three schools for every two thousand of the inhabitants of this city—thus providing ministers of God to go in and out among all their families, warning the wicked, rousing the careless, comforting the sick and the dying, building up the faithful in the hope and holiness of the gospel, and providing able Christian schoolmasters to put education within the reach of their children at a price which even the humblest classes could afford to pay—will any man, I say, be so insane as to deny that the Government, in so doing, would have been following dictates of the soundest policy, and of the most enlightened and Christian philanthropy?"

"The mere fact," he adds, "that the Establishment is visibly a defective instrument in the little locality which comes within the limited range of their own observation, goes with multitudes to constitute a sufficient ground on which to decide the whole matter in dispute. In the city and suburbs of Glasgow, for example, we have had twelve parish churches and ministers to a population of nearly 220,000 souls—that is, on an average, a church and minister to somewhat more than 18,000. It is very clear, without the aid of argument, that, in circumstances like these, the *practical value* of our national Establishment cannot be expected to be very apparent to those who take their opinions on the subject

just from what is presented before their own eyes. The seats, in general, are higher rented in this miserable scantling of Parish churches than in any of the Voluntary places of worship; because, according to what is an essential feature of the Voluntary system, they are made to pay themselves. Parochial superintendence is out of the question; and it is therefore really no great wonder that those who know nothing more of the utility of a National Church than such a specimen exhibits, should either look on with indifference, or be seduced into the ranks of its enemies. If, however, the working-classes who people the crowded lanes of our city were the inhabitants of a peaceful and well-ordered parish; had they been accustomed from their childhood to go up Sabbath after Sabbath to the house of God, where seat-rents were unknown, and where the gospel was preached unto them without money and without price; had their children been enjoying the benefits of an education at once cheap and excellent, through the medium of a parish school; had they been familiar with the inestimable privilege of living under the unbought spiritual superintendence of a pastor whom every family could call their friend;—and were some itinerant Voluntary to come among them and say, ‘Really, now, good people, this is altogether wrong; this is not at all in accordance with the practice of the primitive Church: you must go away immediately and collect from your hard earnings as much money as to buy your church from the State, to which it ought instantly to be confiscated; you must do the same by your parish school and school-house, for they too have been erected on the Establishment principle; you must no longer occupy your accustomed pew without any charge, but must pay for it five or six shillings a sitting, to furnish a stipend for your minister; in a word, you must instantly barter away that whole inheritance of moral and spiritual

privileges which you have hitherto possessed as your very birthright, in exchange for this beautiful "mess of pottage" called Voluntaryism, on which you can then feed to your heart's content,—how do you think this most persuasive harangue, among such a people, would be received?"

The attractive picture which rose before his mind's eye, as he thought of Glasgow with a parochial system as perfect as that which he had himself seen at Salton, awakened pangs of regret which put him out of all patience with Voluntaryism as a possible scheme for meeting the wants of the country. Giving some of the statistics which showed the deplorable spiritual destitution of his own parish, he says: "Surely he must be a thick-headed or a hard-hearted Voluntary whose confidence in his boasted system is not shaken by facts like these. When are those perishing thousands to provide themselves with gospel ordinances, for which many of them cannot afford to pay, and which many more would not give a farthing to procure? When the fishes shall forsake the deep, and go forth upon the dry land,—then may we expect to see an ignorant and degraded and ungodly population coming out spontaneously, with their purses in their hands, eager to remunerate the spiritual guides who will undertake to lead them in the way to Zion!"

Finally, the lecturer closed his exposition with an eloquent peroration, in which he not obscurely ascribed the Voluntary controversy to an influence the reverse of divine. Regarding, as he did, his opponents' views as really infidel if carried out to their logical conclusions, and practically hostile to the evangelization of Scotland, he saw in the movement which they had commenced only another organized attempt on the part of the great enemy of souls to destroy a Church whose revival threatened the interests of his kingdom.

"From the moment when, at the subversion of Popery,

the Church of our fathers came forth out of the ruins of his darling superstition, he evidently recognized her, by the bitterness of the assaults he directed against her, as a Church destined to be his most formidable enemy. Through the selfishness of a grasping nobility at home, and the intrigues of a bigoted foreign power abroad, he laboured, as once he vainly did in the case of her valiant Head, to destroy her in her infancy, or to drive her from the land. A century thereafter, when, in defiance of all his enmity, she had made Scotland as the very joy of the whole earth,—not only a land that had light in all her own dwellings, but whose holy radiance was beaming forth on Ireland, and England, and the continent of Europe, to dissipate that Egyptian darkness in which he is ever labouring to involve our race,—the power of an arbitrary government was then called forth to destroy her. That she was *too free*, too independent of the civil power, too unbending in her allegiance to her spiritual King, was then the argument by which he contrived to plunge her into the fires of persecution. But though her children were hunted like wild beasts upon the mountains, immured in dungeons, driven into exile, or hung like felons on a scaffold, she endured this great fight of afflictions in unsubdued integrity; and when the tyrants who had been the base instruments of her oppression had been swept, by the hand of righteous retribution, from their throne, the Church of Scotland remained unbroken and entire, to bless the people, of whom she had well proved herself at once the guardian and the guide. Coming down yet another century later in her history, we find her ancient adversary again at work, and far more successfully, under a different form. Long uninterrupted prosperity was the siren song with which he had been striving to seduce her from her first love to Christ, and to lull her asleep; and that which is often so powerful with individual



Christians, as an instrument of corruption, was not unavailing with the general body of our Church. And, doubtless, had she slept on in her worldly and lethargic repose, Voluntaryism would not have been allowed to disturb her rest. But times of reviving and refreshing had been coming down upon her from the presence of the Lord—she had been saying, in the beautiful language of the Song of Songs, ‘I will rise now, and go about the city in the streets, and in the broad ways I will seek him whom my soul loveth. Awake, O north wind; and come, thou south; blow upon my garden, that the spices thereof may flow out. Let my beloved come into his garden, and eat his pleasant fruits.’ What was her old enemy to do now? The tyranny of an arbitrary government was no longer at hand to be stirred up on the ancient plea of the Church’s too great freedom and independence. With matchless effrontery he now comes forth as the very advocate of that freedom and independence he had once laboured to destroy. So zealous is he now of the very appearance of subjection, that he will have her divorced from the State altogether. And then, when he has got the State into his own hands,—when he has chased God’s word from the throne, from the senate, from the judicial chair, from the statute-book,—he will tell her, in the language of that infidel philosophy he is labouring to place at the helm of human affairs, that she is only a hindrance to the full development of the spirit of the age; and that if she do not abate her old-fashioned pretensions, she shall find that infidelity can be a persecutor as well as superstition. But let the Church be true to herself and true to her Redeemer. He hath delivered her in six troubles, and in seven no evil shall touch her. Her standards embody, in its purity, his saving truth; her pastors are more and more of them coming forth in their Master’s spirit; her provision is evidently receiving an increase of his blessing.

In his name, then, let us set up our banners,—and he, the Holy One of Israel, will come down, as of old, to fight for our Mount Zion, and for the hill thereof.”

What gave a peculiar bitterness to the Voluntary controversy, was the circumstance that it involved practical issues. It was waged concurrently with the Church Extension agitation; and it pained Buchanan and his associates beyond expression to be met in Downing Street, when they went to ask the help of Government for what was to them a purely benevolent enterprise, not only by the politicians with economical difficulties, but by deputations of Christian men from Scotland who could not overtake the waste places themselves, yet who seemed to be at infinite trouble to prevent the work being done by others. Looking back now from this calm distance on the time, one sees very clearly that neither party did the other perfect justice. There were misunderstandings on both sides, and motives mutually imputed which were quite unwarranted. Dr. Hanna, for example, comments severely on the terms of a petition which was presented to Parliament by the Scottish Voluntaries, and which, among other things, contained the assertion that the scarcely concealed object of the Church Extensionists was “the annihilation of Dissent;” while, on the other hand, Dr. Heugh repels with indignation the charge, brought against himself and his friends, that they had been moved to agitate against the Church because “they saw the Church was rapidly improving.” It is easy enough to understand how such suspicions arose. The natural tendency of Chalmers’ schemes for the expansion of the parochial system was undoubtedly to threaten the existence of Dissent, although that was certainly not the design of it; and although one who held intelligently and conscientiously the Voluntary principle might very well have been allowed to petition against new endowments without being subjected to

the charge of being animated by jealousy or envy, yet, living as we do in a world which has never been conspicuous for its candour and charity, we can feel no surprise at such men as Brown and Wardlaw being suspected, under the circumstances, of acting under the inspiration of narrowness and selfishness.

Without, however, lingering over this page in our Church history, it may be worth while to note here some of the conclusions to which a dispassionate study of the controversy at this time of day conducts.

In the first place, we would emphasize the remark already made, that the Voluntaryism assailed in the Glasgow lectures was something essentially different from the Voluntaryism which is professed in our own day. Whether that is to be accounted for by saying that Voluntaryism has changed its front, or that the controversialists of forty years ago failed to judge it correctly, we do not stay to inquire; but it is absolutely certain that the Church which claims to have inherited the principles of Heugh and Peddie and Marshall, would refuse to accept this sentence as a correct definition of their position:—"The real Voluntary principle is this,—that it is unscriptural and sinful for the State, or civil magistrate, to give the least countenance or support to religion."

Another thing regarding which we feel very much assured is this, that the Voluntary controversy was of much greater service to the Church than it was at the time at all aware of. Not only did it train men practically all over the country for that other conflict which shortly after arose, but it drove many to the study of first principles in ecclesiastical science, and enabled them to deal more intelligently than they perhaps otherwise could have done with the greater questions of the Church's spirituality and independence. Long before 1838, the Evangelical party had made up its mind as to what kind of Establishment it was prepared to fight for. As has been shown,

Mr. Buchanan in 1835 was indignant at the charge made, that the Establishment principle which he and his friends supported involved the denial of the Church's freedom. And for the clear, sharp, pronounced opinions expressed so early upon this subject, we are undoubtedly indebted in a considerable degree to the sifting influences of the Voluntary controversy.

Again: it is not a little interesting to recall what Dr. Chalmers said (1840) in his famous pamphlet, "*What ought the Church and People of Scotland to do now?*" He there tells that the stir in Dissenting circles, if it was excited in some measure by the revived activity of the Church, reacted upon the Church also in still further quickening its activity. After some prefatory remarks upon the nature and place of the *call* in congregations, he goes on to say:—

"It was when occupied with these views—which, indeed, I had been for many years before—that I was summoned to attend a meeting of clergymen and elders, previous by a few days to the Assembly of 1833. By this time there was a great demand in the country, and throughout the Church, for a mitigation of the Law of Patronage, and for a check on the absolute will of patrons, which had become greatly more paramount than was at all suited to the original design and genius of Presbytery. Year after year the Assembly had been plied with petitions, all of them for some change in the actual system, and many of them tending to the abolition of Patronage altogether. Perhaps this general desire to popularize our ecclesiastical constitution had become all the more urgent, in consequence of the movement which took place in the same direction a year or two before in the political constitution of the country. And nothing is more likely than that the new dangers which thickened around the Establishment, not by the increase of Dissenters, but by the change which had come over their spirits, in virtue of

which from mere separatists they had become resolute and relentless enemies, bent on a war of extermination,—not at all unlikely, we say, that this Voluntaryism, with her fierce and noisy menace, had led many of the Church's friends to seek for the means of her greater safety in a greater hold on the affections of the people, and to suggest, as the likeliest method of attaching them more to the Church of their fathers, that they should recur to those ancient principles which, in the days of their fathers, were held in greatest observation and honour, and which after all were the purest and most prosperous days of the Church of Scotland. From these and other causes there arose a very general impression that something should be done; and it was at a preliminary meeting, where I happened to be one of the number, that the Veto Act was first proposed as a method for giving effect to the will of the people, and with the least possible encroachment on the will of the patron."

The biographer of Dr. Heugh gives it as his opinion that "the agitation on National Establishments was the *cause*, rather than the *effect*, of the attempts to conserve the Church of Scotland, by improving and popularizing it." We cannot accept that statement entirely, of course; but that there is some truth in it is proved by the narrative of Chalmers. The Voluntary controversy had, it would appear, very directly to do with the proposing of those measures of Reform which took shape in the passing of the Veto Act.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

THE step taken by the Church in 1834, to secure to its congregations a potential voice in the election of their ministers, approved itself at once as a practically wise one. The drift towards Dissent was completely arrested, the loyalty of the people to the Establishment was immensely strengthened, a new feeling of elasticity was imparted to every department of Christian work, and good men all over Scotland addressed themselves with fresh hopefulness to the prosecution of schemes of usefulness, as seeing in this new departure the promise of a brighter and a better future for their country.\* How a day which dawned so brilliantly so soon became overcast is well known. Mr. Robert Young, a licentiate of the Church, was presented to Auchterarder by the patron of that parish, but failed to meet with the approval of the parishioners. Only three persons could be persuaded to sign his call; while two hundred and eighty-nine male heads of families not only refused to join in the invitation to him, but solemnly and formally objected to his settlement. The Presbytery thereupon refused to proceed with his induction; and if all parties had at this point acquiesced in the decision, Scotland would probably at the present moment have been in possession of the most effective

\* One of the most striking chapters in the "Ten Years' Conflict" is that which tells of the "*Fruits of Evangelical Ascendency.*"

Established Church in the world. As it was, however, the Presbytery's conclusions were not accepted. Mr. Young was advised (it is believed by the Dean of Faculty Hope) to appeal to the Civil Courts against the legality of the Act of Assembly under which he was rejected; and thus the thin edge of the wedge was introduced which ultimately split the Church asunder.

At first no great alarm was felt about the Appeal. In all Societies where civil interests are involved, there must be references from time to time to the Courts instituted for their protection. And as there were questions with regard to the possession of manse and glebe and stipend mixed up with the case that had arisen at Auchterarder, it was not felt that any principle was necessarily threatened when the Court of Session was asked to say how the Veto Law appeared to it to affect the destination of the *temporalia*. But the process had hardly been commenced when it was made apparent that it was going to affect something far more important than the benefice. The right of the Church to pass such an Act as that of 1834 at all, was boldly challenged; and even in the earlier stages of the case the competency of the Court of Session was asserted, not only to direct the stipend to be given to Mr. Young, but to point out imperatively to the Presbytery the course it behoved to follow in the discharge of its spiritual duties.

The hearing of the first great Auchterarder Case took place in the end of 1837 and in the beginning of 1838; and the result was, a division in which eight judges voted one way and five another. At this distance of time, the judges may without indelicacy be weighed as well as counted. In the majority were Lord President Hope, Lord Justice-Clerk Boyle, and Lords Corehouse, Gillics, Meadowbank, Mackenzie, Medwyn, and Cunningham. The minority consisted of Lords

Fullerton, Moncreiff, Jeffrey, Glenlee, and Cockburn. No one acquainted in any degree with Scottish affairs can have much doubt about the presumptive value of a judgment which such men as these last named resisted; and few will be able to read their speeches in the light of later times without seeing that they had an infinitely better understanding of the subject discussed than those who overbore them by force of numbers. The majority were of opinion that the Presbytery had acted illegally in rejecting Mr. Young on the ground of the dissent of a majority of male heads of families, and the Court “decerned” accordingly. It was a sentence which was immediately felt to be halting, because it prescribed nothing to be *done*—it only proclaimed a doctrine—and supplementary action needed to be taken afterwards. But enough had occurred to make it plain that a very serious crisis had arisen. Not only had the Court of Session assumed an attitude antagonistic to the Church, but principles had been enunciated, alike from the Bar and the Bench, which spoke ominously of the certainty of future complications. In a word, that *independence* which the advocates of the Establishment principle had so warmly asserted to be a part of the heritage of the Church of Scotland, was now declared in unexpected quarters to have no existence save in the imagination of the enthusiastic Evangelicals.

Mr. Whigham, for example, one of the counsel for the prosecution, had ventured to describe the Establishment of the National Church as a *compact*. Whereupon he was called to order by his senior, the Dean of Faculty, who laid down what he considered the true law of the subject. “Any such compact,” said he, “implies the existence of two independent bodies, with previous independent authority and rights;” and that idea he scouted as absurd and inadmissible. “What right,” he asked, “had the Church of Scotland, before its



establishment by Act of Parliament, to assert, or surrender, or concede?.....The question I advert to," he went on to say, "involves the claim of divine right—of a power to legislate and regulate as bestowed on the Church by its great spiritual Head, and inalienable, as in a pre-eminent manner derived from the authority and accompanied by the blessing of God. This, my lords, is the most pernicious error by which the blessed truths of Christianity can be perverted."

The Lord President (the Dean's father) was equally explicit. "That our Saviour," said he, "is the Head of the Kirk of Scotland, in any *temporal*, or *legislative*, or *judicial* sense, is a position which I can dignify by no other name than absurdity. THE PARLIAMENT is the temporal head of the Church, from whose acts, and from whose acts alone, it exists as the National Church, and from which alone it derives all its powers."

In view of declarations like these, it seemed high time that the Church herself should speak out with some emphasis; and it was resolved to invite the General Assembly which was approaching to issue something of the nature of a manifesto on the subject. The doctrine of the spirituality and freedom of the Church was, happily, not at all unfamiliar at the time to the men who were called on to deal with it. It had been pressed, in fact, upon their attention in a variety of connections. As has been already seen, the issue of a Religious Commission of Inquiry had compelled some to look at it. It had also been very distinctly stirred by the Voluntary controversy. And in a still more emphatic form it had received consideration during the discussion on the Chapel ministers. Up to a very late period the parochial ministers alone had Kirk Sessions and seats in Presbyteries. This was at last felt to be worse than an anomaly. Practically, it worked extremely ill; and the moment it was seriously looked into, it was seen to be inconsistent with the funda-

mental principles of Presbyterianism. An Act of Assembly was accordingly passed in 1833, recognizing the spiritual status of all ordained ministers, whether they had the charge of parishes or not; and in connection with the debates on this subject, the inherent powers of the Church were frequently insisted on. One scene, in particular, bearing on the right of ordination in *quoad sacra* charges, is well worth recalling. It occurred during a speech which was delivered by Mr. Dunlop in 1834.

“No one,” said he, “will deny that the holy office of pastor is ordained of God; that by ordinance of Scripture certain powers are inherent in that office, and that it involves necessarily the power of ruling as well as teaching. To these powers the Church cannot add, from these powers she cannot take away; and yet Presbyteries dare,—and the other side of the House defend them in it,—Presbyteries dare, in express violation of the Word of God—” (*Immense confusion, and cries of Order*). (Dr. Stirling, Moderator *pro tem.*, called on Mr. Dunlop for an explanation.) In explanation, Mr. Dunlop said: “Moderator, I have to state that I hold the power of ordination to be exercised by Presbyteries solely by authority of the Head of the Church, and that when, in conferring ordination, they attempt to withhold part of the powers wherewith Christ hath invested his ministers, they do act in violation of the ordinance of Scripture. And” (said Mr. Dunlop, turning to the right side of the House) “what member of the House will dare to gainsay this?” (A pause, and silence.)

It does not need to be pointed out that here we breathe very different air from that which hung over the Court of Session when the Lord President spoke of the practical exercise of a Divine Headship over the Church as an absurdity. Mr. Dunlop had a devout belief in the existence of a visible kingdom of Christ in the world, and he recognized the pressure there of laws other than those issuing from Parliament. There

is reason to believe that it was under his direction that the arrangements were made in the Assembly of 1838 for the issue of a DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE; and if that was the case, we can easily account for the selection of his friend Mr. Buchanan to take the lead in the debate.

“I was a member of the General Assembly of 1838,” says the Rev. John Laird of Cupar, “and voted with the majority in favour of the resolutions regarding the Independence of the Church. Dr. Buchanan had previously made himself known as a leading man in the West, in connection with the Voluntary controversy and the Church Extension movement, and on this account was selected as the mover of the Independence resolutions. I took no note of the proceedings of the Assembly, but have a distinct recollection of the enthusiasm on the Evangelical side of the House, and specially with reference to the part of the motion which says, ‘That they do further resolve that this spiritual jurisdiction, and the supremacy and sole Headship of the Lord Jesus Christ on which it depends, they will assert,’ &c. There was only one feeling among us as to the able and statesmanlike manner in which the resolutions were introduced. There was throughout the speech such a decided tone, and, at the same time, so much courtesy in speaking of the judges and their decision, that all of us were thoroughly satisfied that the great cause had been intrusted to one capable of doing it ample justice. The impression produced by the speech was such as to create the universal conviction that Dr. Buchanan was a man eminently qualified to take the influential position in the Church’s affairs which he occupied so long with such credit to himself and such advantage to his brethren. I can never forget the interest of the debate, and the deep and solemn impression that pervaded it,—the majority feeling that they were unfurling the old banner, and displaying it because of the truth.”

This historical debate, as we may well call it, took place on the 23rd of May. It is not necessary to give even a general report of the course which it took, but our readers will be interested to read the principal parts of the speech delivered on the occasion by Mr. Buchanan. After some of the overtures bearing on the subject had been submitted to the House, he rose and said :—

IMPORTANCE OF THE SUBJECT.

“It will readily be allowed that the question now brought by these numerous overtures under the consideration of this venerable House, is one of fundamental importance. The question of the Church’s spiritual independence is a vital question. It bears immediately and essentially, not only on the welfare of the Church’s members, but on the authority and honour of Him who is her blessed Head. And never, since the hour when the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Scotland was originally founded, have the great principles that question involves been assailed or threatened without finding this Assembly prepared, at whatever cost, resolutely to assert and defend them. In proposing, therefore, in accordance with the prayers of the overtures now upon the table, to issue a declaration in support of these principles at present, the only possible difference of opinion that can arise must be limited to this single consideration,—whether at present there be any sufficient call for such a declaration being made. The doctrine of the Church’s spiritual independence, it may be argued, is already abundantly well known. It is laid down broadly and conspicuously in our Confession of Faith. It is recorded in our books of Discipline. It is inscribed, and that not unfrequently in characters of blood, on many of the brightest and most memorable pages of our ecclesiastical history. Like some ancient banner, which has been borne in triumph through many a hard-fought field, it hangs honoured and venerated within our Church’s armoury; and there is no cause, it may be thought, why we should be shaking the dust from its folds, and flinging it again abroad to the winds of heaven. That the framers and supporters of these overtures have arrived at a different conclusion, is sufficiently plain; and if the Assembly will grant me the indulgence I so greatly need, I shall not despair of being able to adduce some considerations that may perhaps serve to show that the view they have taken of the subject has not been adopted on slight or trivial grounds.”

THE CHURCH’S LIBERTY QUESTIONED BY VOLUNTARIES.

“It cannot be unknown to the members of this Court, that by a certain party in this country the lawfulness of Church Establishments has of late

years been vehemently and confidently denied. To the controversy on that subject which has in consequence arisen, I have no intention to allude, further than by offering this remark,—a remark in which, I am persuaded, all who have paid any attention to that controversy will at once agree,—that by far the most plausible argument which the supporters of anti-Establishment principles have employed is this, that the Church cannot be united to the State but at the expense of a surrender of the Church's spiritual independence. That such a surrender has, in point of fact, in particular instances been made, no man will venture to deny. And though any argument founded on cases like these proves nothing more than that the Church Establishment, like every other principle the practical application of which is committed to the hands of fallen and fallible creatures, is liable to be abused,—a conclusion which every one knows may be easily demonstrated even against Christianity itself,—still it has been always and justly felt, that in exposing the pernicious sophistries in which the question has by the Church's enemies been purposely involved, we were placed on a most important vantage-ground, by the fact that our national religious Establishment stood clear from the specific abuse to which reference has been made,—that the Church of Scotland, in entering into and maintaining an alliance with the civil power, has done so with unshackled hands—has made no compromise of her character as a Church of Christ, but continues to hold and to exercise all those inherent and essential rights and privileges she has derived from the Lord Jesus, her sole Head and Sovereign. If the truth of this statement had been called in question only by those who are labouring openly and avowedly for the overthrow of the National Church, and who, in their eagerness to accomplish that object, have not shown themselves particularly scrupulous as to the means to be employed. I for one should have deemed it altogether unnecessary to dignify their groundless accusation by calling on this venerable Court to notice it at all."

UTTERANCES FROM THE BENCH.

"I cannot but feel, however, that the matter has been placed in a very different position by the recent proceedings of other parties, very different from those to whom I have just referred. It is to be presumed the members of the Assembly are well aware there has recently issued from the press a report of the proceedings of the Court of Session relative to the 'Auchterarder Case,'—a report which bears on its title-page to have been 'published by authority of the Court.' In that voluminous report there are contained assertions in reference to the Church's independence, given as employed by eminent counsel on one side of the case, to which I shall not more specially allude. If, however, I must venture to advert with greater minuteness to certain expressions of a similar kind which are reported as having fallen from the bench, I hope it will be understood that I do so with all becoming respect and deference. But it is just because the quarter

from whence these expressions have proceeded is so high and influential—because both professional learning and eminent official station combine with private worth to lend weight and authority to the opinions thus pronounced, that it is impossible to maintain silence regarding them. And certainly it does not diminish the pressure of that necessity which lies upon the Assembly to repudiate these opinions, that they were delivered in some cases by individuals who are not only judges of the Court of Session, but elders of the Church of Scotland. What, sir, are the members of our Church to think, when they hear it said from the bench of our Supreme Civil Court, gravely and deliberately, that the Church of Scotland has no ‘inherent right to any power or privilege except that which the Legislature has conferred upon it,’ and that she is ‘the mere creature of statute’? What are they to think when they hear this extraordinary language—the most extraordinary, I will venture to affirm, that was ever heard within the walls of the Court of Session—‘That our Saviour is the Head of our Kirk of Scotland in any temporal, or legislative, or judicial sense, is a position which I can dignify by no other name than absurdity; the Parliament is the temporal head of the Church, from whose acts, and from whose acts alone, it exists as the National Church, and from which alone it derives all its powers’? I hesitate not to affirm that there is more damage done to the cause of Establishments in general, and to the interests of the Church of Scotland in particular, by that single sentence, than by all the elaborate speeches which, in a controversy of nearly six years’ duration, their enemies have ever uttered. I do not wonder that the sentiments it contains should have elicited from a different part of the same honourable bench the pointed observation—an observation which most justly describes the real character and tendency of the sentiments it condemns—‘If they had really any solid foundation, they would go far to annihilate all the substance of the fabric of the Church of Scotland, and all that has hitherto endeared it to the affections and drawn to it the grateful respect and veneration of the people of this land.’ I rejoice that within the same Court where such offensive statements were made, there were others prepared to disclaim and oppose them. But that circumstance does not relieve this Court from the necessity of lifting up its voice.”

#### DUTY OF THE CHURCH.

“Independent of the consideration, that in the case then under discussion a judgment was pronounced practically in accordance with the opinions of those by whom the Church’s independence was so flatly denied, the very fact that such opinions were expressed from the bench of the Court of Session imperatively requires that this Assembly should not, by its silence, even appear to acquiesce in them. The honourable and right-honourable judges to whom I allude seem, like the well-known Erastus, to resolve all the powers exercised by Church governors into the will of the State. They

seem to look upon the Church as an institution which owed its very existence to the Civil power; or at least, if some of them do not go quite so far, to think any existence it had, or could have, apart and by itself, ceased at the moment of its conjunction with the State,—so that when it reappeared under its Established form it was no longer in any sense the same, but a new institution, whose native and original character was gone, and which dated a new and altogether different existence, all whose powers and functions it derived, not from Christ, but from Cæsar, from the era of its Establishment. In short, that it had undergone a complete metempsychosis—as complete, and far more humiliating and degrading, than any of which we read in Oriental romance.”

#### THE CHURCH NOT A VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATION.

“It did not surprise me to find attached to an overture on this subject, from the Synod to which I have the honour to belong, the name of a highly respected member of the Presbytery of Ayr,\* because I remember the doctrine taught by his venerated relative, Principal Hill—so different from that which has so painfully distinguished the civil proceedings in the Auchterarder case. If the Christian Church were a mere voluntary association, into which men entered without being obliged to it, they might consent, without deserving blame, to place it entirely under secular authority. But, as Dr. Hill observes, ‘the Christian Church is to be regarded in a much higher light than as a voluntary association. It is a society created by divine institution.’ And having shown, by a very simple process of reasoning, that as such it must have all the powers necessary for its own government, he proceeds to remark that the same reasoning and the same facts also prove that when the Church receives the protection and countenance of the civil power, she does not by this alliance lose those rights and powers which are implied in Church government as such.’ And the late lamented Dr. Inglis, in his well-known ‘Vindication,’ instead of countenancing the degrading notion that the loss of these rights and powers is the necessary consequence of the Church’s uniting with the State, makes this strong and explicit statement to the contrary, that ‘if a Civil Government shall attempt to direct the appropriate concerns of the visible Church of Christ, by either superseding or controlling its separate and independent power for the regulation of its own spiritual and inherent interests,.....that Government is so far an adversary of Christ and his cause in the world.’ I have referred to those authors in preference to many others, just because none will suspect them of advocating extravagant opinions on this question—of pushing the doctrine of the Church’s independence one hair’s-breadth beyond its just limits. My sole object in referring to their opinions was merely to show that the Erastianism avowed and maintained by certain learned judges of

\* The Rev. Alexander Hill, D.D., minister of Dailly, afterwards Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow.

the Court of Session is repudiated and condemned by even the most cautious and guarded of our Scottish divines."

DOCTRINE OF THE STANDARDS.

"To prove what is the actual position of the Church of Scotland in reference to the question of spiritual independence, I shall not appeal to the authority of any writers whatever. I shall appeal to her own standards—standards which the State has sanctioned, and which have been nobly illustrated in the most trying periods of her history." [Having quoted from these at some length, Mr Buchanan again proceeds.] "Will any man venture to say, with these standards before him, that the Church of Scotland 'is the mere creature of civil statute'?—that she has 'no inherent right to any power or privilege except that which the Legislature has conferred upon her'? It will not suffice to explain away that extraordinary statement to say, that if the Church really has this spiritual liberty she owes it to Acts of Parliament. The Acts of Parliament by which her liberty is ratified recognize her spiritual independence as a thing already existing—they do not confer it as a mere State privilege. And this leads me to return to what has been already hinted at,—namely, to the utterly erroneous and unfounded notion on which certain of the judges in the Court of Session appear to have proceeded, with regard to the nature of the connection which has so long subsisted between the State and the Church of Scotland. The notion to which I allude is the more deserving of notice, because it evidently lies at the bottom of all those low, unworthy views as to the Church's slavish subjection to the State, which the Assembly is now called solemnly and deliberately to disavow and condemn. There is a passage in one of these judicial speeches which brings out in its broadest and most offensive form the cardinal error which I have in view. 'Now,' said his lordship, 'as to this Act 1690 (re-establishing the Presbyterian Church), one circumstance is very remarkable. If there was one thing more than another within the compass of the exclusive cognizance and jurisdiction of the Church, it would seem to be the settling the terms of the Creed or Confession of Faith of the Church. But the Church knew that it could not do so, and did not venture to do so, by its own authority. The Church drew up what she thought ought to be the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church, but she did not declare and enact by her own authority that this is and shall be the Confession of Faith of the National Church of Scotland. No. The Church presented it to Parliament, by which it was voted and approved.' The fallacy which pervades this passage is so glaring and palpable, that one does feel no ordinary astonishment to find it escaping the notice of any one occupying a place in the bench of the Court of Session. The speech seems to confound two things which are altogether and essentially distinct and different,—namely, the right on the part of the Church 'to settle the terms of her own creed or confession,' with the right 'to enact



and declare, by her own authority, that that creed is and shall be the Confession of the National Church.' Because she cannot do the latter, it is taken for granted she is equally incompetent to do the former. But who does not see through the little obscurity which appears to have led to this erroneous judgment? The union between Church and State is an alliance between two distinct, independent, and co-ordinate powers. In entering into this alliance, each of the parties is entitled to know for what the other stipulates, as terms of agreement. The State, as a Christian State, is not only entitled, but bound, to know what doctrine the Church holds and designs to teach. It is the very fundamental position of the supporters of Church establishments, that the State or civil magistrate is not only qualified, but is under a solemn obligation, to ascertain what is the true religion, and that it is the maintenance and propagation of the true religion alone he is at liberty to countenance and aid by means of the civil power. He must, therefore, see to it that the creed he is to sanction is in accordance with the Word of God; and it is only by his sanction, as matter of course, that it can become the creed of a National Established Church. But this right and this duty on his side imply no prejudice to the right and duty of the Church on her side, to settle the terms of her creed, and to determine of her own exclusive judgment and authority what her creed shall be. Having done so, not as an established Church, for we are here considering her proceedings antecedent to an establishment, but having done so in her native capacity as a Church of Christ, she presents it to the State as her standard of doctrine. If the State accept and own it, then the alliance is formed. If the State disclaim and reject it, the Church does not renounce her creed; she simply renounces the proposal for a State alliance, and continues as she did before to maintain her creed in a state of separation. Now, this which I have now stated is not merely the true theory of what the terms of union between Church and State ought to be, but it is the true theory of the union actually subsisting between the Church of Scotland and the Government of Great Britain. With regard to the Confession of Faith, every one knows it was first adopted by the Church in the Assembly of 1647, and ratified eighteen months thereafter by Act of Parliament, and again at the Revolution, since which time it has stood unchanged. It is surely, then, as plain as any proposition can be, that the State, in sanctioning that Confession, did not create the powers and privileges as existing in the Church, and as derived to her, not from civil statute, but from the Lord Jesus Christ."

## COMPETENCY OF THE VETO ACT.

"Now, I have no intention of going into the question whether or not the Act of Assembly 1834, by which 'intrusion' was defined to mean a dissent by the majority of male heads of families, communicants, was or was not a salutary measure. It is enough for me that a majority of the Presbyteries of this Church deliberately declared this to be their judgment, and that the

Church in consequence passed it into a standing law. But what the Assembly is concerned with at present is not the wisdom of the Church, but the competency of the Church, in making such a law at all. I am well persuaded that, even among those who objected to the passing of the law on grounds of expediency, there are many as much prepared as I am to contend for the Church's full right and authority to make it, and who will be as ready to join in disclaiming that jurisdiction which the Civil Court has assumed in venturing to pronounce it illegal. That the settlement of a minister is a matter purely ecclesiastical, is too obvious to need any illustration. In all such matters, the policy of the Church, as her own standards require, must 'lean upon the Word immediately as the only ground thereof—must be taken from the pure fountains of the Scriptures, the Church hearing the voice of Christ, the only spiritual King, and being ruled by his laws.' And never can she consent to renounce that fundamental article of her constitution, whatever be the cost at which she may be called to maintain it. What course she may find it necessary to pursue in case that happen which I shall not anticipate—that the decision of the Court of Session shall be confirmed in the House of Lords—it would not become me at present to offer an opinion. But this I will venture beforehand confidently to affirm,—that she will never consent to abandon a law which she has made under a solemn conviction that it was imperatively required, alike by a regard to the fundamental principles of her own constitution, to the spiritual welfare of her people, and to the honour and glory of her supreme and only Lord. To do so were to lay herself prostrate under the feet of her enemies; to proclaim with her own tongue what they have injuriously and calumniously averred,—that she has sold her birthright as a Church of Christ for what, in comparison, were more worthless than Esau's mess of pottage."

## CHURCH AUTHORITY.

"But without involving this discussion in difficulties which I trust may never be developed, there is one thing meanwhile which the Church not only may do, if she desires to vindicate her own honour, in the question which is now at issue between her and the Civil Courts. She must assert her authority over her own ministers and licentiates; she must not allow her own office-bearers to defy her own laws—to employ the very status she has conferred upon them for the purpose of pouring contempt on a jurisdiction they have sworn to obey. To be dragged to the bar of a Civil Court by a civil personage, is only to suffer an injury which cannot, in certain circumstances, be avoided; but to permit such an outrage to be perpetrated by an ecclesiastical personage, is subversive of the first principles of ecclesiastical government. The course which, in similar circumstances, was pursued by this Church in the celebrated case of Montgomery in 1582, was no new thing in the Christian Church. The very same thing was done twelve

hundred years before, in the Councils of Antioch and Carthage. The truth in such a course is prescribed by the very nature of things,—there can be no government unless those who are legitimately within its jurisdiction be compelled to obey it.”

CONCLUDING APPEAL.

“Suffer me only, before I conclude, to remind the Assembly of the eminently responsible position in which it now stands. The eyes of the country are fastened upon you, in connection with this question, with an earnestness and anxiety of the intensest kind. The enemies of our venerated Church are looking on, in the eager hope that your indecision or unfaithfulness may leave them to raise the shout of malignant triumph. They know and feel that all their own efforts from without to endanger her stability have been impotent and unavailing, and that if their desire for her overthrow is ever to be realized, it will be the result, not of an external assault, but of a stroke dealt to her from within. Nor is it with an interest less keen the Church's friends are now waiting your decision. Let the Assembly show itself wavering and irresolute as to the Church's spiritual independence—let it discover the faintest symptom of a disposition to abandon the spiritual rights and privileges of the Christian people, declared to belong to them in virtue of her own fundamental laws—and you will have done more in one day to alienate Scotland from the National Church than a century of the bitterest hostility on the part of her enemies could possibly achieve; but, on the contrary, let your deliverance this day proclaim throughout the land that the Church of Scotland is resolved to stand fast in that liberty wherewith Christ hath made her free—to adhere unalterably to those great principles of spiritual independence which were cemented into the constitution of the Church of Scotland by the blood of our martyred fathers—and by that deliverance you will raise a wall of adamant around our Zion, and impart unbounded confidence and comfort to the hearts of the many thousands of her faithful children who are now fervently praying for the peace and prosperity of Jerusalem. Let the banner of the Church's spiritual freedom, emblazoned with the Redeemer's crown, be seen floating, as of old, over her high towers, and she need fear no evil; for then her God will be in the midst of her—her God will help her, and that right early.”

Mr. Buchanan then read the following motion:—

“That the General Assembly of this Church, while they unqualifiedly acknowledge the exclusive jurisdiction of the Civil Courts in regard to the civil rights and emoluments secured by law to the Church and the ministers thereof, and will ever give and inculcate implicit obedience to their decisions thereafter, do resolve that, as is declared in the Confession of Faith of this National Established Church, ‘The Lord Jesus Christ, as King and Head of the Church, hath therein appointed a government in

the hand of Church officers distinct from the Civil magistrate; and that, in all matters touching the doctrine, government, and discipline of the Church, her judicatories possess an exclusive jurisdiction, founded on the Word of God, which 'power ecclesiastical' (in the words of the Second Book of Discipline) 'flows immediately from God and the Mediator, the Lord Jesus Christ, and is spiritual, not having a temporal head on earth, but only Christ, the only spiritual King and Governor of his Kirk.' And they do further resolve, that this spiritual jurisdiction and the sole Headship of the Lord Jesus Christ, on which it depends, they will assert, and at all hazards defend, by the help and blessing of that great God who, in the days of old, enabled their fathers, amidst manifold persecution, to maintain a testimony, even to the death, for Christ's kingdom and crown; and, finally, that they will firmly enforce obedience to the same upon the office-bearers and members of the Church, by the execution of her laws in the exercise of the ecclesiastical authority wherewith they are invested."

The motion having been seconded by Dr. William Thomson of Perth, Dr. Cook proposed an amendment, the gist of which was that the Church should do nothing until the result was known of the appeal to the House of Lords. Mr. Pirie of Dyce (afterwards Principal Pirie of Aberdeen) supported that view, and an animated debate ensued, in which Mr. Gibbon of Lonmay, Mr. John Cook, Dr. Esdaile of Perth, Mr. Bisset of Bourtie, and Mr. Whigham spoke on the one side; and Mr. Beveridge of Inzievar, Professor Brown of Aberdeen, Mr. Carment of Rosskeen, Dr. Forbes of Glasgow, Mr. Dunlop, and Mr. Earle Monteith, on the other. Mr. Dunlop, referring to the cloud of words in which it had been sought to envelop the subject, said,—“The real point of difference between the two sides was this: *Who was authoritatively to determine what was the spiritual jurisdiction of the Church?* Was the Church, in guiding her own conduct in matters spiritual, to take the decision of the Court of Session as the leading rule of her proceedings? This doctrine was involved in Dr. Cook's motion. If admitted, however, the independence of the Church in matters spiritual was but a name, as it rested entirely on the arbitrament of the Court of Session. The

only true rule in questions of conflicting jurisdictions of supreme courts, even where there is no peculiarity such as that of the Divine source, from which the Church's jurisdiction immediately sprung, was that in such matters each Court judged for itself in its own matters, and did not take the determination of any other tribunal. Thus the Court of Session in determining in all civil questions, such as the right to manse, glebe, and stipend, would act on its own construction as to what was *ultra vires* or *intra vires* of the Church, and decide without the determination of Church Courts. They, again, in matters spiritual, which alone they could decide, as in regard to ordination, deposition, and the like, would not be bound by the decision of the Civil Court, which had no control over them in such matters, but would to this effect determine for themselves. Still more must this be the case when it is considered that the jurisdiction of the Church does not proceed from any civil authority, but is conferred by her Divine Head."

When the vote was taken, it was found that 183 were in favour of the motion of Mr. Buchanan, and 142 were in favour of that proposed by Dr. Cook. The independence of the Church was therefore asserted in its most emphatic form, and the determination proclaimed to maintain it at all hazards.

The attitude thus taken up by the General Assembly had, however, no effect in staying the aggressions of the Civil Courts. Nearly a year later—in May 1839—the House of Lords affirmed the sentence of the Court of Session, and thus the consent of the people was authoritatively declared to be not at all an essential element to the right settlement of ministers in Scottish parochial charges. But that was not all. The Court below had contented itself with declaring what was its view of the law, hoping apparently that when the Presbytery was told its duty, it would address itself to

the discharge of it of its own accord. In the meantime, however, indications had been given that the Church might refuse to intrude Mr. Young into the cure of Auchterarder under any circumstances; and the question was raised, What was to be done in that event? Lord Brougham was equal to the occasion. "I should at once," said he, "make an order upon the Presbytery to admit, if duly qualified, *and to disregard the dissent of the congregation*..... Still, it is affirmed that the Presbytery may persist in refusing. My Lords, it is indecent to suppose any such case. You might as well suppose that Doctors' Commons would refuse to attend to a prohibition from the Court of King's Bench." The utterance of sentiments like these opened the eyes of Chalmers and others to the radical nature of the conflict which had begun. They did not care particularly about the Veto Act as to its mere form. To prevent needless disturbances, they were willing to repeal it, if that was thought indispensable. What they alone were concerned about was the maintenance in some shape or another of the *principle* that no unacceptable presentee should be intruded on a reclaiming congregation; and if that end could not be gained by one method, they were perfectly ready to seek it by another which might prove more acceptable. The opinions of the judges in the House of Lords, however, dispelled all illusions. In them it was made as clear as day that in no form would the opposition of the people be tolerated. The objection was not to something technically defective in an Act, but to the vital principle expressed in that Act. To have proceeded, then, to repeal the Veto, would have brought the two parties no nearer to the point of reconciliation; and as to have repealed it would have been like a change of front in presence of an enemy, and would certainly have been misinterpreted, it was obviously the course of wisdom which the Church followed when it resolved to

keep its flag flying, and to fight the battle out on the line on which it had entered.

Matters, then, at the stage now reached, stood thus :— On the one hand, the Civil Courts said : “ You are bound by the law to induct all ‘ qualified ’ presentees (that is, all those against whose life, literature, and doctrine you have nothing to complain), *without any regard to the dissent of the congregations to which they are to minister.*” On the other hand, the Church responded : “ That is an interpretation of the law in which we are not prepared to acquiesce ; and in any case, we cannot conscientiously agree to renew the old and calamitous system of forced settlements.” In other words, the House of Lords affirmed that “ intrusion ” was of the essence of the constitution of the Church of Scotland ; while the General Assembly emphatically repudiated that doctrine, and prepared itself to battle for “ non-intrusion,” not only as for what was a part of the inalienable heritage of the Church, but for what was believed to be indispensable to the maintenance of vital religion in the country.

Dr. Chalmers’ motion in the Assembly of 1839 exactly met the crisis. It proposed that the Church should acquiesce in the loss of the temporalities at Auchterarder [the State’s right to resume these when it was not satisfied with the way in which the Church was fulfilling its part of the contract was never for a moment questioned] ; it asserted afresh, and more emphatically than ever, the principle of “ non-intrusion ;” and it suggested the appointment of a committee to confer with the Government, with a view to the prevention of any further collision between the Civil and Ecclesiastical authorities. This motion was carried, and a committee having been appointed accordingly, a deputation representing it was as soon as possible sent to London. Lord Melbourne was then in power. He had resigned in May 1839 ; but Sir

R. Peel failed at that time to form a stable Administration, and the Whigs returned for another term to office. The inconveniences attending the ecclesiastical deadlock in Scotland were admitted on all sides, and all parties showed themselves to be not unwilling to do something toward composing the existing differences. But the Premier had too recently disappointed the Church in the matter of church extension, to be looked to with much confidence now; and after a brief effort at negotiation with the Whigs, the eyes of the deputation were turned to their old and, as it seemed, zealous friends, the Conservatives. Nor did it appear at first as if this confidence were to be misplaced. Lord Aberdeen, in particular, threw himself, with all the ardour of a partisan, into the business; and a Bill, bearing his name, was by-and-by introduced into the House of Lords. The nature of this Bill, which was to reduce the chaos of the Scottish Establishment to order, is well known. Its leading feature was its adoption of the principle of a *veto with reasons*. It was afterwards actually tried and found grievously wanting, so that it is not necessary at this time of day to vindicate the wisdom of the Church in refusing to accept it. The memorable thing, however, in this connection, is the circumstance that it was in the course of the debates which took place at this time that another and melancholy process of disenchantment commenced. The Evangelicals had long since lost all faith in Whig politicians; they were now to learn that it was no more safe to trust the interests of the Church to those who were Conservatives. Other cases besides that of Auchterarder had by this time arisen, and the Court of Session had not been slow to act on the hint thrown out by Lord Brougham. Presbyteries were no longer told in a mild way what the law was, and left without the temporal benefits of an Establishment if they refused to obey it. They were imperiously ordered to do



what the Civil Judges directed; and when the specific courses thus pointed out were not taken, the Judges resorted to a system of reprisals, by which the Church was harried as if it had been the territory of an enemy. Against those aggressions the Church rebelled; and it was with a feeling of bitter disappointment that it heard from the familiar friends in whom it had once trusted, sentiments which showed that it had no sympathy to expect from them in its struggles.

Lord Aberdeen was deeply offended with the Assembly of 1840 for refusing to approve his Bill, and he showed his irritation by insulting it. He told the House of Lords that "it was governed by a few ambitious lawyers;" and when, on the 10th of July, he withdrew his measure because of its manifest unacceptability, he went out of his way to express in the strongest terms his sympathy with the Strathbogie ministers, and intimated that he should not object to see those in prison who were daring to preach the gospel in defiance of the Court of Session interdict. Sir Robert Peel was quite as explicit. "The spiritual authority now claimed by the Church of Scotland he believed to be unjust and illegal, and he would not, for the purpose of conciliation, give his support to it. The best evidence he could offer to the Church of Scotland of his regard and respect, was to take this opportunity of inculcating upon its authorities a giving up of their personal feelings, and a strict obedience to the law."

Chalmers referred to this appeal of Sir Robert in a magnificent speech, which was delivered in the August Commission following. "Never," said he, "was an appeal made so utterly wide of the object, to sensibilities which have no existence; or if they have, it is in so slight a degree that they are overshadowed by principles of such depth and height, and length and breadth, as to engross and occupy the whole man. These principles, whether comprehended or not by our adversaries,

are the only moving forces that tell, or have told, on the proceedings of the General Assembly. The free jurisdiction of the Church in things spiritual; the Headship of Christ; the authority of his Bible as the great statute-book, not to be lorded over by any power on earth; a deference to our own standards in all that is ecclesiastical; and, what is more, a submission unexcepted and entire to the civil law in all that is civil;—these are our principles—*these*, and not personal feelings, are what you ask us to give up, by giving in to those adversaries who have put forth an unhallowed hand upon them.”

These were the principles of the Evangelicals. “The position of the other party,” it may be convenient at this point to say,\* “was equally clear. They believed as firmly as their brethren in the duty of accepting no law which inferred disloyalty to the revealed will of the great Head. They also claimed for the Church undisputed liberty in the exercise of her judicial functions. But they further asserted that when the Church, after due deliberation, had settled her own constitution, and had come to terms with the State as to the conditions on which she should accept establishment, and had satisfied herself that there was nothing in the statute so establishing her which inferred disloyalty to conscience and the Word of God, she had then become bound by contract, and had no right *proprio motu* to legislate in such a manner as to nullify her own constitution and the statutes to which she had agreed. These laws had become her laws, and held her in a certain fixed relationship, not only with the State, but with her own members and every individual who had a *locus standi* before her courts, whether minister, communicant, patron, or heritor. All these, the constitutional party maintained, had a right to

\* “Memoir of Norman Macleod, D.D.,” vol. i., pp. 175, 176.

see that they had the privileges of law, that they were tried by properly constituted courts, and with the observance of such forms of process as statute law and the practice of the Church herself prescribed. They also maintained that any one who deemed himself aggrieved by an infringement of law was entitled to the protection of the Civil Courts. When disputes arose not respecting *what the law ought to be*, but as to what *was* the existing law by which the Church Courts and the members of the Church were equally bound, they held that this, being a purely legal question, fell of necessity to be determined by a court of law."

The work from which the above is an extract has had a very wide circulation, not in Scotland only, but throughout the British Empire; and as many must have read it without any particular acquaintance with the controversy to which the extract refers, it is more than probable that the very plausible account here given of the points at issue between the two parties may have led some to wonder whether after all Chalmers did not labour under some unfortunate hallucination. For how simple does it all look! Two parties enter into a contract with one another. By-and-by they come to dispute about its terms; and to settle the dispute they ask a dispassionate third party—the Courts of Law—to examine the contract, and to tell them authoritatively what its real signification is. Could anything be more reasonable than such an appeal? Could anything be more fanatical than that men should disrupt a Church rather than abide by it?

But the case assumes a very different aspect when it is viewed all round, and in the light of history.

1. That there was some foundation for the idea of a "contract" between Church and State may be admitted; and the idea is a not unimportant one to keep in mind, because (as

the Dean of Faculty clearly saw when he called it in question) it carries with it the assumption that, before the alliance was entered into, the contracting parties had each a self-contained and independent sphere of its own. But an unsophisticated person who knows nothing of the history will form a very fanciful conception indeed of the actual character of the "contract" in question, if he supposes it to consist of a regularly drawn deed of partnership, signed and sealed in the presence of witnesses, and deposited for safe keeping in Doctors' Commons or other such place. The contract to which such loyal submission is proffered is as vague and loose a thing as can well be imagined,—being made up of the very variegated legislation of centuries, and presenting the appearance of a piece of patchwork in which the colours have sometimes no consistency with one another whatsoever. But that is by no means the worst of it. During the whole of the time that the alliance has lasted, the State has always more or less imperatively claimed the right to alter the terms of the contract in the direction that seemed best calculated to promote its own interests. The Church had hardly been established after the Reformation when this process of alteration began; and with very brief intervals indeed it continued, and that in the most intolerant forms, up to the period of the Revolution. Then a new and brighter page was supposed to have been opened in the ecclesiastical experience of Scotland; but a few years passed, and the State stepped out of its proper position again. It was itself but *one* of the parties in the contract; and the plainest principles of justice required that before making any constitutional change the other party should be consulted. But that was apparently considered a needless formality. A Bill was suddenly introduced into the House of Commons, the object of which was the reimposition of Patronage; and it was passed with a high hand, in the very teeth of opposition

from the sufferers. Thus *Patronage became*, in the State's view, a part of "the contract." It may, of course, be said, that although there was stern opposition at first, it wore away, and the Church, by submitting to the law, by-and-by acquiesced in the arrangement whereby Patronage was made part of the contract. And the argument, so far as it goes, is unanswerable. But what we wish specially to point out is this, that the State has scarcely ever had any honest belief for itself in the existence of any *contract* with the Church at all. When it has thought of fresh ecclesiastical legislation, it may have courteously sent its purposed Bills to the General Assembly,—just as in similar circumstances it has submitted measures affecting them to Town Councils or Commissioners of Supply; and more or less weight may have been attached to the opinions, one way or another, of prevailing ecclesiastical parties. But very seldom indeed has there been on the part of the Legislature any serious recognition of the principle that the formal consent of the Church is necessary to render valid and binding any alteration in the terms of the contract. And, in view of all that, it does sound a little like figurative speech to talk of the Church having, "after due deliberation, settled her own constitution," and consequently "become bound by contract." One may well ask, "*At what period was this final arrangement come to?*" The "contract" has been altered in most material ways within the memory of a good many of us. Lord Aberdeen's Act changed it in 1844; Lord Advocate Gordon's Act changed it again in 1874; and we may live possibly to see yet greater transformations. It must be patent, therefore, to every candid mind, that the pressing of the principle of *contract*, when its terms can be varied at will by one of the parties, may involve intolerable tyranny.

But we are now well warranted to question whether what

really animated the Moderate party in the conflict was an enthusiastic respect for contract obligations. Queen Anne's Act, which was passed in direct opposition to the will of the Church, might have been quite fairly challenged as not properly entitled to be regarded as a part of the contract; but there cannot be a moment's doubt in any quarter about this, that *the contract included the Confession of Faith*. That was accepted in the most formal and deliberate way by both parties, and its binding obligation has never been called in question. Now it is not a little instructive to find Dr. Norman Macleod, who in the Disruption times pressed the contract principle beyond the point of breaking—whose respect for the law, as interpreted by the judges, was so great that he refused to recognize the right of the *quoad sacra* ministers to sit in Presbyteries, and in consequence took the first step toward dividing the Church by splitting his own Presbytery into two—and who, in the Assembly of 1843 (after Chalmers and the rest had gone), lifted up his voice and said, "*I glory in declaring that this is not a Free Presbyterian Church*"—it is very instructive to find, at a subsequent period, Dr. Macleod himself tearing "the contract" to tatters, and yet bitterly angry with those who sought to apply his own principle to his own case.

"The Confession," says Mr. Gladstone,\* "taught most unequivocally and perhaps crudely the eternal punishment of the lost. Dr. Macleod seems to have sapped its foundation (vol. ii. pp. 345-382). The Confession taught the redemption of a few; he extended it to all, and he held (ii. 117, 118) that Christ's sufferings were not penal. The Confession set up the strictest Sabbatarianism; he demolished it. A tenth part of the deviations of Dr. Macleod, not from Christianity but from Calvinism, would have sufficed to convict an unfor-

\* *Church Quarterly Review*.

tunate Ritualist or Puseyite of treason and dishonesty; but he died minister of the Barony, honoured by the court, popular in society, respected by every class,—and, what is more, in possession, by unequivocal and official marks, of the full confidence of his Church.”

Now, we do not say a word about the truth or otherwise of the doctrines here referred to. But there cannot be a moment's doubt about the fact that in teaching as he is here described to have done, Dr. Macleod *broke the contract*; and when he showed a fierce indignation at being called to account in consequence, we have a revelation made to us as plain as day of the real whereabouts of himself and his party. It was not from any love to the fetters of the State as such that they encouraged the Civil Courts in their aggressions. It was not because all contracts were, from their very nature, so venerable in their eyes that they were in all circumstances and at all times prepared remorselessly to uphold them. It was because they had made up their minds on the *merits of the struggle*; it was because they did not for themselves wish for “non-intrusion” or approve of spiritual independence (both of them, in fact, they determinedly opposed); and it would really be more frank and manly just to say as much, than to profess to have been governed by a principle which broke down at once in their own hands when it came to be subjected to a strain which they felt.

2. The Evangelicals themselves, however, never objected to the most rigid application of the principle that the contract, whatever it was, must be enforced. What they resisted, it must ever be remembered, was the adoption of another position altogether—namely this, *that it belongs to the Courts of Law to interpret the contract FOR BOTH PARTIES, and to enforce its interpretations BY REPRISALS ON STRICTLY ECCLESIASTICAL TERRITORY.* It is curious to see how axiomatic in some people's eyes is the assumption that, in all disputes whatever, a final appeal must

lie to the Civil Courts. It is peculiarly strange that such an idea should find acceptance among Scotchmen. *They* believe that a true Church is an institution *sui generis*, and is entitled to somewhat different handling from that which may be given to a banking corporation or a gas company. *They* know also that the modern principle which admits the right of the Court of Session to determine, not for itself only, but for the Church, what is spiritual and what is temporal, is just the old doctrine, which their fathers refused to bear, of the supremacy of the crown in all causes civil and ecclesiastical. And if they are in any degree acquainted with the history of their country, they cannot possibly be ignorant of this,—that if that history teaches anything, it teaches this, that the less the Church trusts its liberties to the safe keeping of the civil power, the better will it be for its own comfort and utility. It is then, we repeat, specially surprising that Scotchmen should be Erastians. But in this, as in other matters, laxer views have come in upon us from across the Border, and even to some modern Scottish Presbyterians it sounds positively like a violation of the laws of common sense to refuse to recognize in the Court of Session an authority competent to direct a Church on the limits of its liberties and the lawful exercise of its powers.

In reference to the attitude assumed by the Church of Scotland during the conflict, it is very easy to offer on its behalf a complete vindication.

(1.) The judges, in claiming the right to determine the law not for the State alone, but *for the Church also*, assumed an authority which was certainly not given to them *by express statute*. *Whatever else was in the contract, that was not in it*. If it had been and could have been quoted, it would have put an end to the struggle at once. The Church would have had no case to go through with,—no Claim of Right to present to the Legislature,—if in the original concordat it had agreed to



submit all its differences with the State to the final arbitration of the Court of Session. In this respect there was a radical distinction between the Established Churches of England and Scotland. The former deliberately accepted the Queen as supreme judge in all causes, civil and ecclesiastical. The latter as deliberately arranged that there should be no such principle in its constitution.

(2.) Further, this may be said, that although the Church has tamely submitted to a great deal at the hands of the State, it has never at any period of its history shown the least disposition, until lately, to look with any favour upon such a principle. It never did so when Evangelical religion was flourishing; for then Covenanting memories revived, and its members came to realize afresh what the supremacy of the crown meant. Nor was the thing more acceptable to the Moderates in the heyday of their prosperity; for, whatever else could be said about them, this was true,—that they had sufficiently exalted notions of Church power, and were prepared to use it when they thought fit in a high-handed way.

(3.) It may be argued, however, that although the principle is not in the contract, and is not perhaps quite consistent with the genius of Presbytery, it is yet so reasonable in itself that it only requires to be looked at dispassionately in the calm light of the present day to meet with instant acceptance. But is there any warrant for that being said? On the contrary, there are three considerations on the other side which can never be got lightly over. One is, that our Courts of Law are not so constituted as to give any guarantee as to their fitness to judge of ecclesiastical questions. In England, where it is always assumed the Erastianism is pure and undisguised, the highest court of appeal for the Church has at least *some* “spiritual” persons in it. The archbishops are there to represent the ecclesiastical authority. But the judges of the Court of Ses-

sion are all "civil," and not one of them is required, as a condition of office, to profess any form of belief whatever. Another thing to be remembered is, that *any subject whatever can be declared to trench on civil interests*; and hence, if the right is conceded to the Courts to interfere in every matter which *in their opinion* involves such interests, a sword is put into their hands which they may legally use in cutting away every semblance even of ecclesiastical liberty. The deposition of a minister of course involves civil interests; so does the refusal to ordain an unfit man to a charge; so does the barring out of an unworthy communicant from the Lord's Table; so does the acceptance or not of a commission to sit in a Presbytery or General Assembly. We do not suggest imaginary cases when these are named. The Court of Session has *already* claimed a right to intermeddle with the Church's free action in all the connections indicated, and in the present state of the law (now deliberately accepted) it may do the same again to-morrow. But that is not all. What gave to the Evangelicals a bitter dislike to this principle of allowing the Law Courts to be the authoritative interpreters of the contract, not only for the State, *but also for the Church*, was the circumstance that these Courts were not content merely to give forth, in a calm and oracular way, their judgments upon the cases submitted to them, or to enforce these in the only way that posterity will pronounce to be competent to them—namely, by ordering the withdrawal of all the civil benefits which the State on certain conditions conferred. The thing which can never be forgotten is this,—that they carried the war over the border of the spiritual kingdom as into the country of an enemy. They ordered the Church to ordain a man under the threat of a fine. When a Presbytery took it upon itself to proceed to an act of ordination without the consent of the Court of Session, it was publicly

admonished, and menaced with imprisonment. Ministers who had been deposed were declared to be in full possession of their spiritual status, and directed to proceed to administer the sacraments as before. Interdicts were issued prohibiting the preaching of the gospel, under appointment of the General Assembly, within a whole district of country. And, in short, everything was done to prove that the idea of the Established Church of the time having any title to think or act for itself was regarded as simply preposterous. If it is conceded that we are to see in the acts of the civil authorities during the Disruption period a fair embodiment of the principle which to the biographer of Dr. Macleod seems so self-evidently reasonable, we can only express our surprise that any one can continue to retain his confidence in a principle of which such are the natural fruits.

What the Evangelicals contended for was not an Ultramontane sovereignty over the State, but simply liberty for the Church to live and move within its own sphere—liberty to act in alliance with the State, as it had done during its days of separation. It is now argued that such freedom can never be conceded under an Establishment—that, for example, as a Presbytery has civil matters to look after as well as spiritual (manses and glebes, for instance), the State must be invited to countersign the qualifications of the members, and must be held as entitled to quash all its proceedings if its countersign in any case is wanting. This is what is now argued, and it is not for those who have sought independence outside to stay to dispute the conclusion. But it is fair to remember that that was not the view taken by the men whose passionate devotion to the interests of the Establishment we have had such frequent occasion to notice. *They* devoutly believed in the possibility of a free Established Church. It was the only kind of Established Church that

they cared to fight for. And if it is now held as demonstrated that their dream could never in the very nature of things be realized, then so much the worse for the prospects of the "Establishment principle" itself. It implies, in fact, a great triumph for the Voluntaries, for no principle can be of God which necessarily involves the selling of the Church's privileges for money. These privileges,—its right to preach the gospel to every creature, its functions of self-government, its power of the keys, its immediate subjection to its Divine Head, its submission to the law laid down in His statute-book, —these and such-like privileges have been entrusted to the Church by Christ to be used for him, and in no circumstances can it be justified in entering into entanglements which make the free and unrestricted employment of any of them impossible.\* No earnest Christian man living in any particular country ever concedes to the State which he obeys in temporal matters the right to determine for him the limits of his faith or worship. The State has the power to determine these limits if it likes, and its laws may be such as to subject him to persecution. But his loyalty to God and his own conscience is preserved notwithstanding, and he may suffer quietly in the hope of a better day to come. A Christian Church is in an exactly similar position. It is no mere voluntary association which, because it is self-originated, has the power to make its own laws and form its own alliances. It is a province in the kingdom of God on the earth, and no consent on its part to a contract can ever make it right in it to admit a foreign power within its walls, so as to be no longer able to carry out what it believes to be the will of its lawful Head.

Regarding the Church's claims to freedom in those days, Dr. Donald Macleod thus describes what were his brother's feel-

\* The standing phrase of Scottish theology was that the legitimate action of the State toward the Church was always *cumulative*, never *privative*.

ings:—"His whole nature was opposed to what savoured of Ultramontane pretensions, however disguised; and knowing how easily 'presbyter' might become 'priest writ large,' he was too much afraid of the tyranny of Church Courts and ecclesiastical majorities not to value the checks imposed by *constitutional law*." The "checks imposed by constitutional law" mean the limitations imposed on the free action of the Church by the civil authorities; and the satisfaction expressed in the existence of these is very significant. The language, in fact, thus applied to the drift of the Ten Years' Conflict, in 1876, enables us to see how real and deep-cutting was and is the divergence between the two parties that have always contended for the ascendancy within the Scottish Church. On the one side, there has been constantly manifested, in one shape or another, *a deep distrust of the Church*. A Church is, they allow, a most useful institution, which should be countenanced and supported, but it can never be safely left to itself, and so they insist that it shall be controlled by the State, and placed "under the checks of constitutional law." On the other hand, the characteristic feature of the Evangelicals is that they have always had an unwavering faith in the Church as a Divine institution, and believe that it will best fulfil its ends in the world by being left free to develop itself according to the laws of its own being.

Returning for a moment, however, to the Assembly of 1838, which marks the commencement of a new and important era in the history of the Church of Scotland,—for then the old flag of Spiritual Independence was flung out afresh,—we may only further note that the significance of the step taken was from the outset thoroughly apprehended.

"With her eyes open," says Mr. Buchanan, in his history, "to all the hazards of the conflict now begun, the Church

had, in this important Assembly, distinctly drawn the line round her own spiritual territory, and taken her ground, resolved, by God's help, to abide the issue."

What the issue was we shall see immediately. In the meantime, we may note that among others who were watching the course of events at this period with a keen and intelligent interest was Lord Cockburn. He was one of the five judges constituting the minority of the Court of Session on the Auchterarder case, and his opinion therefore can perhaps hardly be accepted as that of a perfectly independent and unbiassed witness. But he was a layman; his shrewd eye followed all that happened in his time with a keenness of observation which has given a permanent value to his Journal Notes; and it is, therefore, well worth while listening to the verdict which he pronounced, in the privacy of his own library, on the attitude assumed at this juncture by the two parties in the conflict.

Here is the view taken by him of the Auchterarder decision:—

*March 19, 1838.*—The Church will be on fire at the principles avowed by some of the judges, which certainly go to impeach the very existence of the Assembly as a supreme ecclesiastical authority vested with the powers of spiritual legislation which it has been exercising for centuries. It will probably resist any order to induct or to proceed with the induction of this presentee; and how the Court is to enforce its order I do not see. Scotland won't hear the last of this Auchterarder case for the next century. I suspect that henceforth the wild party in the Church are about to be outdone, in spite of all their faults, by the wilder party in the Court.

What he thought of the Assembly in which Mr. Buchanan made the speech given above, may be gathered from the following:—

*June 4.*—The late General Assembly has made a considerable sensation. The Church could hardly have been expected to be quiet after the decision in the case of Auchterarder. Nor could it be expected to be cool

after the provoking speeches of a few of the judges. Accordingly the Assembly, by a majority of 183 to 142 (a very full house), passed a resolution declaratory of its independence; and it called the presentee of Auchterarder to the bar for serving a protest against the Presbytery, threatening that body with damages if it did not proceed with his induction,—but accepted his explanation that this meant no disrespect, but was done by the advice of counsel as a step in his civil action; and it refused to suspend the Veto Act *while the appeal from the judgment in Auchterarder was in dependence*. All this I think quite right. [Lord Cockburn then quotes the words of Mr. Buchanan's motion, and proceeds.] The very sound of these words recalled the old hill-folk. Those by whom they were now uttered, and whose Presbyterian blood they fired, talked openly of the glorious day in which the blood of the Covenanters flowed on the hillside, and boasted that they were ready to let it flow again. I hold it to be certain that this assertion of its supremacy is within the words and in the spirit of our law. The Church of Scotland was established by brave and good men, who made it and meant it to be more independent of the State, and more purely spiritual, than any religious system that has ever been reduced to practice. I have no doubt, therefore, that the Assembly might lawfully effect the purposes of the Veto Act, even though that Act were to be set aside, simply by exercising its lawful power over the qualification and the call.

In Lord Cockburn's eyes there was nothing fanatical in the claim to Spiritual Independence. He says:—

*December 22.*—In reading any of the ancient proceedings of the Church, I am always struck with wonder how any person can discover in them evidence of an intended subjection by our old ecclesiastics to the civil power in relation to the qualifications, calling, induction, or deprivation of ministers. If the Auchterarder case had occurred in 1638, or at any time for a century afterwards, the patron would have been set in a white sheet at the church-door, the presentee deposed, and the Court of Session excommunicated. Some hold this to be a proof that wise men ought to discourage the vices of old Presbytery that still prevail. So they ought. They should individually give all that discouragement to whatever imperfection adheres to anything good that can be supplied by reason. But it does not follow from this that whatever is offensive to the wise must be offensive to the people, and still less that *Government* are ever entitled to trample on religious principles which the people imitate their fathers in venerating. Every sect, on this principle, might crush its rival by force. Even if it were settled what was wise, the world can never be made to adopt wisdom by compulsion. The antiquity of the Scotch creed, and even its picturesque peculiarities, considering how intensely and how generally

it is clung to, are the very circumstances which make it oppression to interfere with it, except by gradual change. Those who fancy themselves philosophers may sneer at religious enthusiasm, but while our present human nature endures it can never be discounted in the practical management of human affairs.

At the same time, he expected little from an appeal to the politicians:—

*May 29, 1839.*—They have appointed a Committee to confer with Government, with a view to legalise the Veto Act. If it be a Whig Government, the answer must be: “You boast of your hatred to us, and wish us to renew the persecution of Dissenters; we won’t run our heads against an English and Irish post to please you.” If it be a Tory one, the answer will be: “You are against Patronage and the law; get you gone.” If it be a Radical: “We hate the Church; your ruin rejoices us.” Thus left to itself, and Patronage confirmed, the Evangelical party will be always appealing to the people and railing at the law. The opposite party will be sneering at the people and hardening the law, and the result will be that in the next generation the Dissenters will be the majority. My anticipation was that the Veto would have worked well. It is a remarkable fact that the year from May 1838 to 1839 did not produce a single Patronage dispute that was not adjusted in the country.

It has been noted above that the Evangelicals had a double complaint to make against the Civil Courts. They had just cause to accuse them, not only of deciding points of duty *for the Church as well as for the State*, but of enforcing their sentences *by a system of reprisals*. Fines and imprisonments may be inflicted at times in an intolerant and unjust way, but this at least may be said for them, that they are weapons which the civil law is legally entitled to employ. But a very different assumption was made when the Court of Session committed the identical offence which it was professing to punish, and itself intruded into the recognized province of the Church. It is of this, among other things, that Lord Cockburn speaks in terms of astonishment and indignation in the following extracts; and his review of the whole subject is altogether so clear and interesting, and (as most candid men



will now allow) so conclusive, that we need offer no apology for giving it at some length :—

*July 15, 1840.*—On the 11th instant the First Division of the Court interdicted the Commission of the Assembly, the Presbytery of Strathbogie, and all concerned, from executing the order by the last General Assembly. In substance this is a reversal by the Civil Court of a judgment of the Assembly touching the discipline of ministers; a supercession of the Commission and Presbytery in libelling a minister by the Assembly's order for what the Assembly holds to be an act of contumacy—a direct suspension of what has hitherto been supposed to be in the spiritual power of the Church. It is not a decision merely to the effect that what the Church is about to do shall have no *patrimonial consequences*, but that the acts shall not be done. The grounds of this are, that as the order of the Assembly says and is meant to compel the majority of the Presbytery to obey the supreme Ecclesiastical Court instead of obeying the Court of Session, that order is illegal, and (which is the questionable assumption) that every illegality on the part of the Church whereby civil interests may be even incidentally affected is liable to be corrected by the civil authority. If, as is probable, this interdict be disregarded, and the seven suspended ministers be libelled, and this or any other breach of the interdict be punished, this forces on another crisis. I have not seen the very words of the interlocutor, but I understand that it actually interdicts the unsuspended ministers—that is, the only ministers at present acknowledged by the Church—from acting *in any way* as a Presbytery even in the matters in which the Assembly expressly directs them to act. It is unfortunate for the legal character of the Court that all these extremities have been resorted to in absence; and very unfortunate for the public that the indiscretion of the Church, if there be any, in appearing to resist the law, should have the apology of as great indiscretion on the Bench. I have been accustomed to think that the Church, acting within its clear jurisdiction, was no more liable to be controlled by the Court of Session, because it erred in law, than the Courts of Justiciary or Exchequer are. The *patrimonial consequences* of an illegal act by the Church is another matter; but can the act be entirely suspended, or the anticipated act be prohibited?

*January 26, 1841.*—I anticipated that the seven suspended ministers of Strathbogie would not *ordain* in defiance of the prohibition of their superiors, but I have turned out wrong. They have done it. They have obeyed the order of the Court by admitting and receiving, and, as a part of admission and reception, by *ordaining* Edwards. Seven suspended ministers have, at the command of the civil tribunal, ordained a presentee who is not only suspended but under a libel. This may be law, and it may be useful law; but if it be, what jurisdiction exclusive of the control of the Civil Court has the Church?

*May 29, 1841.*—The deposition of the seven ministers is condemned by many as cruel, and as hurtful to the cause it was meant to advance. No fair judgment, however, would have been formed of almost anything that the Evangelical party might have done, and this despair of attracting any support beyond their own adherents is one of the feelings that makes them reckless of consequences, which they mistake for boldness. The Church is still riddled, and with increasing fierceness, by a cross-fire from both its friends and its enemies. Its enemies exclaim that the Church stands condemned on the present occasion by the mere fact that it has punished the application to a court of law as a crime. They won't see that the Lord Chancellor does this every time that he punishes a breach of one of his injunctions, restraining a party from instituting legal proceedings or even from using a judgment actually obtained, which he does so as to affect even Scotchmen and other foreigners who are only within his grasp by having property in England. All other courts do the same thing. Then some people cry out that the Church has been violating the law, and that it is the duty of the Civil Court to protect the subject; and they consider this conclusive. They will not stop to consider that the protecting power of the Civil Court is governed by rules and restrained by limits. The Court of Justiciary would violate the law if it were to sustain the relevancy of a charge of witchcraft; but could the Court of Session correct this! These short and peremptory conclusions are hollow.

The truth is, that even although the Assembly had gone further wrong than it is said to have done, its misconduct would exhibit no injustice beyond what generally marks the collisions between two authorities, each of which thinks itself independent of the other, and takes its own way. The House of Commons and the Court of Queen's Bench were in a state of as great repugancy last year. The sheriffs of London, who were obliged to serve as such, and gratuitously, were ordered by the court to execute a writ, and would have been punished if they had failed or refused. They obeyed the law; on which the Commons, who had warned them not to execute the writ, seized and confined them till this unseemly difference was adjusted by a statute. And so long as the Legislature does not interfere in such cases, two supreme authorities, equally conscientious and equally jealous, which happen to be engaged in a conflict of jurisdiction, must always break each other's heads and crush its own members who are guilty of the rebellion of preferring its rival.

The same principle which has caused the Court to interdict the Assembly from executing a sentence of deposition, proceeding on what the Church holds to be a crime—no matter whether this crime consists in contempt or in having violated ordination vows by applying in particular circumstances to the civil power—would have entitled the Court to restore John Home if the Assembly had deposed him for writing *Douglas*, provided their lordships had thought this authorship an act of virtue.

The practical result of all this is, that *as a separate and independent power the Church is altogether superseded*. It is difficult to fancy any act which it can do, or can refrain from doing, without being liable to the review of the Court of Session; so that the great problem has been solved of having a perfectly powerless Church. The Established clergy of Scotland are reduced by these judgments to the same state as the Established schoolmasters. They are established in so far as they are a body of public officers, appointed and paid by the State, but are as subject in all their proceedings to the control of the supreme civil tribunal as any common inferior court is. Now this may possibly be law, and as all clerical power is dangerous, it may possibly be useful law, but it seems to paralyze the Church in that spiritual discipline which has hitherto been exercised so salutarily for the people, and which no sect, even of Dissenters, has ever renounced. Can any candid man wonder that the Church is startled by the announcement of such law? There is probably no living man, even on the Bench, to whom these views had ever occurred three years ago; and at this moment they are demurred to by at least five of the judges. Nobody could expect the Church to resign that spiritual independence which it holds essential to religion, and which till now was never doubted, without a struggle.

We have now in Scotland a thing called a Church, the *spiritual* acts of which the law condemns and punishes. We have seven men deposed, and one deprived of his license; but though these eight be cast out by the Church as ecclesiastical criminals, the civil law declares them to be, *even spiritually*, ministers of their respective parishes. And we have a large number of clergymen who openly accede to the rebellion of their eight brethren; and if they shall act on their protest, we may possibly have, in the course of another year, some hundreds of men recognized by the judges in every respect as ministers and elders, whom the Church disowns. What more can the Voluntary wish? His doctrine is that religion may be taught effectually without an Establishment; and here his proposition is proved, for the law, as administered, declares that it may be taught, not only without, but against an Establishment.

*March 14, 1843.*—Strathbogie (Cruikshanks against Gordon) was an action by the deposed seven for getting the ecclesiastical sentence of deposition set aside by the Court of Session! There is no living man to whom it could have been made credible five years ago that such a claim could have been seriously made. Whatever might have been supposed to be the grounds of the action, no man could have fancied that the Civil Court had any jurisdiction to reduce, *quoad spiritualia*, a sentence of deposition by the General Assembly. However, the jurisdiction has not only been pleaded gravely, but successfully. The objection to the jurisdiction has been repelled; and this merely because the Court differs from the Church as to the grounds of deposition. The Church thought its seven sons rebel-

lious, and therefore cast them out; the Court thought their rebellion a virtue, and therefore claims jurisdiction to review, and will ultimately reverse, their ejection,—and this although one of the offences for which these men were punished was contumacy or contempt, which it is commonly held that no court can judge of except the court contemned.

It was not easy to go beyond this, because if the Court can make ministers of those the Church has unmade, why can it not make those the Church refuses to make, and thus supersede the Church altogether, and take the whole matter into its own hands? Yet it did contrive to go one step further; for, in the case of Auchterarder, the Court have actually decided that the minority is to be held the majority of the Presbytery. They have not prohibited the majority from attending the meetings for the examination and admission of Mr. Young, the presentee; but they have done worse, for they have allowed them to act, but only on condition that they do what the Court desires—that is, nothing that can be held an *obstruction* to the presentee's settlement; and, if they choose to stay away, the minority may proceed without them. In short, *quoad* this settlement, the whole authority of the Presbytery is vested in the minority. Lord Cuninghame thought that as those willing to act legally were overpowered by those determined to act illegally, the Court might proceed as in ordinary cases where there was a vacancy produced by accident or violence in any *civil* office; and that though it was better to let the minority act *as by a devolution from this Court*, it was quite competent for the Court to appoint the business to be done by *anybody else* (we suggested the macer). I don't yet know the exact words of the judgment, but this was its substance.

Both of these interlocutors were opposed by the former minority, consisting of Jeffrey, Moncreiff, Fullerton, Ivory, and myself. But I rather think we shall prolong the struggle no more. We must yield to authority at last. We must, as judges, now hold that the Church has *no exclusive jurisdiction whatever*.

Yet this is so clearly against law, and so utterly subversive of our ecclesiastical system, that it may be predicted with absolute certainty that all these judgments will be retreated from; and this, perhaps, by the very individuals who have pronounced them. For what they say now is that they mean them only for this particular case of what they call "*abused powers*." The Church, they say, has not been exercising but abusing its authority—a fact which is assumed, because the Court thinks the Church wrong in its laws and in its objects; and although these Judges correct the abuse, they profess the profoundest reverence for the *properly exercised* power—that is, for the power when exercised according to the Court's view of propriety. This I can already espy is the door through which, after serving their turn, these decisions are hereafter to be escaped from. Whenever the season of prejudice shall have passed away, these judgments will receive that correction which is implied in the fact of inconsistent judgments being then

given. Let no future minister steal or contemn in the faith that, if in punishing him the Church goes wrong, the Court of Session will put it right. Meanwhile, the Star Chamber never made greater encroachments on the common law of England than the Court of Session has made on the ecclesiastical law of Scotland. Yet so purely and utterly Scotch is all this matter, that it can never be discussed before strangers without the arguments against the Church appearing more plausible than the arguments for it. In particular, the case in its truth is not pervious at all to the English understanding. Hostility to Patronage has never been a popular feeling indigenous in their Established Church.

The independence of Ecclesiastical Courts is an idea that cannot arise in a Church which acknowledges the Crown as its head. The mere claim of a right to reject a presentee without giving good reasons is incomprehensible to an Englishman. Yet he can easily understand why popular electors should be allowed to reject a Parliamentary candidate without either giving or having any reason except their dislike of him. Indeed, the demands of the Church of Scotland, however clearly founded in law and in statute law, are so peculiar, and so little like anything else in our modern political system, that it may really be doubted whether ours be a Church that is now compatible with a connection with the State. Has it outlived its age?

All hope being excluded even from Parliament, I presume that the new secession must proceed; but I don't expect the fracture till May, when the majority of the Church will probably cast off the State.

So much for Lord Cockburn. With such a testimony, borne by one who was so peculiarly competent in every way to judge, we may live in the confident assurance that the final verdict of the Nation will be that the General Assembly of 1838 was as truly National, in the highest sense, as was that of 1638, and that it was at once right and politic in the Church to issue at this date an emphatic DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

## CHAPTER IX.

### PEACE NEGOTIATIONS.

IN drawing aside the curtain, and showing more closely, as is the object of this chapter, some of the relations of "*the Church and the Politicians*," \* there is no thought of adding anything new to the history of the period. The general course of events up to a certain point has been already referred to, and whatever other information is now possible will be found contained in the standard narrative which we have so often had occasion to mention. Mr. Buchanan was far too directly and intimately acquainted with everything connected with the negotiations for peace, to have neglected to note any point of the slightest real importance. The *inner life*, however, of the negotiations is peculiarly instructive—for this reason, if for no other, that it suggests very serious lessons for Scottish Churches and Churchmen. Two worthier representatives no denomination could desire than Robert Buchanan and Alexander Dunlop; but no one can read the story of their interviews with the various statesmen whom it was their business to influence, without feeling that there was much that was painfully incongruous in the means requiring to be used to secure liberty for a branch of the Christian Church. Such conferences were no doubt unavoidable in the circumstances; but the glimpses given of them in the journals and letters

\* See "The Ten Years' Conflict," chap. x.

which follow will not tend to increase the faith of Christian men in the fitness of politicians to deal with ecclesiastical questions, nor incline them to commit the control of the Church in any degree into their hands.

When the collision had fairly taken place, in March 1839, on the occasion of the confirmation of the Auchterarder Appeal by the House of Lords, the General Assembly resolved to "sist procedure" in the case of all disputed settlements, and (as has been already noted) appointed a Committee to endeavour to come to terms of peace with the State. With this object in view, that Committee sent as its deputies to London Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Dunlop, and they had their first interview with Lord Melbourne at the Treasury on the 19th of February 1840. Mr. Buchanan gives a somewhat amusing account of this interview in his history. "'Who are you—from whence do you come?' said his lordship, addressing the deputies as they entered, with that blunt and careless and yet perfectly good-humoured air that was so natural to this accomplished but somewhat indolent statesman. They had come by his own appointment, and in consequence of communications made to him, which might have been supposed to render these inquiries not very necessary; but the Church of Scotland was a subject a good deal out of his lordship's usual line of thought, and he had not unlikely at the moment forgotten all about it. Satisfied on the preliminary points, his lordship listened to the statement of the case that was submitted to him—a statement which elicited from him only this very safe remark, that the question was one of great difficulty. The deputies acquiesced, but signified their hope that now, after having had it so long in view, and considering the expectations his lordship had held out to a former deputation seven or eight months before, the Government would be prepared to say what they intended to do.

‘The law is against you,’ was the very direct, though perhaps perfectly diplomatic, reply which the observation drew forth. ‘Of course it is,’ they answered; ‘and hence our application to have it changed.’”

The conversation was pursued in the same line a little further, and the Premier became merry over the pretentious spirit of the Churches of the day; but nothing issued from the interview of a practical kind. Lord John Russell, however, was more satisfactory; and as he promised a reply from the Government in the course of a month or less, there was nothing for it but for the deputation to hang on in London until it pleased the oracle to speak. While they were there, however, they did not consider themselves bound to seek help from only one class of politicians. The Conservatives, especially some of them, had always shown themselves peculiarly friendly, and their counsels were also asked.

So began the negotiations described in the Journal. It may be necessary, however, to add, in explanation of one thing frequently referred to in it, that there had been shortly before a Parliamentary contest for Perthshire; that both candidates had tried to make capital out of the Church question, by each claiming to be on the popular side; and that Mr. Dunlop had given deep offence to both Whigs and Tories by intermeddling in the election, and pronouncing one of the two men to be a better Churchman than the other.

*Tuesday, February 25, 1840.*—Went to Compton Hall, Kensington, to see Lord Bute. He was out, but waited; and he came home. A rather little man; very short hair, brushed straight down; and being nearly blind, though his eyes are quite open, has a singular look. A very modest, quiet, and most amiable man. Had a full conversation on our question, about an hour. *He* would go all the length of Committee, but gives his decided opinion that all the Conservatives *would not*, and therefore thinks it most expedient to get Committee and Conservative party to an understanding. He is sure they would all take the Act 1649. He told me Lord J. Russell had said last summer *he* would not help us out of the scrape.



He told me Lord Aberdeen had been using all his influence with Lord Haddington to bring him up.

Went thence to Belgrave Street to see Duke of Argyle. Found him at home. Little man, thin, gentle in his appearance, large forehead, but head littlish. He had on his table a dozen copies of Chalmers and the same of Buchanan,\* and he told me he and his son had been busy all the morning writing notes to send along with them to members of the two Houses. Buchanan's sketch he thought greatly useful to inform English about our ecclesiastical constitution. It had, he said, much influenced his own mind. He quite agrees with 1649 plan, and is clear for barring out the Civil Courts. He had never heard of former Intrusions. When I told him of some of last century, he was astonished. Seems a very amiable, well-meaning man. He was going this day to have questioned Lord Melbourne as to Government's intentions, but had met Lord Aberdeen, who informed him of their answer to the deputation, and therefore he saw it would serve no purpose.

He and Lord Bute both saw and admitted the danger of Government outbidding them, and therefore highly approved of our letting them bring out their own measure. He begged me to say to Dr. Chalmers and the Committee how desirous he was to be of use, and that if Government would not introduce a measure, he and Lord Aberdeen would in the House of Lords. Lord Bute told me the Archbishop of Canterbury was at one with us in the *principle* that the Church should have power to prevent Intrusion, and that he and many of the Episcopal Bench wished to have the same power in their Church. This good.

Went to Athenæum to find J. C. Colquhoun; missing him, went to House of Commons. Fell in there with Webster, and got an extract he had prepared about Act 1711, to be used in letters. Met Colquhoun in lobby of House. He gave me Mr. John Hamilton's letter to him. Glad to find he takes the very same views I have been pressing on the Conservatives. To meet Colquhoun on Friday at four p.m. at Athenæum.

I wrote editor of *Times* this morning, asking admission for some letters; venturing on this bold stroke as not having found any proper channel of access.

*February 26.*—Wrote part of third letter to Mr. Collins. Letters to Dr. Chalmers and Mr. Dunlop, explaining result of interviews with Duke of Argyle and Marquis of Bute, and entreating consideration of plan 1649. Called on Duke of Richmond; gone to the country.

Called on Lord Aberdeen. Long conversation. Referred to misunderstanding which appeared by Mr. Dunlop's letter of this morning to exist between his lordship and Committee. To bring it to a point, read sentence of Mr. Dunlop's letter explaining what *he* understands Lord Aberdeen to insist on. Lord Aberdeen disclaims it; says he does *not* mean that the Presbytery must sustain *reasonableness* of dissent.

\* Rev. James Buchanan, D.D.

Found him more excited about the question than before. Spoke as if there could now be no permanent arrangement—it must lead to abolition of Patronage; and he said he thought the people would make as good a choice as any one could do for them. He feared, however, *that* might be a step towards a Voluntary Church—that they would think they ought to pay the minister they chose (a curious *nonsequitur*). He then talked complainingly of the majority of Assembly, as if they had raised all this outcry; that the people were not seeking in 1834 any alteration of system—the patrons were acting well, &c. I said decidedly that I entirely disagreed with his lordship on all these points, but that I saw no advantage to be gained from discussing them. However it had come about, or whoever might be to blame, *here* we were, and the practical question was, What was *now* to be done? He admitted this, and returned to the subject. I then brought him to the point on the 1649 plan. He was very cautious; said he was afraid to commit himself to more than general principles—that he was most anxious to give fullest effect to the *honest* dissent of the people. I then said their dissent should be held as honest, unless some one having interest could prove otherwise. He admitted that to be fair, and concluded by saying he saw no objection to it.

He told me that Lord Melbourne had been talking to him of the matter, and that he had assured the Premier *he* would not make it a party question. He was sure Lord Melbourne would not do it either; but I told him he said there were people about him who would.

I wrote Dr. Chalmers and Mr. Dunlop several letters, describing all this, and further urging consideration of it. Note from Mr. A. H., announcing that *Standard* will receive letters. *Times* declines, alleging risk of controversy.

*February 28.*—Went to visit by appointment the Duke of Argyle. Found him still more zealous than before. He is now quite prepared for the Committee's plan—*dealing* with the people on their reasons, not adjudicating on them except when malice or faction is alleged. The young Marquis of Lorne present, who seemed deeply interested,—a fine intelligent youth, who appears to be catching the spirit of his forefathers. The Duchess also came in, and was equally interested. The Duke mentioned he had received notes of acknowledgment for the copies of Mr. Buchanan's pamphlet he had distributed, from Lord Aberdeen, Duke of Wellington, Sir R. Peel, Lord Ellenborough, &c., who all said they were reading or would read it. He mentioned he had noticed the subject last night in the House of Peers, and also Lord Galloway, urging Lord Melbourne to an early measure. He wished me to put down shortly for him in writing the wishes of the Committee, as he intended asking an interview with Lord Melbourne to talk over it—Lord Melbourne being an old friend.

Had a long conversation with Sir George Clerk at his house, Cavendish Square. He will come to the 1649 plan, with the specific details

already noticed, but refuses to go further, and, like Lord Aberdeen, says he thinks popular election would be better than the more absolute irresponsible Veto. He expressed himself most anxious to speed the measure forward; but till Government came out with its plan, it was difficult to say what would be the likeliest way to promote it.

Called on Sir William Rae, but missed him. Visited my old friend Mrs. Dennistoun in the same street. Spent an hour with Turner, and at four met Colquhoun at Athenæum. He is keen against my leaving London till the Bill be tabled. Difficult to consent to this. He is of the same mind still,—to labour to bring up Conservatives to highest point, higher than 1649 if possible, and to endeavour to get Government to come to the same.

Saw Sir George Sinclair, who is in a state of strong feeling on subject, and thinks they ought to put questions in the House of Commons to urge on Lord John.

*February 29.*—Received letter from Dr. Chalmers, entreating me to remain in London. Wrote in reply, agreeing if Committee think it indispensable; request immediate answer. Webster has fixed interview for me with Dr. Lushington, for Tuesday, eleven A.M.

*Monday, March 2.*—Letters from Dr. Chalmers and Mr. Dunlop, entreating me not to leave London; the former saying he thought the plan I had suggested as to the settlement of the question would be highly satisfactory. Mr. Dunlop intimated that the Committee were to meet on Monday (to-day), when the plan would be submitted. He states that he had been at Perth about the election. Intimates that a meeting of ministers and others had resolved that Mr. Drummond's views on Non-Intrusion were unsatisfactory, and that Mr. Stewart's were so. Think this interference of Mr. Dunlop's a wrong movement. We should limit our efforts to our own sphere, and leave political affairs to those whom they concern. It appears to me impossible to tell whose return for Perthshire would be most desirable for us. Let us trust in Him "who doeth all things well."

Found that Mr. Bruce of Kennett had arrived to join the Edinburgh deputation. He had been in search of me, but mistook my address. A note from him to meet him at the Burlington Hotel to-morrow. He states his fears that Dunlop's visit to Perth has been irritating the Conservatives here.

*Tuesday, March 3.*—Met Bruce at the Burlington Hotel at ten. He had called on Lord Aberdeen yesterday, and found him very testy indeed about the affair of Dunlop's visit to Perthshire—took it as almost a breach of faith in regard to the understanding between him, Lord Aberdeen, and the Committee, as to the terms on which they were willing to treat. In short, he was very angry, and expressed himself accordingly. A pity this has happened. It helps to complicate a negotiation already sufficiently intricate.

At eleven A.M. went to Webster's. With him proceeded to Dr. Lushington's, St. George's Square, Westminster, the great ecclesiastical lawyer,—a man about fifty-five to appearance, mild and amiable and affable in his manners. He began by expressing his fear that we were coming in a wrong attitude to Parliament. We should have appeared at the bar of Court of Session when Strathbogie interdict was applied for, and appealed to House of Lords when it was granted; that now coming for a change of law, without having exhausted all means of redress under existing law, would prejudice us greatly. A long discussion ensued, in which he endeavoured to establish his views from a reference to the courts of England. His Admiralty Court, he said, admitted of no appeal but to the Privy Council, and its jurisdiction was independent; but if Queen's Bench interfered with him, he must apply to House of Lords for redress. Same, he said, sitting in Bishop's Court, in a case of Church censure. He could suspend, though not deprive,—only bishops do that,—no Civil Court had right to touch his judgment; but if they did, he must appeal to the House of Lords for redress. I endeavoured to make a distinction by alluding to the half-secular character of his office in the Bishop's Court, which might therefore be consistent with an appeal to a secular tribunal. But our Church Courts were purely and inherently spiritual, composed of Christ's officers, holding of and acting under Him immediately. He answered that he was really the "*Bishop's voice*," acting in his court. My acquaintance with the constitution of these Courts was not sufficient to enable me to point out the distinctions which I was nevertheless clear existed. But I cut the argument short, by reminding him that however that might be, we did *not* come to Parliament on the footing of the Strathbogie interdict, but on the footing of the *Auchterarder decision*, in which we *had* exhausted all the remedies of law. *There*, he allowed, we stood firm. I pointed out, moreover, that the Strathbogie interdict had actually *grown out* of the view of the Court of Session's jurisdiction assumed in the Auchterarder case, and *sanctioned* by the House of Lords, and therefore that, strictly speaking, any appeal, even if we could have consented to it, in the matter of the interdict, was useless. Dr. Lushington *was clear* that the Strathbogie interdict was *utterly incompetent and illegal*.

I was very thankful to have had this conversation, as otherwise he might, in this crotchet about the interdict, have risen up and done us mischief in the House of Commons. I hope he is now quite clear as to the ground on which we came to the Legislature. He said: "We have many *loose reasoners* in Parliament, who will not see the logical order of the case, and may do you injury by dealing with it as if it rested on this interdict." I said my hope was that he would keep such loose reasoners on the course, and not allow them so to misrepresent us and our cause. He told us *confidentially* that the Procurator had just written to ask his advice whether an appeal was competent, should the Court of Session, in enforcing

their interdict, *fine* or *imprison*. He seemed to think that would be difficult; and was not aware of any form in the Scotch Courts which allowed it. I told him what Mr. Dunlop had written me—that the Court, it was now understood, were not to enforce their interdict.

Joined Bruce at the Union, and with him called at the Athenæum, and left a note for J. C. Colquhoun. Called at the Carlton for Sir George Clerk, and found him. His first motion was to pull out from his pocket a printed copy of the Perth ministers' resolutions, saying it was Dunlop that did it all. He did not seem, however, to mind it much, though he complained strongly of his interference. He read us a part of a letter from Mr. Drummond just received, from which it appeared some of the Perth Non-Intrusionists waited on him after the resolutions meeting, and were satisfied with his explanations. He named Mr. Craigie of Glendoick, and did not seem to think his election likely to be much affected. Sir George alluded to the conversation which took place last night in the House of Lords, as showing how slow Lord Melbourne was to commit himself. Lord Haddington was evidently angry in his speech, and attributed all the excitement to the Commissioners disregarding the civil law, and suspending the seven men who were obeying it. Lord Aberdeen begged to be understood as not assenting to that statement. Duke of Richmond made a good speech, urging Government to proceed; and also Bishop of London.

Called for Sir George Sinclair at Arthur's—missed him. Went to Duke of Argyle's. The Duke agreed to go with deputation to Lord Melbourne. His son was present,—a fine youth, red hair, bright complexion, fine forehead, open, frank bearing, intelligent countenance.

*Wednesday, March 4.*—Received letter from Dr. Chalmers, containing appointment of me by Committee as their deputy here *sine die*, and kindly and warmly acknowledging my services, and the necessity that exists for my remaining in London. He seems to anticipate some injurious influence from the movements of our friends in Perthshire, but has apparently no idea of the irritation caused by Dunlop's interference in the election. He will learn more from my letter of yesterday; and from the *Times* of today, which contains a most gross and outrageous attack upon Dunlop as a place-hunter. Little do they know his real character who so say!

Met the Edinburgh deputation just coming out from Lord Melbourne. There had been present with his lordship Lord Normanby. The deputation were—the Provost of Edinburgh, Graham Speirs, and Bruce of Kennett; with them, Duke of Argyle, Sir J. Campbell, Sir George Sinclair, Mr. Pringle, Gibson-Craig, Bannerman of Aberdeen. All urged on him the necessity of legislation. Bannerman, when appealed to, spoke strongly as to the state of feeling in Aberdeenshire, and as to the unanimity of the people for Non-Intrusion. The Duke of Argyle, nearly the largest patron in Scotland, expressed his anxiety for the measure, and his readiness to subject his patronages to every restriction necessary for the good

of the Church and people. Hope some good done by this additional pressure.

The conversation which took place last night in the House of Commons (above alluded to) shows Lord John is as slow as Lord Melbourne to commit himself.

*Thursday, March 5.*—Breakfasted with Bruce at Burlington Hotel, and talked over our business.

Went to call on Duke of Richmond. He declined expressing his views, as he said he had never done it to any one, but would when measure is produced in Parliament. From the tone of his conversation, he seems favourable to our views. Has evidently been attempted to be prejudiced by letters from Strathbogie. As to undue means of exciting people, I endeavoured to make him see where blame of that really lay; in rebellion of ministers and outrageous interdicts of Court of Session. He could not defend ministers, and condemned the interdict. Corrected some erroneous views he had received about new church at Huntly. Glad I had the interview, as it will remove some misapprehensions, and help him to sound views.

*March 6.*—Letters from Mr. Lorimer describing proceedings of Commission up till evening sederunt of the 4th. Motion condemning the conduct of the seven suspended ministers, and reporting the whole case to the Assembly, carried by 108 to 11. The general question of the jurisdiction assumed by the Court of Session in granting the interdict to come on in the evening. Resolutions to be moved on the subject.

Went to see Lord Aberdeen, agreeably to his request. Found him more frank and cordial than ever. He had great difficulty, he said, in bringing the leading men of the party to the point he had come himself. When he came up from Scotland in January, he found Sir Robert Peel and the Duke of Wellington full of the Dean's pamphlet, and had immediately set to work, by putting Hamilton's pamphlet into their hands, to lead them to more moderate views, and had so far succeeded; but now the risk was of their resiling. Immediately on getting my letter yesterday he had acquainted Sir Robert Peel with its contents, stating my assurance that the proceeding of Mr. Dunlop was totally unauthorized by and unknown to the Committee. He hoped that he might be able, by impressing this fact on the minds of his friends—as he trusted it *was* the fact—to prevent their breaking off all friendly negotiations on the subject. When he came through Edinburgh, he had seen, he said, the Dean, who was a personal friend of his own; and the Dean had then attempted to dissuade him from seeing or having anything to do with the Committee. "You will repent of it, if you do," said the Dean. "They will seem to acquiesce in your views, and to be quite fair and reasonable; but, depend on it, they will betray you!" (How insolent!) "I confess," said his lordship to me, "this proceeding of Mr. Dunlop goes too far to justify the Dean's anticipation." Nothing, he said, could have been more

gratuitous than his interference. He would not have in the least complained of the Perth ministers acting as they were doing of their own spontaneous movement, or of Mr. Dunlop going into Perthshire had he been a mere private individual; but as the servant of the Committee, and a member of the deputation, he could not conceive anything more out of his way.

In this I strictly concurred, as it exactly expressed my own views, being a decided departure from that purely ecclesiastical position the members of Committee were bound to maintain. Moreover, I added that the bearing of the Perthshire election on our cause seemed to me so uncertain, that had the power of determining on which candidate it should fall rested in my hands, I would positively have been at a loss how to decide. I felt that we were involved in events we could not control, and whose effects we could not foresee; that our wisdom and duty was to leave these to the All-wise Disposer, and to confine ourselves strictly to our own sphere.

In this his lordship strictly concurred. Looking at the interests of our cause, he was almost disposed *still*, after all that had happened, to say he scarce knew whose return would be most desirable. If Mr. Drummond got in, no doubt the Conservatives would be less angry; but then Government would say the power of the Church party is not worth our courting—it cannot turn an election. If, again, Mr. Stewart succeeded, the Conservatives would be deeply offended; while the Government, having found the question so useful, would be inclined to keep it *in retentis* for a general election. This reminded me of what Colquhoun told me last night that Charles Butler had said to him: “This Scotch Church question is too good a quarrel. We shall not settle it in a hurry.” Lord Aberdeen expressed himself as anxious as ever to have it adjusted, and assured me he would do his utmost to soothe irritation among his friends. He was pleased to say he considered my stay in London indispensable,—as insuring a medium of friendly communication with himself and his friends,—and pressed on me that I must on no account return to Scotland till we see the matter further advanced.

We spoke of the late interdict, and he told me he had written the Dean to express to him his conviction that he had brought himself and the Court into a bad position with the country; that without pretending to decide whether or not the jurisdiction assumed was strictly legal, it was fitted to outrage the feelings of society, as an interference with the preaching of the Word of God.

He referred to a speech he had made last night in the Lords to explain to the House what he saw they were utterly ignorant of. As an illustration of the confusion of their ideas on the subject, he told me, laughing heartily at it, that even the Duke of Richmond, though now living so much in Scotland, uniformly presented his Non-Intrusion petitions “as petitions *against* the Non-Intrusion!” Nothing could be more open and unreserved than his lordship’s whole conversation in this interview. “I have spoken

to you," he said, "in the most undisguised and confidential manner;" and we parted on the most friendly terms, he inviting me to come to him as often as I wished.

Dr. Brown of Aghadoey and Mr. Denholm of Derry, two ministers of Synod, tell us the sympathy with our Church is *universal* and warm among the Presbyterians of Ireland, and that this struggle had done more to draw out their love and veneration for the parent Church than anything that ever happened. They believe there will be petitions from all their congregations.

*Monday, March 9.*—Received letter from Mr. Dunlop, intimating that he thinks he will start for London to-morrow, and also that the Committee have agreed to an advertisement disclaiming all participation in the Non-Intrusion proceedings connected with the Perth election. He sent me the *Witness*, containing a letter from him to the editor of *Times*, in answer to that journal's indecent attack on him. The answer is triumphant.

With these documents I went immediately to Lord Aberdeen, to show him how completely they confirmed all I had stated last week as to my conviction that the Committee knew nothing of the Perth proceedings at all. He was quite satisfied as to Committee, though still thinking Mr. Dunlop's conduct unfair while the negotiations were pending. At same time, he entirely vindicated Mr. Dunlop from all personal or party objects in what he had done. He had heard from Dr. Chalmers this morning, expressing the same thing as to the Committee's entire ignorance of Mr. Dunlop's visit to Perth. Lord Aberdeen, before I called, had seen Sir Robert Peel, and showed him that letter. He hoped that no harm would now come out of all this, though it had been very vexatious, and fitted to inject feelings of distrust into the minds of the Conservatives. He was evidently, from his tone and manner, conscious that the Perth business had put him upon stronger ground in holding out against the utmost of our wishes. Still, he said he would not go back a step; but evidently would not *now* be easily moved further forward. I reverted to the 1649 scheme, to which he seemed still quite favourable. He hoped Government *now* were more likely than ever to propose such a scheme as he and his friends could support. He thought there was now no chance of Government proposing to legalize the Veto Law as it stood. He thought the Perth election had settled that. He mentioned that Lord Melbourne and one or two other members of Government had been confidentially consulting him about the matter; and in this view I thought more important to press such a definite plan on his attention as that of 1649, as he may use it in his conferences with the Premier.

He asked me a number of questions as to the mode of admitting to the communion in Scotland; being anxious to show Englishmen that *being communicants* was a far higher test of *character* in Scotland than in England, where there is no restriction imposed. He mentioned that though



sincerely and conscientiously preferring the Church of Scotland to that of England, it so happened that he had never taken the communion in Scotland, and consequently that he was not well informed as to the mode of admission to that ordinance. I, of course, gave him the information he wanted.

He asked the meaning of the distinction made in the Veto Law in favour of heads of families, saying there is no foundation in Scripture for such distinction. I reminded him the distinction was made by Lord Moncreiff, avowedly by way of making the encroachment on Patronage as limited as possible, when he framed the Veto Law, and that Lord Moncreiff did not acknowledge the Spiritual view of the matter, but treated it as a question of expediency and constitutional ecclesiastical law. The heads of families were supposed, finally, to be the most staid and sober-minded people in the parish, and the most stationary.

*March 10.*—Called this afternoon on the Lord Advocate,\* and was immediately struck with his manner, as indicating that there was a grudge in his mind. “You have been in town all this while,” was his first remark, after the ordinary salutation. “Yes, my lord.” “Seen a great deal of Lord Aberdeen, have you not?” “I have seen him several times,” I answered quietly, “and various other people besides.” “It is a pity there has been so much of a double negotiation going on.” “I don’t know what your lordship means.” “Oh, so much consulting and communicating with one party while negotiating with another.” “If your lordship means that there has been any consulting inconsistent with the avowed plan of operations of the Committee, or that carries in it anything disingenuous towards the Government, I shall make the Committee aware that such is your lordship’s opinion, and they will no doubt answer the charge.” “But I don’t mean, Mr. Buchanan, to make any charge of the kind against the Committee, and you must not so understand me.” “Then, my lord, I am at a loss to know what you *do* mean. As far as I have understood the avowed purpose of the Committee, it was this,—to confine their communications to no *one* party in the State, but, regarding the question as one altogether apart from and above party, to deal with it as such by inviting all parties to concur in the adjustment of it. And this, my lord, I understood to be the light in which Government wished to regard it.” “Certainly; it is their wish so to regard it. But Chalmers has been writing in very violent terms against the Government, and that is calculated to irritate.” “Why, my lord, I can of course know nothing of private letters; but I can only say I have heard the very opposite alleged as to other members of the Committee, and in both cases the report is perhaps equally untrue. But however this may be, surely your lordship and the Government will not allow yourselves to be influenced in dealing with a great public question by random words reported to have occurred in the private correspondence of individuals.”

\* Andrew Rutherford.

“No; certainly we will not. You may depend upon it that whatever Government do, it will be done without regard to anything Dr. Chalmers may have said about them.” “I really am taken quite by surprise at hearing of offence being taken by *the friends of Government* at the Committee. I was prepared to hear the very contrary—that the offence taken would be on the other side; for nothing certainly has been done that I know of *against* the Government by any of the Committee, while a very overt act has been done in their favour by Dunlop going into Perthshire. If there was to be a fire, I certainly expected to find it kindled on the other side. I say frankly, as I have always done, that I think Dunlop did wrong in going to Perthshire, as I am clear that members of the Committee, while this negotiation is pending, should keep completely apart from all political movements on either side. But unquestionably I was not prepared, in the actual circumstances of the case, for any offence being taken, *on the side of Government*, with our proceedings.” “Were not letters written by Lord Aberdeen and others to the Committee from London?” “Not since we came here. So far as I know or believe, not a single letter was written by any of the parties in question, except in answer to a circular sent them by Dunlop to ascertain their sense of the conversation which took place between them and the Committee at the interview they had in Edinburgh. This correspondence arose out of the publication of a newspaper paragraph giving a false account of what had occurred. I believe no other correspondence with the Committee has since been held by any of the individuals in question.” “Well, well! I am sure I am most anxious there should be no disagreement. For God’s sake, let us allay all irritated feelings, and endeavour to go on with the negotiations calmly and amicably.” “Nothing, my lord, can be more in accordance with my wishes; and I trust I have ever so acted as to evince that such is my desire.” “Certainly; I have never seen in you anything but what strictly corresponds with that sentiment. I assure you I find no fault with you; quite the contrary.” And he again reverted to Chalmers’ letters. I have no idea to what he alludes. He ended by begging that Dunlop and I would come and breakfast with him on Friday morning at Groves’ Hotel, 38 Albemarle Street; which I of course agreed to do, on the supposition that ere then Dunlop will be up. He said he had not a doubt that by Monday or Tuesday we would get our answer from the Government, but did not indicate—if he knew—what that answer was likely to be. It appeared to me that the complete defeat\* in Perthshire has probably exhibited a result very different from what he and Fox Maule had been teaching Government to expect, and that in consequence they feel very uncomfortable. And as this question was mixed up with the election, and made probably a main ground of their hopes of success, they are disposed, being out of humour, to throw blame on anybody or anything, by way of easing themselves.

\* Home Drummond elected by 1586 over 1128 for Mr. Stewart.

In the evening dined with the London Presbytery, in the same room, London Coffee-house, in which, exactly two years ago, at their March meeting, I dined with the same body when up with Drs. Macleod, Muir, &c., on the Church Extension business. Dr. Brown, Aghadoey, and Mr. Denholm of Derry, were on the present occasion the only strangers besides myself. The Moderator was Mr. Thomson, Scotch minister at Woolwich;\* an amiable and pious young man, doing well in his position at Woolwich. He had this day got a grant of ground from the Ordnance for a new church and schools. The Presbytery had to-day a discussion on the Non-Intrusion question, Mr. Burns, of London Wall,† having proposed a petition to Parliament. It was carried. Ministers in the majority—Dr. Brown, Mr. Burns, Mr. Lorimer, Mr. Thomson; in the minority—Dr. Crombie and Mr. Cumming.

In the evening some interesting statements made regarding the progress of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, and of the National Church in Scotland, which forced the company to bethink themselves of the stagnant state of Presbyterianism in England. Measures were suggested for making a movement in this cause, as by getting up statistics regarding the number of Scots in London, their places of residence, condition, &c.; then dividing the town into districts, assigning them to district committees, and labouring to raise funds and churches where the Scots most abound. Will this vanish in words?‡

*March 11.*—Heard to-day what explains the Lord Advocate's irritation about the letters of Dr. Chalmers he spoke of yesterday. It is rumoured that Dr. Chalmers had written to various parties in Perthshire, telling them not to trust the Ministerial candidate, as his party could not be depended on, while Mr. Drummond's might with safety. If this be so, the irritation is quite intelligible.

The *Times* admits the return of Mr. Drummond to be no proof of the weakness of the Non-Intrusion principle, but merely a proof that Mr. Drummond's professions on the subject were *believed*, while those of Mr. Stewart were *not*.

A good deal of talk after party left as to what should be done in case of the Ministry refusing to meddle with the question. Think, upon the whole, it would be best to have a Bill brought in by Lord Aberdeen in the House of Lords, where it would be well advocated, and meet with a less factious opposition, and passing one branch of the Legislature, would make it more difficult to resist it in the other. Must talk of this with Dunlop.

*March 12.*—Went to Union Hotel at half-past two, and found Dunlop had arrived. I told him of the *Times'* apology and insertion of his letter—which he was very glad to hear of; also, that I had made sure of Lord

\* Still minister there—1877.

† Now Free Church minister of Kirkliston.

‡ No. There were then half-a-dozen congregations in the Presbytery of London: now there are upwards of sixty!

Aberdeen becoming acquainted with his letter, by going personally with the paper—the *Witness*—the instant I received it, and reading it to his lordship. Dunlop felt much obliged by this, and, with the candour which belongs to his noble nature, at once allowed that it was an unwise step his going into Perthshire, calculated as it was to give an appearance of the *Committee* intermeddling. He mentioned the extreme dissatisfaction which Lord Aberdeen's speech, *approving* of the Government's procedure *very deliberately*, had given in the *Committee*. The *Committee* have fixed a meeting for Tuesday the 24th; thus giving us the *whole of next week* to get the Government's answer, but limiting us *to that week*.

Dunlop told me the Edinburgh *Committee* had divided—twenty-three to nine, or seven, I forget which—in favour of taking the Government grants for schools; to the extreme astonishment of Dr. Muir. The Government have agreed to name as Inspector, Mr. Gordon, the Superintendent of the Assembly's schools. This will no doubt serve to remove jealousies. We agreed not to write the Government till we had seen the Lord Advocate, with whom we breakfast to-morrow morning.

*Friday, March 13.*—Dunlop and I breakfasted with Lord Advocate. His wife with him; a quiet, lady-like, agreeable woman. General talk during breakfast.

When we did come to speak of our business, the feature most prominent in the little he said was a wish not to *press* Government very much, but to give them next week. He twice said, in the course of his conversation, "I believe you will get their answer next Thursday." It seems from this there must be some understanding among them about that day. Though very guarded, his conversation would certainly lead one to suppose they have a measure in progress.

On returning to the Union, Dunlop received a letter from Mr. Brown, Aberdeen, giving an extract from a letter of Mr. Bannerman, M.P., to a friend of Brown's, in which Bannerman describes himself as doing his utmost to get a measure speedily introduced, and expressing his conviction that "it will very soon appear in Parliament." This letter of Bannerman's was of date 7th March.

Went with Leighton to the House of Lords. Glad to see the "Duke" in his place, and looking well again. Nothing doing of importance. Saw J. C. Colquhoun there, who came into the bar to give Lord Aberdeen a letter he had just received from Dr. Chalmers, containing his intended resolutions in case of Government doing nothing. *First*, To condemn inaction of Government; *second*, To apply to Conservatives; *third*, To appeal to country. These were read at *Committee* some days ago, but not put or recorded till it should be seen what Government do. J. C. Colquhoun says that this would do good, as the Whig members of *Committee* would no doubt communicate the matter to the Advocate, and he and his party will thus know that "delay may be dangerous." C. told Lord Aberdeen how

much regret his speech *encouraging* Government's delay had produced among the friends of the Church.

*Tuesday, March 17.*—Nothing new, except that from the Advocate's conversation with Dunlop it is plain the Government are working at a measure, or they and he are cheating us. He was anxious about some of the details, particularly as to there being some stop to the Veto. That in the Cabinet was made a great difficulty, he signified. We had agreed, should this be persisted in, to recommend that after three vetoes the Presbytery should be entitled to inquire and judge whether these had been so exercised as to allow the vetoing to be continued. Dunlop had given this answer to the Advocate, who seemed to think it would do.

*Wednesday, March 18.*—We are positively to have our answer on Monday, 23rd. This on authority of an official letter from Advocate. Went with Dunlop to hear Mr. M'Neile's\* fourth lecture on Church and State. Not very good. Clever things said, sometimes with a striking manner, but lecture poor as a discussion of a grave and profound question. As to establishing the position that the Church of England stands in a Scriptural relation to the State, he never touched it, though he said he did. He certainly pointed to various things in its doctrines and practice that were Scriptural, but not bearing at all on its relation to the State. This is what I went to the lecture mainly to hear him attempt, and of course was disappointed, though not surprised. The tone of the lecture was too much *anti-Government*—bad policy in every sense, as it was giving the Voluntaries all the additional aid of the Whig party. From what I read in the newspapers of his preceding lecture, in which he had professedly stated our question, it is evident he had entirely misunderstood it. They get out of the difficulty very cleverly by treating the people like heathens or children—giving nothing whatever to say in the settlement of their pastor. They have nothing corresponding to our call, or induction into the pastoral cure. As Hooker says, the patron now consents *for* the people!

*Friday, March 20.*—Called on Lord Aberdeen, to explain to him why we were holding no conference with him—that having got no answer from Government, we could not take a step one way or another. Very long conversation as to the whole bearings and consequences of present movement.

*Saturday, March 21.*—Called by appointment at Mr. Hamilton's, Cheap-side. He communicated the unanimous wish of the Regent Square congregation that I should become their minister; urged many reasons for it, but I could not see it to be my duty, in all the circumstances of the case.

No letter having yet been received from Lord John Russell or Lord Melbourne, we deemed the note of the Lord Advocate, assuring us we were to get our answer on Monday, as by no means a sufficient reply to our communications. And accordingly we wrote a respectful but firm letter to Lord Melbourne, recapitulating our note of the 14th referring to Lord

\* Now Dean of Ripon.

John Russell's assurance that we were to have Government's answer by middle of March, and stating that we were still, notwithstanding of all this, without any acknowledgment of our notes of the 14th at all. We then called on Lord Advocate to tell him of this letter. He said we were quite right to send it, but that he had as little doubt as ever we would get our answer on Monday. We thought his tone in regard to the *nature* of the answer on the whole less encouraging than some days ago.

About half-past four P.M. an answer was sent back from Lord Melbourne, in the coolest manner "entreating pardon" for not sooner having answered our communications, but adding at the same time that he was not able at present to name a time for giving the answer! Not being at the hotel at the time, Dunlop opened it, and went down immediately with it to the Lord Advocate, whose honour was implicated, he having given us a written assurance, *as from Lord John Russell*, to the effect that we were certainly to get our answer on Monday; and this he gave us as the ground on which we were to ask, and did ask, the Edinburgh Committee to postpone their meeting to the 26th. The Advocate was much annoyed on reading Melbourne's letter, and went off in quest of some members of Cabinet to talk it over. He returned to Dunlop at the hotel at six, saying he had only got Lord Normanby, and that he still felt sure we would get our answer on Monday. He begged us to breakfast with him on Monday, by which time he hoped to have it all arranged. This is a queer business.

I had a note this evening from Lord Aberdeen, begging me to let him know on Monday what the answer of Government was. I wrote this afternoon a long letter to Dr. Chalmers, contemplating the possibility of Government doing nothing, and the course we must then pursue. Described a plan of Dunlop's to get the Civil Courts' interference shut out, leaving them all their power over the benefice. This *interim* measure he thought both parties would pass. I disapproved of this strongly. It would be condemned as an attempt to do underhand, and by ecclesiastical censures, after we had got the civil power shut out, what we could not carry by fair force of law. Told Dr. Chalmers I could never concur in this proposal, but would prefer Lord Aberdeen securing us full *judicial* power—free from all civil interference—to give full effect to the Non-Intrusion principle.

With regard to those resolutions that condemn the conduct of Government, circumstances may render them necessary, but I begged he would do nothing without full consideration. I would be loath to drive out the Procurator and the other adherents of Government. A split in the Committee would have most injurious effects, and is to be avoided if possible.

*Monday, March 23.*—Met Dunlop after breakfast. The result of his conference at breakfast this morning with the Lord Advocate was this,—“You may still get an answer from Government to-day if you insist on it, but it will tell you nothing definite. If you wait till Wednesday you will really have their ultimatum.” In explanation of this he had told Dunlop

that a meeting of Scotch members, in the Liberal interest, was to be held to-morrow to hear Government's plan laid before them, as Government wished to know their minds about it before committing themselves to it in Parliament. Of course, in these circumstances, we had nothing for it but to acquiesce.

I went to call on Lord Aberdeen, to let him know of this new cause of delay. Had a long conversation with him. He told me he had heard on Saturday, from what he considered good authority, that Government designed to propose the Veto. If they do, he said, it cannot be honestly; it must be with the design of leaving the whole matter unsettled, as they know *that* will be decidedly opposed. He said he was therefore unwilling to believe they *could* be intending to bring in the Veto, and thereby to act so dishonestly towards the question. After a great deal of interesting conversation, he stated that, on the whole, he was becoming more and more inclined to settle the question on the footing of a *positive call*, as being the true, old constitutional usage of the Scotch Church. He asked me if I thought that would be satisfactory. I assured him it would be so in the highest possible degree; as it was the very thing the majority of the Church wished to have had, when, through Lord Moncreiff's great influence, the Veto form of it was carried. I remarked that the only reason we did not press for the positive call now was, the feeling that it would be more difficult to obtain the concurrence of the patrons to it than to the Veto; and that this, in fact, was Lord Moncreiff's avowed reason for preferring the Veto. Lord Aberdeen was quite aware of all this, and was anxious to know whether, when Lord Moncreiff spoke of the Veto being a lesser encroachment on Patronage, he meant to contrast it with the positive call of a majority, or of some smaller proportion. I answered, I believed of a majority, as many of the overtures prayed for that, and it was difficult to fix on any lower number. Lord Aberdeen admitted it was difficult; that all human affairs were regulated by majorities; and that if therefore any lesser proportion were taken, it would be considered arbitrary, and based on no principle. I mentioned that I believed it would be quite satisfactory to the Church to have "a majority of *those assembled* in congregation at the moderating of the call." This practically would be less than the gross majority, and yet would fairly preserve the principle. His lordship seemed to think this nearly met his views; said he wished to think more about it, and wished me not to mention it to any one till he had made up his mind. I used the freedom of urging his lordship strongly to adopt this mode of settling it, as it would not only be so satisfactory in itself, but so free from all the difficulties which embarrass the other form of the question.

He intended, if I had brought him word to-day that Government had given their answer, to ask Lord Melbourne in the House this evening to say what it was.

If we could get Government to *propose* the positive call, this would secure the passing of the measure.

Means used with Maule and Advocate to bring this about. The former grasps at it as infinitely the preferable mode. The latter more cautious about it, but promises to state it at the meeting of members of Parliament as an *alternative* proposal. He wishes to adjourn his meeting of members of Parliament from Tuesday, after making his statement to them, till Wednesday, and fixes our interview with Government for Thursday. Wrote to Dr. Chalmers, letting him know our position, and begging him to adjourn the meeting of Committee from Friday to Saturday, to receive our communication as to ultimatum of Government.

*Tuesday, March 24.*—Was waited on at Union Hotel by Mr. M'Lellan of Glasgow, as to Moderate memorial from that city which he has been entrusted with. Told him I considered first and second resolutions gross calumnies. They accuse certain of the clergy of resistance to the law of the land. Let them call it resistance if they like, but don't falsely describe the parties making it. It is not certain of the clergy, but certain *Church Courts*—not individuals, but *courts*; and that is the point on which the whole controversy about resistance turns. And then these courts are not composed of clergy exclusively, but in nearly equal proportion of elders. I told him I thought it most unmanly to make such an attack upon the clergy. He confessed the resolutions were too strongly worded, and that if he and others had had the drawing of them they would have been different. The memorial was signed by nearly four hundred—respectable as to station; few of them could I recognize as the names of religious men.

Called on the Advocate at four. His meeting had gone off well, and was adjourned till Thursday morning, and we are to have our interview that day.

*Wednesday, March 25.*—Wrote Lord Aberdeen, explaining that we were not to get Government's answer till to-morrow, and urging his lordship to the further and favourable consideration of the positive call.

*Thursday, March 26.*—Called, Dunlop and I, on Lord Advocate at twelve, and expressed our disappointment that no communication had reached us from Lord John Russell appointing the expected interview. The Advocate said the cause of it was that the meeting of members, adjourned from Tuesday, had not been held; that meeting could not take place till three P.M., and it would be difficult to get an interview to-day. We represented the extreme awkwardness of the position in which that would place both us and his lordship, as we had written on *his assurance* to the Committee at Edinburgh that we were *certainly* to get our answer to-day, and had urged the Committee to consent to an adjournment till Saturday on that account. He admitted it was very awkward; engaged to see Lord John, and endeavour still to secure the interview.

At three he sent us a message, saying Lord John Russell would receive us at quarter past four.



At the time fixed we were at the Colonial Office. Lord John left it while we were in the waiting-room, and crossed over to the Treasury, as we saw from the window,—no doubt to talk to Lord Melbourne. In a little he returned. The servant came in to the waiting-room to inquire if the Lord Advocate had arrived; and finding he had not, after another interval of a quarter of an hour was sent back to invite us into Lord John's room. He said he expected to have seen the Lord Advocate here, but that he did not like to detain us longer. The Cabinet, he said, had considered our question. They thought they could frame a measure fitted to serve the object we had in view, and which ought to be satisfactory; but that they did not see any sufficient evidence of being able to carry it. There was so much division on the subject, in the Church, in the country, and in Parliament, that they despaired at present of being able to carry through a measure satisfactory to the Church and country. It might be that by-and-by there might come to exist a greater unanimity on the subject, and then they would be able to do what they could not effect at present. We, of course, represented to his lordship the extreme danger of leaving things as they are—that the existing evils must be aggravated from the inevitable course of events, as the Civil and Ecclesiastical Courts were and must be hopelessly at variance so long as the law continues as it is. His lordship, however, adhered to the answer he had given.

We proceeded immediately to the hotel to write our letters, as it was now within twenty minutes of the close of post. Dunlop wrote to Candlish, and I wrote to Chalmers, briefly announcing the answer we had received from Government, and intimating our intention of immediately consulting with the leading Conservatives in order to arrange for their moving in the business.

Our letters had just been despatched, when the Lord Advocate came up to the hotel in haste, to prevent our writing north until we had considered what he had now to say. Of course that was past recall, but we begged him to proceed. He then told us that we had scarcely left Lord John when he arrived there from the meeting of Scotch members. That the result of the meeting, which he then communicated to Lord John, was this,—that the decided majority in numbers and influence of the Scotch Liberal members were of opinion that the time for legislation *had come*, and that Government should move in the matter; that a measure should be indicated in Parliament, so far, at least, as to get the opinion of parties, of the country, and of the Church regarding it, but that it should not be passed till *after* the Assembly, as the opinion of the Assembly, if strong and decided in its favour, might greatly influence the passing of the Bill in the Lords; and further, that the meeting very decidedly approved the scheme of a Bill which he had submitted to them.

The Advocate said that Lord John, on hearing all this, expressed his regret that he had not known it before giving the deputation the answer

of Government, and that if they chose they might hold the answer as *suspended*, and the communication still open with Government.

“It is for you, therefore,” said the Lord Advocate, addressing us, “to consider whether you will write Lord John, referring to what I have now stated, and reopening the negotiations.” We said we should take till next day to think of it; and that meanwhile we should send another letter to Dr. Chalmers by a gentleman who was going down to Scotland to-night, and who would deliver the letter before the others sent by the post could reach; and that in this supplementary communication we would ask Dr. Chalmers to confine the contents of our *first* letters to the Committee, and not to let anything go abroad till we wrote again.

This placed us in a difficult position. If we refused to reopen the negotiations, we might be blamed as having ourselves shut the door of Government against the cause. If we did reopen them, we might be blamed for *replacing* ourselves in the unsatisfactory position in which we had been held too long already, hanging on upon Government without getting anything done, and wasting most precious time. We need wisdom from above.

*Friday, March 27.*—After mature reflection on the difficulties of our position, I resolved, without communication with Dunlop, and on my own responsibility, to take the advice privately and confidentially of Lord Aberdeen. It is to him we must look, if Government refuse to move; and should we entangle ourselves anew with Government and waste time, he may hold himself acquitted of all obligation to interfere, on the ground that we have allowed the proper time for his moving to be trifled away. It seemed to me, therefore, indispensable, for our own vindication, and for the safety of our cause, to advise with him on the point. I accordingly went to him at ten A.M., and said I hoped he would allow me to make to him a *confidential* communication, with the view of obtaining his private advice. He kindly and cordially agreed; and I narrated to him all that had passed yesterday at the Colonial Office and with the Lord Advocate.

After the fullest consideration of the subject, he was of opinion that it was our duty to write to Lord John, and ask if the communication he had received since we saw him led to any change in his views. It would be a strong step to refuse to do this, having, as we had, been invited, though indirectly yet very plainly, to do so,—and an ill use might be made of our refusal afterwards. Fortified by this opinion, I proceeded to the hotel, and told Dunlop what I had done. He was at the moment preparing a note to the Lord Advocate, stating that we did not feel justified in reopening a communication so little likely to lead to any satisfactory results. He was, however, but imperfectly resolved as to the propriety of this course; and when he heard Lord Aberdeen’s opinion, he said at once we should not hesitate an instant. He was very glad I had taken the course of asking his advice, as it placed us on very safe ground.

I wrote, therefore, immediately a note to Lord John Russell (a copy is

kept), referring to the Lord Advocate's communication,—to the possibility of a consequent change in the views of Government,—and that we would call at three p.m., when we hoped to be informed whether the answer of yesterday was adhered to.

We called accordingly, and after waiting about a quarter of an hour were shown in, and found with his lordship the Lord Advocate and Sir George Grey. Lord John then invited the Lord Advocate to state what he had to say; and he accordingly went over very exactly the account of the meeting of Scotch members he had given last night to us.

Lord John then reminded us that yesterday he had said that Government's declining to introduce a measure at present did not arise from their being unable to agree what the measure should be, but from their not seeing any good prospect of carrying it; that the communication made by the Lord Advocate had in some degree altered the circumstances, and warranted the reconsideration of the matter. He said the difficulty would be to know whether the Assembly would approve the measure. We said there was no reasonable ground to doubt that, if the measure satisfied the Committee, it would satisfy the majority of the Assembly, and therefore it was not necessary to wait for the Assembly to learn what would satisfy the Church. Sir George Grey remarked that he rather thought Lord John meant that their measure might not be found to go far enough to satisfy the majority of the Church. Of that, we said, we could not judge without knowing what the measure was. Lord John indicated that their measure involved some modification of the Veto, without saying what it amounted to. After some general conversation on the subject, he said he would bring the whole matter anew under the consideration of the Cabinet to-morrow, and press upon them the considerations now presented; and that if we would call upon him on Monday at half-past two, we should hear the result. This was on the whole as satisfactory as in the circumstances we could have anticipated.

I saw Lord Aberdeen afterwards, made him aware of what had passed, and begged him to delay putting his intended question to Lord Melbourne till Monday; to which he agreed.

*March 28.*—Maule called on Dunlop at Union, and had a long talk over our business. Dunlop laboured to impress him with the importance of getting Government to adopt the plan of the positive call as the simplest, most satisfactory, and most likely to carry. Maule undertook to go to Lord John Russell immediately, and endeavour to impregnate him with the same views before the Cabinet meets to-day.

Ultimately the Whig Government refused to face the difficulty, and the settlement of the Church question was undertaken by Lord Aberdeen. At first things seemed to pro-

mise exceedingly well. His lordship was willing to propose legislation on the footing of the positive CALL; and "there can be no doubt," says Mr. Buchanan in his history, "this would have been more satisfactory to the Church than even the Veto itself." But, unfortunately, Lord Aberdeen was not decided enough to act on his own judgment in the matter. He consulted with, it is believed, the leaders of the Moderate party in Scotland; and the result was, the beginning of that course of backsliding to which allusion has been made in a previous chapter. One of the earliest indications given of a change in the temper of the Conservative leader was his refusal to receive Mr. Buchanan and Mr. John Hamilton as deputies from the Non-Intrusion Committee. This was in the beginning of April 1841. It was then made plain that his lordship meant to break with the Church as represented by its Evangelical majority, and to attempt the forlorn task of composing the deep-cutting differences of the Church in the lines followed by the minority. He failed, of course. Dr. Chalmers told him at once, "with inexpressible grief and concern"—for "all his tendencies were on the side of putting the most favourable construction on every clause"—that the Bill which he introduced could not possibly be accepted; and this view was confirmed shortly afterwards by the emphatic division of 221 to 134 against it in the General Assembly. But Lord Aberdeen persevered, and on the 16th of June he carried the second reading of his measure in the House of Lords. It looked as if the story of the passing of Queen Anne's Act were about to be repeated. The State seemed about to impose again, in a high-handed fashion, its sovereign will upon the Church; and, for anything we can see to the contrary, Parliament might, without much difficulty, have been got at the time to agree to the outrage. But a strongly-worded petition from Scotland, asking that the Church might be

heard by counsel at the bar of the House of Lords, backed up as that was by a bold speech from the Marquis of Breadalbane, had the effect of arresting the deluge. Lord Aberdeen shrank from pursuing a course which threatened to issue in anything but pacification, and, although not with a very good grace, he withdrew his Bill.

It could not be said, however, that thereupon things returned again to the same state in which they were before this abortive attempt at a settlement. The rejection of Lord Aberdeen's proposal, taken in conjunction with the suspension by the Assembly of 1840 of the Strathbogie ministers, had greatly provoked the future Premier, Sir Robert Peel. To him the "rebellion" of the Church of Scotland appeared intolerable; and on the 27th of July he spoke in his place in the House of Commons in a way which made it all too certain that when the Tories came into power, as they seemed likely to do ere long, even less was to be expected from them than from Lord Melbourne. This was discouraging enough for the Evangelicals, but it put fresh heart and hope into the Moderate party; and from this point we may date a new and more bitter recommencement of the struggle. The Strathbogie ministers (who, as we have the best reason for saying, had had at times their serious misgivings) were stirred up to a more obstinate resistance to ecclesiastical authority; the Moderate leaders also became more reckless in their methods of carrying on the war; and the foolish confidence was everywhere sought to be propagated that nothing was needed to cause the Non-Intrusion agitation to collapse, but a resolute pressure of the compulsitors of law. As a matter of fact, the calculations failed. The Evangelicals were not dispersed but compacted by the pressure. But, apart from that, it is worth remembering that it is in a very great degree to the shortsighted statesmanship of Lord Aberdeen and Sir

Robert Peel that we owe at this time the exacerbation of the conflict.

Things, however, could not possibly be left as they were, and another nobleman presented himself as ready to make a fresh attempt at pacification. This was the Duke of Argyle, whose Bill was read a first time on the 6th of May 1841. As its provisions proved satisfactory, the clouds again lifted; but in June the Ministry was defeated, and all further progress was stayed until after the general election which ensued. It was then found that the reign of the Whigs was over, and that the Church must thenceforward look to Sir Robert Peel. A deputation was accordingly sent to him in September; but the interview to which it was admitted was not encouraging. The great statesman was ominously reticent; and as the little knot of Scottish Churchmen retired from the audience, to compare notes among themselves, one of the shrewdest of them said to his associates, "That man will never sanction the independent jurisdiction of the Church." And he was right. The Duke of Argyle's Bill was transferred to the House of Commons, where Mr. Campbell of Monzie undertook to take charge of it. That it would have been carried there at the time under any circumstances, is of course extremely doubtful. But the Government did not give it the chance. Its second reading was set down for the 4th of May; but before the debate came on Mr. Campbell was requested to postpone his motion, on the ground that the Ministry now saw its way to propose a satisfactory measure of its own. Mr. Campbell, suspecting no evil, consented. Mr. Fox Maule and others refused to agree; but their opposition was of no avail. They were beaten on a division, and the ground was thus left free for Sir James Graham to do his best. That best proved to be nothing. The secret of his interposition at all is now well understood to have been, that in the meantime

there had begun to be put forth the baneful influence of THE FORTY.\* They succeeded in convincing the politicians that the Non-Intrusion party was divided; that some of its representatives, at any rate, had no intention whatever of pressing things to an extremity; and that the idea of a great Disruption might be very safely dismissed as a chimera. Any thought, therefore, that might have been entertained of concession was abandoned. Events were allowed, so far as the Government was concerned, to take their course. Mr. Campbell's Bill, when at last brought in, was thrown out on a technicality. The Claim of Right was ignominiously rejected—Sir James Graham stating on the occasion that “these pretensions of the Church of Scotland” could never be recognized “in any country in which law, equity, order, or common sense prevailed.” And at last, on the 18th of May 1843, the crash came which drove the Evangelicals outside the Establishment, to seek in a separated condition that independence which the State denied to them in a state of union with it.

This short narrative will suffice to make the letters which are given below intelligible to every reader. It may, however, be desirable to add two things more. One is, that for a time Sir George Sinclair's proposal of a *liberum arbitrium*, as it was called, had a very disturbing influence on the Non-Intrusion party; and the other is that, as he shows in his history, Mr. Buchanan had very good cause to complain of the conduct of Lord Aberdeen. The refusal of the Church to accept his Bill seems to have turned the love which his lordship had for it before into positive hatred. When Dr. Candlish's appointment to the Professorship of Biblical Criticism in

\* A party of men who had hitherto acted with the Evangelicals, but who now separated from Chalmers and others of the same class, and began negotiations on their own account. On them lies chiefly the responsibility of the Disruption.

the University of Edinburgh was challenged, because he had dared, in the face of a Court of Session interdict, to preach the gospel in Strathbogie, Lord Aberdeen was one of those who insisted most bitterly that it should be cancelled. It was he too who most strongly supported Lord Dunfermline in assailing the Church when a petition from the Strathbogie ministers was presented to the House of Lords. And when, on the 15th of June 1841, he appeared as protesting against the deposition of these ministers, his indignation seemed to know no bounds. "The presumption," said he, "manifested by the General Assembly in these proceedings, was never equalled by the Church of Rome. Tyranny such as was exhibited in this case would annihilate the liberties of the people of this country; but it surely would not be tolerated in the present day."

Such was the spirit of the Ministers under whose administration the Disruption actually took place. But, without a word of further comment, we shall let the letters speak for themselves. They are addressed to two of Mr. Buchanan's life-long friends, Mr. Alexander Dunlop and Dr. Harry Rainy of Glasgow.

(*To Mr. A. Dunlop.*)

"LONDON, *February 26, 1840.*

"I had an interview with Sir George Grey, who seems favourable to our views, and desirous to promote a settlement. I have also had long interviews with the Marquis of Bute and Duke of Argyle. The former would go all the length of the Committee so far as he is personally concerned; but he said he was confident the Conservatives as a body would not. He was quite sure they would, *as a body*, agree to the 1649 arrangement,—putting in 'causeless prejudice' in addition to 'factious motives,'—and that they would readily consent to have it arranged that the dissent should be held good, and should stop the settlement unless some party having interest should prove that it was tendered under the disqualifying terms of the Act—of which *terms*, at the same time, the Church Courts should be the sole interpreters. He said if the Committee should think fit to accept this arrangement, and say to the Government, 'Give us *that*,' it would be sure to



pass speedily through the two Houses. I suggested the risk of the Government answering the request by proposing, *on that very account*, a measure making the people's dissent absolute, and so indulging their grudge at the Church, which would then infallibly get no measure at all, and get at the same time for the Church a possible odium from the people.

"He admitted this fear was too well founded; for he told me in confidence that Lord John Russell had been heard to say last summer, 'he would not be the man to help the Church of Scotland out of her difficulties.' This, of course, *entre nous*. The Duke of Argyle was most kind and friendly. Up to the point of 1849 he is quite firm and decided; and both he and Lord Bute were strong against the late interdict.

"I am going to-day to call on the Duke of Richmond. I shall also endeavour to see Lord Aberdeen, and ascertain distinctly what he means. I am thoroughly convinced that our wisdom and our duty is this,—to bring the Conservatives up to the highest point we can; and ascertaining what that is, to use our whole influence to bring the Government to the proposing of a measure as near to it as possible, without, of course, hinting what the Conservatives will do."

(*To Mr. A. Dunlop.*)

"LONDON, March 3, 1840.

"I confess it appears to me so entirely doubtful how these political movements are to affect our cause—the way of Providence in this whole question is so much 'in the sea,' that any attempt to trace it at present seems hopeless. And therefore my feeling is to go steadily on, using the means which lie plainly within our own sphere of duty, leaving the issue to Him who ruleth over all."

(*To Dr. Harry Rainy.*)

"LONDON, April 24, 1840.

"With regard to the great object of my mission, I found, on my arrival on Wednesday evening, a note waiting me from Lord Aberdeen, saying that he was in the country, and was coming to town next day to meet me. I went to his house accordingly yesterday forenoon, and we had a very long confidential discussion, which lasted upwards of two hours, in the course of which he told me the nature and provisions of his intended measure, the difficulties he had to contend with—in short, opened his whole mind without reserve on the subject; of course on the understanding that the conversation was to be held as strictly private. He is to submit his Bill to Mr. Hamilton and myself on Monday; and till one sees the *terms* of it, it is impossible to speak with confidence. He pledges himself that it will *at least* remove all difficulties on the side of *conscience*, by leaving us full power to determine in what circumstances the pastoral relation shall be formed,

and by giving full effect to our refusal to form it, whatever may be the grounds on which we decide that the settlement cannot be proceeded with.

“I find there is great activity on the part of our enemies, exhibited chiefly in efforts to pervert and alienate Lord Aberdeen. By telling me candidly what had been stated to him, he gave me an opportunity of putting many things to rights. It is a very delicate business altogether, and makes me very anxious, as it places me in a position of so much responsibility. I am conscious, however, of being influenced by no consideration but a regard to the welfare of the Church; and if I do my best to promote that end, I must be contented to leave the issue in better hands than mine, and to be blamed, as I may very likely be, for not accomplishing what is beyond my power.”

(To Dr. Harry Rainy.)

“LONDON, April 29, 1840.

“Mr. Hamilton and I had a three hours' discussion yesterday with Lord Aberdeen, with his Bill before us. He put us strictly under *quarantine*; which, of course, interferes considerably with our freedom of communication. It is not violating his lordship's interdict, however, to mention generally the character of the Bill to one who is so swift to hear and slow to speak as yourself. In a word, then, it takes away all our difficulties so far as *conscience* is concerned, leaving the Church Courts to give full effect to *any* objections of *any* kind against the presentee or *his settlement* which the people may urge. It pronounces the presenting of the minister to the people when he goes to preach before them, as a part of the ‘trials’ which ‘are wholly in the power of the Kirk.’ It entitles the people to object if they think him unfit to edify them,—with power to appeal if unsatisfied with the Presbytery's judgment, and the appeal to be exclusively to the Church Courts. It makes no reference to the Veto Law direct or indirect; and leaves the Presbytery, so far as I can see, full power in each case judicially to give effect to the veto of the parish if tendered on the ground that the presentee's gifts are not suited to their edification.

“It would have been unspeakably wiser and simpler had they just left the Veto to stand as a general rule, instead of risking the litigation which the separate judging of each case as it comes may produce. But still, as it leaves the Church perfectly free, absolutely to determine when they shall constitute a pastoral relation and when not, our *conscience* will be delivered; and though I would not *actively concur*, I think we would not be warranted in directly refusing and repudiating it. We are to have a copy of the Bill put into our hands to study immediately. He had only the one copy he read from yesterday, which was to be transcribed last night. He will give notice to-morrow night in the House of Lords as to the night when his Bill will be introduced.”

(To Mr. A. Dunlop.)

“GLASGOW, June 12, 1840.

“I am both astonished and gratified beyond measure to hear that Lord Aberdeen has begun again to think of the ‘call.’ The man is a perfect enigma. I have ceased to speculate about his movements. I hope you have resolved on sending up the deputation—the step seems indispensable.”

(To Mr. A. Dunlop.)

“LONDON, June 13, 1840.

“As it may possibly be useful for you to know exactly Lord Aberdeen’s state of mind in reference to the proceedings of the Assembly, I subjoin an extract from a letter I have just received from him. He seems to be in no humour to amend his Bill. I had written him in regard to what he said lately in Parliament about the necessity of the Church obeying the law. He ‘keeps to his threap’ on that subject, insisting that the maintaining of the Veto Law even under the existing limitations is ‘a violation of the law.’ After leaving this point he comes to his Bill, and writes as follows:— ‘Undoubtedly it would have afforded me pleasure if I could have adopted all the amendments of the Bill proposed by you and Mr. Hamilton, consistently with a sense of my own duty, and with the main objects I had in view when proposing the measure. But my present fear is that I have already adopted too many of these amendments; and I assure you that I rejoice from the bottom of my heart in having firmly resisted the adoption of that which you inform me would have secured the adoption of the Bill by the Assembly, but which would also, in my judgment, have led to the ruin of the Church. The temper and spirit evinced by the leaders of the Assembly, and their proceedings, have been such as to produce any other effect than an inclination to extend their powers.’ His lordship is evidently angry.”

(To Mr. A. Dunlop.)

“GLASGOW, July 8, 1840.

“Not a word from London or Edinburgh. Are you equally without information as to Lord Aberdeen’s movements? A preliminary meeting I called yesterday has adjourned till to-morrow, eleven A.M., in hopes of having more definite information to guide us as to the intended public meeting. We have fixed conditionally for Wednesday next, and have engaged Begg and Makgill to attend it; and we are most anxious for Guthrie, who is *new* here, and who would create a sensation. I wish you would second our application to him, and urge him to come. It is very important.....

“I am glad and thankful the Moderate manifesto is such an *out and outer*, as the Americans say. They have overshot the mark.”

(To Mr. A. Dunlop.)

“GLASGOW, August 3, 1840.

“This speech of Peel's makes the cause very clear as to the League. If, *before*, it was expedient, it is now indispensable. I presume it is to go on as was agreed. I trust no cross accident has arisen to mar it. It is time now. Colquhoun is dismayed at the speech of Peel, and says the party had no conception it was coming. Be that as it may, it has broken the party's back, and all their surgery will not mend it in Scotland for years to come.

“I am glad Gordon approves the League, and trust that Chalmers will be of the same mind. Peel's speech will help him to a right conclusion, if he was in any difficulty before.”

(To Mr. A. Dunlop.)

“GLASGOW, September 22, 1840.

“The preparations for the Bicentenary dinner are going on prosperously. To all appearance we shall have an ample attendance. The Committee wish you to prepare as a toast, ‘The memory of the *Scottish worthies* who in former days contended for the liberties of the Church of Scotland.’ Something to that effect. And if Lord Lorne be present, we would say, ‘The memory of the Earl of Argyle, and the *other* Scottish worthies,’ &c. He and the Duke are invited; but no answer has been returned. They are both in town, and we may expect to hear to-morrow. If either of them engage to attend, I shall write you.

“Cooke is coming over to represent the Irish Presbyterians.

“Chalmers is to speak on the union of all orthodox Presbyterians; a subject of which he is quite full.”

(To Mr. A. Dunlop.)

“GLASGOW, October 23, 1840.

“How does your municipal election look? It is a pity that any fresh fuel should be flung on the fire that has hitherto burned so mischievously between us and the Dissenters. It was, of course, unavoidable at Edinburgh. But it would be an immense matter if the division between us could be healed. I cannot help thinking that if one had access to know what is going on among them behind the scenes, there would be found to be some materials for union.”

(To Mr. A. Dunlop.)

“GLASGOW, February 8, 1841.

“I enclose for your information a letter received this morning from Colquhoun. If Lord Melbourne represents the feelings and intentions of

Government as to our question, what he has written Sir George Sinclair is certainly ominous enough. There seems certainly to be no help in man; and perhaps it is to bring us to a more unreserved dependence on God that we are to have every human stay broken."

(To Mr. A. Dunlop.)

"GLASGOW, February 22, 1841.

"Now that Hamilton's admirable pamphlet is likely to give a fillip to our cause among Parliamentary men, should not a decided effort be made privately to get some such Bill as he sketches in the Appendix introduced into the House of Commons? It is not so remote from the views on which Mr. Maule and the Advocate were willing to legislate last year, as to render it unlikely that they would support it; while many of the Conservatives, I am inclined to think, would not be unwilling to aid it. The return lately made to Maule's order about the Veto Settlement would afford a reasonable ground for his supporting it, or even introducing it, or something like it.

"I have written Colquhoun and Mr. Home Drummond about it."

(To Mr. A. Dunlop.)

"GLASGOW, March 12, 1841.

"I had come, before receiving your letter, to substantially the same conclusion you have expressed; and have resolved to do nothing till the smoke of this explosion so far clears away as to enable one to see distinctly the real state of things. I have written Hamilton that, at least in the meantime, I cannot go to London; but have urged his setting out, without delay, as in truth now more necessary than ever. To get a Bill on sound principles even introduced, is a point of great importance; and no pains should be spared to secure it. Above all, we must be on our guard against giving way to the sort of despondency—the feeling of its being hopeless any longer to struggle to avert the catastrophe—which late events are calculated to produce.

"We can now, however, distinctly see the breakers without climbing to the masthead. The seven have only to get an interdict against the Assembly pronouncing sentence of deposition. After the views expressed by Lord Normanby, in name of the Government, their Commissioner *cannot remain* while an interdict is violated; and *then* comes the crash.

"It is a solemn thought. I shall endeavour to be in (*D. V.*) on Tuesday. There ought, perhaps, to be a conference of a more select kind than the ordinary meeting in the Religious Institution Rooms. It is time to be setting our house in order; but we must do nothing rashly—nothing to precipitate so frightful a calamity. A false movement, in our present critical position, might not only ensure the Church's overthrow, but leave on us the responsibility of the event."

(To Mr. A. Dunlop.)

“GLASGOW, April 9, 1841.

“I heard from Hamilton this morning, and am glad to hear there is some light beginning to appear. The old proverb says, ‘Clear in the *sooth* beguiled the cadger.’ I hope Mr. Hamilton’s hopes are not doomed to end the same way.

“He is anxious to have letters addressed him showing how really Conservative the popular movement of the Church is, and how grossly erroneous it is to imagine it has any affinity with Radicalism. I have set two such letters agoing to-day, which will exactly meet his views. The one from the secretary, or rather political agent, of the Conservative party here, proving that the active adherents of the popular party in the Church have been the chief instruments in bringing about whatever reaction has taken place towards Conservatism in this town and county, as well as in the neighbouring counties and burghs. The other, from the secretary of the Conservative Operatives’ Association, showing that, out of its 500 members, not more than 6 are opposed to the Church’s movements; and that the whole of the remainder so entirely identify their Conservatism with the Church’s principles and present proceedings, that at this moment they *will not move* as a political body at all, under an impression that Peel and other leaders of his party are unfriendly to the Church. And, further, that Conservatism is absolutely out of the question among the operatives, apart from the Church question.”

(To Mr. A. Dunlop.)

“GLASGOW, May 21, 1841.

“By a letter from my brother-in-law, Mr. Lee of Campsie,\* I have just heard that the seven are positively to hold out. Lee was anxious they should give in, and pressed Cooke, when over at Principal Haldane’s dinner, to advise them to do so. He says he thought he had made some impression on him in private; but once with his party, he finds him taking another tone. I need not tell you all this was his own spontaneous act. Of course, the information may be relied on, and you will therefore have no occasion to deal with the embarrassing question of what kind of acknowledgment would suffice? The course now is clear, and the duty plain; but the circumstances in which the Assembly is placed are unspeakably solemn. How the two parties are to continue one Church, if the minority support the seven out and out, is what I cannot see to be possible. We are therefore, to all appearance, on the eve of a great change. May God give us all the grace which the emergency requires.

“The great thing will be to bring out the true character of those principles which the seven have been trampling on. Votes are valuable; but a powerful exposition of the truth is more valuable still.

\* Afterwards Dr. Robert Lee of Edinburgh.

“I hear it has been resolved to discuss Anti-Patronage, and to take the debate *before* the day for considering the Duke of Argyle's Bill.

“I am perhaps no judge, not knowing the grounds on which this arrangement has been adopted. One would say, at a distance, it would have been better to take the Bill first.”

(*To Dr. H. Rainy.*)

“EDINBURGH, *May 25, 1841.*”

“We got safe here yesterday, within the four hours, after a very pleasant journey. We were quite a party of ourselves—Dr. Henderson, Mrs. Brown, and Miss Graham. Robert\* dined here, and we went to the Assembly in the evening, when he got his first sight of that venerable Court. He went down to Pilrig in the evening. I took him this forenoon to the Commissioner's Levee, to see the little piece of State ceremonial that goes on there; and to-morrow he accompanies me to the Moderator's breakfast, where one gets something more substantial than a bow. As to the Assembly, things hitherto have gone on very satisfactorily. Wright of Borthwick's dangerous and insidious heresies were discussed last night. He was found guilty, by an overwhelming majority, and *deposed*. The minority's motion was only for some delay. All concurred in condemning—for the Moderates have now become wonderfully orthodox. Candlish's speech was a masterpiece.

“To-day we have had the India Report, the English Presbyterian Church Deputation, and the Anti-Patronage discussion, now in progress (half-past five). It was opened by Cunningham in an able and temperate speech. Chalmers followed in a speech not well conceived, I think, and not aiming very decidedly at anything. Dr. Mackellar succeeded him, and moved the amendment (for which Chalmers will vote) to the effect that the motion of Mr. Cunningham would not facilitate but retard the settlement of the Church's difficulties. It is so framed that the Moderates *may* vote for it; and if they do, it will, of course, carry by a decided majority, and leave the way open for the discussion of the Duke's Bill to-morrow unembarrassed by Anti-Patronage.

“If it *be* the result of to-night's debate that Mackellar's motion carries, I should think the Duke's Bill likely to have a very large majority to-morrow. Strathbogie is fixed for Thursday. There are *still rumours* about some concession on the part of the seven. But my belief is they will come to nothing. Nothing seems to be known as to what the Moderates will do in the event of the deposition of the recusants.”

(*To Dr. Harry Rainy.*)

“59 YORK PLACE, EDINBURGH, *May 27, 1841.*”

“Resolutions in favour of the Duke of Argyle's Bill were passed by the Assembly about one o'clock this morning by a majority of 230 to 105. The

\* Now Principal Rainy.

subject was introduced by Mr. Candlish in an able speech expository of the Bill, and which he concluded with an appeal to the Moderate side of the House. The appeal was most touching and impressive, and thoroughly solemnized the minds of the audience. The counter-motion was made by Dr. Hill (that the Bill was not calculated to settle the difficulties, and that the Veto Law should be repealed) in a very weak and paltry speech. Though as a body the Moderates held together, there were honourable exceptions of men who broke from their ranks and met the appeal made to them in a corresponding spirit. Dr. Brunton was one of these. He could not support *all* the resolutions; but he would not oppose the Duke's Bill, and would concur in no movement to obstruct its progress. With some amendments, he thought it would work well. Lee of Campsie took the same view, in a vigorous and manly speech that was most distasteful to his own side of the House. Dr. Ferrie of Kilconquhar voted for the resolutions; and several Moderates were silent. On our side, some half-dozen High Anti-Patronage people, such as Makgill Crichton, Bridges, &c., did not vote.

“The debate was conducted in the most admirable spirit, with the exception of the speech of Dr. Hill, and one of Mr. David Milne (Sir David Milne's son), which Dr. P. Macfarlan discussed in fine style, giving Mr. Milne himself a rebuke which he will feel for some time to come.

“The seven men are resolved to hold out. By a private agreement, Dr. Cook, Principal Macfarlane, Dr. P. Macfarlan, and I, had an interview with them yesterday afternoon. They would not yield a peg. ‘Wha will to Cupar maun to Cupar,’ as the old adage says. They deserve their fate, and they will certainly get what they deserve. It is a serious business; but the Church has no choice but to go through with it.”

(To Dr. H. Rainy.)

“LONDON, June 10, 1841.

“The approaching dissolution of Parliament and succeeding elections engross every mind here, and hardly any one will look at our question at present. The Bill of the Duke of Argyle must, of course, be postponed till next session. The Duke will state his views on Monday night in the House of Peers, and refer to the strong support his Bill has received from various quarters, and above all from the Church herself, the party chiefly concerned. He will intimate his purpose, and reintroduce it early next session. Lord Bellhaven comes to town to-night, and to-morrow we shall have some consultation regarding the resolutions of the Assembly against the interdicts. I hope the Government may be induced to present to Mortlach, as the speediest way of bringing the question to an issue whether or not the courts of law will give civil effect to the deposition of the Strathbogie ministers. We shall know in a day or two.

“It is of the utmost consequence to get some of our *own friends* into



next Parliament. We shall never do any good till this is attained. Now, I have to mention to you, in confidence, that there is some idea of Mr. Dunlop coming forward for Ross-shire, if he can be assured of a sufficient *territorial* support (that of Whig proprietors) to back the influence the purely Church party may be able to exert. He would, of course, come forward as an independent member, and avowedly as the supporter of the Church's cause. He is anxious to have the opinion of any judicious friends who know that county, whether they think he would have a reasonable chance of success. Various persons will, of course, be consulted; and it has occurred to me that you may have some knowledge of the state of matters. Pray write me, *in course*, what you think, and suggest anything that occurs to you on the subject—such as names of individuals who could be of use, &c.

“Another point I have to mention. Mr. Patrick Stewart is to contest Renfrewshire. He is an able man, and *publicly committed on our question in its whole extent*. It is considered by our best friends here that his presence in Parliament would be of great service. Can you do anything there? Your friend, General Darroch, used to support the Stewart family, I believe. Would he be inclined to do so at present? It would probably decide the contest. Stewart speaks well, and we need such a man greatly in the House of Commons. Our impression here is, that if Sir R. Peel get a large majority, and come into office with a strong Government, he will try to *crush* us. I am not without hopes that a seat in Ireland may be got for Makgill Crichton.”

(To Dr. H. Rainy.)

“LONDON, June 12, 1841.

“There is little good to be done here in our question at present. We had some hopes of getting Government to present to Mortlach (one of the seven parishes, and which is in their gift); but the Lord Chancellor, after taking two days to think of it, declines to recommend it—and, of course, Government will act accordingly. He is afraid it might be misunderstood as if it were an indication of Government being on the side of the Church, and against the Civil Courts; whereas they wish to stand neutral, and give no opinion either way. They are a poor, shuffling set. All we can say is, they let us alone; whereas Peel would interfere actively against us, if his party were in office with a strong majority at their back.

“There really is no help for us in man, and we have much need to be putting our trust in God.

“Lord Aberdeen is to ask a question of Lord Melbourne on Monday night about the proceedings of the General Assembly; of course as a pretext for making an attack upon us. We are taking measures to have Lords Rosebery, Breadalbane, Belhaven, and the Duke of Argyle, in readiness to say something in reply.

“The Moderate deputation have been waiting on Lord Brougham! Think of that. Ultra-Tory Moderates in league with the most profligate of the Ultra-Radicals. I look upon it as a bad omen. It shows to what lengths the Moderate party are ready to go to prevent a settlement on the only principles that will prevent the overthrow of the Establishment.”

(*To Mr. A. Dunlop.*)

“LONDON, *June 17, 1841.*”

“In consequence of what passed at our last conference with the Wesleyans, and of other circumstances growing out of it, I have consented to remain here till Friday night. The *Watchman* of this morning has a strong article addressing electors on our question. Dr. Bunting, Mr. Beecham, and the editor of the *Watchman*, came to my lodgings last night at nine o'clock to revise it; and they seem now resolved to make common cause with us. A slip containing merely the article was to be sent to Sir Robert Peel, enclosed in a letter, calling his attention to it, ‘from the *Watchman* office.’ This will secure its meeting his eye; and I should hope it will have some effect in deterring him from meddling with us.

“I have been with the Duke of Argyle this morning about seeing Lord Stanley. The Duke thinks it desirable; is to see him or write him to-day, and endeavour to arrange an interview for to-morrow. The Duke is most indignant at Lord Aberdeen; talked of his attack on the Church last night as disgraceful, and expressed his conviction that it must surely ruin his influence with all who have the least respect for the Church of Scotland. He himself was not reported, but he is to send to the papers a report of what he said. It was he who called up the Chancellor by a question as to the proper extent and effect of the Auchterarder decision. The Chancellor’s few remarks, the Duke says, evidently implied that he did not wish to be understood as sanctioning the subsequent proceedings of the Scotch courts of law. Lord Melbourne, on the whole, did well; and I feel sure the discussion will do good in the way of forcing men to consider the subject, and at length to discover that it does involve a great constitutional question.

“I am going to ask the editor of the *Watchman* to extract from your pamphlet two pages on Montgomery’s case—the one referred to by Lord Melbourne—as the most parallel to the present controversy. Giving it entire, will show that the Church triumphed in that case.”

(*To Mr. A. Dunlop.*)

“GLASGOW, *August 19, 1841.*”

“I have this moment received a letter from Chalmers. He is very anxious that the resolutions should stick to the grand question of jurisdiction, as the one on which we differ with the Moderates, and which lies at the bottom of the threatened schism—the one on which they are to

appeal to Parliament. He thinks it will present a simpler view of our case to the public and to Parliament, and unite the *largest number* of our own friends in the Church. I am satisfied he is quite right. The occasion seems to dictate and demand this policy. Anything else brought in should be, at any rate, incidental and subordinate."

(To Mr. A. Dunlop.)

"GLASGOW, August 21, 1841.

"Macleod left this on Wednesday to dine at the Dean's, to meet Lord Aberdeen, professing to be most anxious to bring his lordship to more rational views,—condemning Cook's movement, &c. He came back *quite changed*. On the other hand, I have had a letter from Dr. Chalmers this morning, saying that Sir G. Sinclair appears, from a letter he has had from him, to be 'highly satisfied' with the conversation of Lord Aberdeen! He, Sir George, was, I believe, at the dinner-party which Macleod went in to attend.

"We have had enough of his lordship. Let us hold on our own course."

(To Mr. A. Dunlop.)

"GLASGOW, November 26, 1841.

"Grant's\* speech is indeed warlike; but he belongs to that class who *wish* to push things to an extremity. I don't believe he has any other ground to think he will be backed than that which he expresses in his speech,—that the known sentiments of members of Government are such as must in consistency carry them that length. His speech seems to have been very much meant to instigate public men to maintain that *fatal* consistency, by putting into deeds what they have some of them indicated in words."

(To Mr. A. Dunlop.)

"GLASGOW, April 5, 1842.

"In answer to your note of yesterday, I shall as briefly as possible state my views about the proposed resolution,—the *stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae* of next Assembly. (I.) That it should be quite distinct from any resolution to which the Assembly may come on the subject of Patronage. With this view, I would recommend that the question of Anti-Patronage should be founded on the *overtures* on that subject, and that the resolution on the jurisdiction should be based on the *report of the Non-Intrusion Committee*. This would keep the two matters quite distinct, and yet would avoid even the appearance of casting Anti-Patronage into the shade.

"In order that the Independence resolution should grow naturally out of the Non-Intrusion report, I assume that that report will be so formed as to give the chief prominence to the fact that the Government have declined

\* Dr. Grant, late of St. Mary's, Edinburgh.

to propose any legislative settlement of our difficulties, and have announced their purpose to enforce the law as it has been or may be declared by the Civil Courts. I would make that announcement the *starting-point* of the Assembly's resolution,—narrating in the preamble of the resolution how that, by this rejection of the Assembly's appeal to Parliament, and throwing of us upon the decision of the very Courts of whose encroachments we are complaining, we are thus of necessity driven to contemplate the result which may in all probability be awaiting us, and to intimate beforehand what the Church will hold herself bound to do in case of the Civil Courts confirming by a formal decision the Erastian supremacy they have recently, *without* any formal decision, assumed.

“ Having got a good broad platform laid in this way for the superstructure, I would straightway set to work to build up the resolutions; and—

“(1) I would state what is meant by the Headship of Christ as the doctrine out of which the Church's exclusive jurisdiction in matters spiritual flows,—state it, that is, as a religious principle, embodied in Scripture and laid down in the Standards of the Church.

“(2) I would set forth concisely the legal grounds on which we rest our claim to this jurisdiction as an essential article of that Church constitution which the State has ratified.

“(3) I would narrate the usurpations upon that jurisdiction involved in the recent proceedings of the Civil Courts, selecting those cases which are best fitted to bring out clearly and unequivocally the assumption on their part of spiritual power. In doing this, I would take occasion to advert to the origin of this contest, bringing out the fact explicitly that it was in a course of practical reformation, and in the very act of guarding and securing the privileges, not of the *courts* of the Church, but of the *members* of the Church, that her jurisdiction was assailed. Moreover, in detailing the usurpations of the Civil Courts on the ecclesiastical province, I would be at some pains to disclaim all idea of the Church desiring to invade the civil province.

“ *N.B.*—Perhaps the proper place to ‘redd the marches’ between the two provinces would be at the close of the *second* resolution; and so, having laid down the *principles* there, reserve the *third* entirely for *facts*.

“(4) I would bring out the fact that all the forementioned usurpations were in the face of statute and of usage, and unsupported to this hour by any one single decision. And here it might be important to show what the Auchterarder decision—as yet the *only* decision—did fairly establish, and what it did not establish.

“(5) I would bring out the points *now* at issue in the Civil Courts, and show that under these the whole question of the Church's jurisdiction is now under litigation; and that if the actions pending be decided against the Church, the Erastian supremacy of the Stewarts would thereby be restored, and the key-stone with which the Revolution Settlement crowned the arch

of our religious liberties would be wrenched from its place, in defiance of the Treaty of Union, by the mere dictum of a Court of Civil Law.

“And having thus brought the matter to a point at which all Scotchmen might see that the *very liberties* for which our forefathers shed their blood like water were on the point of being wrested from us, I would—

“(6) Bring out simply, but solemnly, the unequivocal intimation of our purpose to stand or fall on this ground,—that, like Luther at Worms, we are brought to the ‘*hier stehe ich!*’—that the affirmance of the supereminent jurisdiction of the Civil Courts will reduce the Church to the necessity of saying, and saying at once, to the Legislature, ‘Give us back our freedom, or we must of necessity regard your simple refusal to do so as *ipso facto* breaking up our Establishment.’

“I do not know if this sketch will be of any use to you, but it will at least set before you the general idea of the thing which, after a good deal of reflection, approves itself to my mind.”

(To Mr. A. Dunlop.)

“GLASGOW, March 18, 1842.

“Peel calls on Maule to bring in a Bill, if he can frame one that will satisfy Scotland, and put an end to our disputes. Would it not be worth while to take him at his word, and to have the Duke of Argyle’s Bill brought in either by Mr. Maule, or (if the Duke of Argyle would not agree to give his Bill up to a Whig) by Campbell of Monzie? It may be brought in on the mover’s own responsibility, and without any connection with the Assembly’s case at all.

“It would give us the benefit of a fresh discussion, and give occasion to try the pledges of last general election.

“This is a *Parliamentary* question. The question, what our *ecclesiastical* parliament, the Assembly, should do in the shape matters have now assumed, is very important. I wrote Candlish on the subject this morning. The more I think of it, the more I am convinced that we may turn this determination to leave us in the hands of the Civil Courts to good account. The grand question now under litigation is shortly this, Is the Church of Scotland an Erastian Church? Do the conditions of her Establishment make her such? If the jurisdiction claimed and exercised in the late proceedings of the Court of Session be found by them, when the point has been fairly raised, to be *theirs* by the law of this land, and if this be affirmed by the House of Lords, of course we are then *at the wall*, and can have nothing more to do but to tell the State either to alter that law or disestablish the Church.

“Now, is it not our duty and our *policy*, in a series of carefully prepared resolutions, to *trace* the question to that result at next Assembly, and to set forth what, in the event of an adverse decision, we shall feel ourselves

solemnly bound to do? This would be the best of all bonds or leagues. The question is one that would unite our party to a man. The Assembly having affirmed these resolutions, we could immediately afterwards take measures to have them signed, not only by the members of Assembly who vote for them, but by all our ministers and elders over all Scotland; and then, and best of all, we could take them to our individual congregations, by whom, when the matter came in *that form*, they would be signed so extensively as to make us a body worth looking at. This, if we are to be driven to the wall, would be a noble preparation for the day of trial. Humanly speaking, it would secure what we have been long aiming at as the grand desideratum,—a means of binding us to stand or fall together.”

(*To Mr. A. Dunlop.*)

“GLASGOW, *June 3, 1842.*”

“Let me urge upon you the necessity of allowing no time to be lost in having the Claim of Right signed by ministers and elders all over the Church. The *momentum* of the Assembly should be taken advantage of. Remember it is our ‘Torres Vedras’ in this struggle, and we should bestow as much pains in strengthening it as Wellington did those famous lines. Again, therefore, I entreat, let no time be lost.

“To save me writing Candlish, will you say when you see him that I hope the co-operation of other religious denominations in the observance of the day of humiliation will be sought respectfully and *early*. It will not do to call on them to join us at the last hour. Would it not be well to send a copy of the Assembly’s Deliverance to the Moderators of all their Presbyteries, and to the different Independent ministers? I have an idea that many of the Secession and Relief are not unwilling now to come to a better understanding with us of the Establishment. Let this state of feeling be improved, and we may yet be one.”

In addition to those letters written in the confidence of friendship, we give one or two more of a different class. So anxious was Dr. Buchanan to avert the catastrophe which he saw approaching, that he left no means untried which might promise the preservation of the Establishment in its integrity. Even, therefore, when prevented from continuing the negotiations in person, he endeavoured to influence the men at the head of affairs with his pen, and during the whole of the year 1842 he seems to have carried on a confidential correspondence with Sir Robert Peel. It would serve little purpose to reproduce that correspondence at length here. The ground

gone over was very much the same as that which we have already seen traversed in his journal and letters to Mr. Dunlop. But the following will be read with interest,—as a sample,—especially as they show that the Evangelicals were too eager for peace on honourable terms to be in the least impracticable. The Strathbogie ministers were righteously deposed, not for “obeying the law of the land,” as it was the fashion of the Moderates to say, but for contumacy of the most reckless and gratuitous description; and there was the best reason for being seriously offended with them. But, to bring about a reconciliation, the leaders on the popular side were willing even to make a bridge for them to return. On the other hand, Sir Robert Peel exhibits, in his view of the situation, a loftiness of air which said sadly little for his comprehension of the true nature of the crisis.

*(Dr. Buchanan to Sir R. Peel.)*

“GLASGOW, *June 2, 1842.*”

“The communication I was allowed to make to you in regard to the affairs of the Church of Scotland, when lately in London, will, I hope, plead my excuse for again addressing you on the same subject.

“Lord Bute will probably inform you of what has been done privately in order to bring about the restoration of the Strathbogie ministers, and thereby to remove the difficulty which their case to some extent may interpose in the way of an amicable settlement. Meanwhile, having been consulted by his lordship on the subject, and immediately concerned in the measures which have been adopted, and conceiving it to be extremely desirable that you should know exactly in what shape the matter stands, I venture to place a short statement of what has been done before you.

“At Lord Bute’s request I gave him in writing a summary of the terms on which the Strathbogie ministers might be reponed. His lordship thereupon framed a paper embodying the declaration they might make to the Church, and after showing it to a few leading members of the Assembly, submitted it to Mr. Whigham, who had been counsel for the deposed ministers. Mr. Whigham thought the paper and the other conditions connected with it contained materials for a settlement of their case which might be acceded to. He was, however, of the same opinion which I had previously expressed to Lord Bute, that it would be impossible to complete the nego-

tiation during the sitting of the Assembly, as several of the Strathbogie ministers were at home in Aberdeenshire. In these circumstances I ventured to suggest to his lordship that the likeliest way to bring matters into the proper train would be by some influential member of the Moderate party asking from the Assembly authority to the Commission to receive any application from the ministers of Strathbogie presently under censure, and from all other ministers who had become involved in their proceedings, and to remove the censures imposed on them respectively if the Commission should see cause. His lordship, concurring in the propriety of this suggestion, spoke of it to Mr. Whigham, by whom it was entirely approved. It was then communicated by his lordship to Dr. Cook, who received it with the utmost cordiality. Accordingly, when the time for appointing the Commission arrived, and for giving it the usual instructions, Dr. Cook rose in the Assembly and formally moved that, in addition to these, it should be further empowered to act in regard to the ministers under censure in the manner above described. The motion was met with the greatest unanimity on the side of the majority, and the Commission was instructed accordingly.

“The best feeling has prevailed throughout the whole sitting of the Assembly between the two parties in the Church; and in promoting and maintaining this friendly feeling, Lord Bute, in his office as Commissioner to the Assembly, has been of most essential service.

“My conviction is decided—and it is that of all who are best acquainted with the state of our Church affairs in Scotland—that if Her Majesty’s Government continue to manifest a disposition and purpose to bring about a settlement of the Scotch Church question, the measures which under Lord Bute’s auspices have been set on foot will be crowned with complete success, the threatened schism will be prevented, the integrity of the Church maintained, and peace and unity restored. An object so unspeakably important will not, I feel assured, be deemed by you unworthy of your countenance.

“I hope to have your forgiveness, if I shall venture in another letter to address you in a day or two on the subject of the more public proceedings of the Assembly, especially as regards the votes on Patronage and the Spiritual Independence of the Church. The former of these in particular is not unlikely to be regarded in England as interposing a fresh obstacle to the settlement of the Non-Intrusion question. If rightly understood, the impression, I feel assured, will be different.”

It can injure no one, at this distance of time, to have the private and confidential grounds stated on which the restoration of the Strathbogie ministers was actually proposed. They were as follows:—



## THE STRATHBOGIE MINISTERS.

“ EDINBURGH, *May 28, 1842.*

“ The grounds on which the Strathbogie ministers were deposed require that any proposal for their restoration should be treated as a case of discipline. This of necessity implies some acknowledgment of error and expression of regret—not merely for the consequences of the course they have pursued, but for that course itself—accompanied at the same time with whatever explanations they may think fit to offer. Those members of Assembly who have had an opportunity of examining the paper handed to them are afraid it does not satisfy, as a statement of the present views and feelings of the parties, the conditions necessary in dealing with a case of this kind. The statement prepared with the same view by Sir George Sinclair, in concert, as is understood, with the late Dean of Faculty, having been refused by the deposed ministers, they feel a difficulty in assenting to any statement less full and explicit.

“ With these general remarks on what they consider as the defective character of the statement, they have further to observe that, should it be so modified as to meet the exigencies of the case, it would be further indispensable that the parties should intimate to the Assembly their willingness—1st, to withdraw the actions raised in the Court of Session against the Church; 2nd, to agree to abstain from the exercise of all clerical functions during the period between the date of their making the above statement and the time to be fixed for recalling the sentence of deposition, in deference to the sentence and authority of the Church.

“ It is quite necessary that it should be understood, further, in connection with any arrangement of this kind, that the Church must be held as reserving full power to make provision for having the ordinances of religion administered to those persons in the seven parishes who have adhered to the Church and separated themselves from the seven ministers, and who may be conscientiously of opinion that it is not their duty to return to their ministry. To force them to do so would be, in the circumstances, alike impolitic and unjust.

While the members of Assembly who have consulted together as requested on this subject have come to the conclusions above expressed, they feel strongly that, amid the pressure of the business of the House, and the shortness of the time allowed for considering the question, they are not in circumstances to do full justice to the subject, in the way of explaining the grounds on which these opinions rest. They are afraid that, within so brief a period of time as now remains before the rising of the Assembly, it is not possible to bring this matter to an adjustment in a way that would be doing justice to a case so difficult and to interests so grave and momentous.

“ At the same time, they feel assured the Church will always be ready

to give prompt attention to this matter so soon as the parties concerned shall put the Church in a position for doing so.

“It is necessary to add, in order to prevent misapprehension, that the Church cannot possibly consent to entertain any proposal for the toleration of the seven deposed ministers, if it be made a part or condition of any arrangement for the settlement of the Church question.”

*(Sir Robert Peel to Dr. Buchanan.)*

WHITEHALL, *June 20, 1842.*

“I beg to apologise to you for having omitted, through the extreme pressure of public business, to acknowledge the letters which I had the honour of receiving from you, dated respectively the 2nd and 11th of June.

“The proceedings adopted and the declarations made at the meeting of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, compelled Her Majesty’s Government to abandon the hope of being enabled by the means of present legislation to compose the unhappy differences which have prevailed among members of that Church.

“The unwillingness to exasperate them, and to diminish the chance of a satisfactory adjustment of them, has induced men of different views on the Church question, and different political opinions, to avoid discussions in Parliament which might have increased irritation, but could not have led to any useful practical result.

“I hope this example of forbearance may have its just influence in Scotland, and dispose the members of the Assembly to more moderate and conciliatory courses than might be inferred from their public acts and declarations.”

*(Dr. Buchanan to Sir Robert Peel.)*

GLASGOW, *June 24, 1842.*

“I have had the honour to receive your letter of the 20th in answer to my letters of the 2nd and 11th inst., and beg leave respectfully to offer my acknowledgments for this mark of your attention.

“It is unfortunate that the proceedings of the late General Assembly of the Church of Scotland should have appeared to Her Majesty’s Government to interpose any fresh difficulties in the way of the settlement of those questions which for some time past have stood so urgently in need of legislative adjustment. They certainly were not intended to have this effect. The imminent danger in which the Church’s whole jurisdiction and government rights and liberties have come to be involved, through the neglect and opposition under which she has been allowed to suffer,—and from which it did not seem that there was any intention to relieve her,—appeared to call for those measures which the Assembly adopted.

“Whenever Her Majesty’s Government shall be prepared to take up this important subject with a view to its settlement, I venture very con-

fidently to assure you that the members of the Church will be found most anxious, as they have always been, to afford every possible assistance, and most willing to concur in any course consistent with the Church's honour and welfare, and fitted to secure the confidence of her people and the good of the country. I feel equally confident that meanwhile the utmost care will be taken to avoid, so far as it lies in the power of the Church to do so, whatever might tend to widen the existing breach, or to lessen the chance of a satisfactory arrangement."

*(Dr. Buchanan to Sir Robert Peel.)*

“GLASGOW, October 19, 1842.

“Since I last used the freedom of addressing you on the affairs of the Church of Scotland, the course of events has every day been rendering more and more manifest the necessity of legislative interference.

“The resuming of communion with the deposed ministers of Strathbogie, to which my last letter referred, is one direction in which difficulties are increasing,—though it is satisfactory to observe that that step does not appear as yet to receive much countenance except from a few of the more extreme men of the Moderate party. There is, however, another and a new feature beginning to appear in the Strathbogie case, which, if some settlement of the general question be not soon effected, cannot fail to issue in the utmost confusion. The deposed ministers are threatening with ecclesiastical censures the minority of their Presbytery, who adhere to the Church. The plea on which they are doing so is that the minority disregard their authority, and refuse to obey their citations when summoned before them. However inept and even ridiculous this attempt at retaliation must appear in an ecclesiastical point of view,—and however unnecessary and useless for any purpose connected with their own temporal interests,—it is sufficiently obvious how speedily and how extensively it may complicate the affairs of the Church, and throw fresh obstacles in the way of their adjustment.

“A still more pressing danger has arisen with the late decision on the Auchterarder question of damages. On the ground of that decision actions of damages are already raised against three different Presbyteries; and in at least one of these cases an arrestment has been laid on the stipends of the ministers in security of the damages claimed, thereby throwing them and their families into a state of destitution. Nor is this by any means the worst or most formidable aspect which that decision wears. It has introduced an entirely new principle into the working of the Scottish Church Establishment. It has placed, for the first time since the Revolution, the Church Courts under the compulsor of an action of damages in discharging an ecclesiastical duty. I am not going to presume to enter here into an argument on that subject. I simply state what the Church firmly believes and thinks herself able, without difficulty, to prove; and to add, what is

clear as the light of day to every one acquainted with the mind of the Scotch Church, that if this principle be maintained and enforced, the immediate dismemberment and the eventual and early overthrow of the Establishment are inevitable.

“To satisfy you that in using this language I am not exaggerating the alarm which this decision has created, I beg leave to hand you a printed circular which I received a few days ago on the subject. The ministers by whom it is subscribed are the senior clergy of the Church,—men whose names carry great weight over all Scotland, both with their brethren and with the members of the Church generally,—and it cannot be reasonably doubted that the sentiments they express are shared in by at least six or seven hundred of the ministers of the Church of Scotland. It were, however, the greatest possible mistake to suppose that those who have issued this circular are not most anxious to avert the calamity which they honestly believe the enforcing of the obnoxious decision must produce.”

In this last letter Dr. Buchanan refers to the preparations which were going on in October for the CONVOCATION, that most memorable gathering of ministers which was held in Roxburgh Church, Edinburgh, in the following month. On that occasion resolutions were adopted which pointed to a disruption as in certain circumstances inevitable. If our statesmen had been as wise then as they became afterwards, when the evil had been irrevocably done, they would have paused in their course and addressed themselves to the business of pacification in earnest. But they were blind to the significance of the events which were occurring under their very eyes. With a reckless disbelief in the conscientiousness of religious parties, they held on their way as if it were impossible that the most solemn engagements could ever bind men to do anything which was against their temporal interests. And it is not at all to their credit, or to the credit of human nature, that they seem to have felt a genuine astonishment when nearly five hundred ministers proved true to their principles and their word.

Read in the light of the history of these later days, what a humiliating story these letters tell! Politicians like Lord

Melbourne, and Sir Robert Peel, and Sir James Graham, had the Scottish Church at their mercy; and the first, out of indolence, the others because they could not tolerate ecclesiastical liberty, higgled about the amount of power they were to give to the Christian people, as if they had nothing higher in hand than a Road Bill. And all the while the noblest and best men of their generation—Chalmers, Candlish, Cunningham, Gordon, Buchanan, Dunlop, Spiers, Monteith, Hamilton—were breaking their hearts in their anxiety to preserve what they considered to be the priceless benefit of a Free Establishment to Scotland. Well, God meant that all these negotiations should fail. And for us they have left lessons by way of legacy. The very last of the letters written by Buchanan to Dunlop before the Disruption contained an aspiration which may yet prove a prophecy. Looking towards those disestablished denominations against which he once himself waged so fierce a war, he said, “We may yet be one.” It was on that line that the subject of this biography finally moved. No man had better opportunities than he had to become acquainted on all its sides with statecraft, and no man was less disposed in the end to entangle himself again in its meshes. His last and dearest hope was to see one great Evangelical Presbyterian Church for Scotland; and he looked for the realization of that in its most effective form without any help from the Imperial Parliament.

Will it, one wonders, be felt by any one to be a consolation to read yet another letter which we may introduce here as a postscript to this chapter? The following was written on the 24th of March 1853, and was addressed by Dr. Buchanan to his son Alexander, who was living then, as now, in England. The visit to London was in connection with, we believe, the Education question :—

“I got home,” says he, “safely and comfortably, after a bustling eight days in London. We had interviews with seven members of the Cabinet,—Lord Aberdeen, Lord John Russell, Sir James Graham, Lord Palmerston, Lord Granville, Lord Lansdowne, and the Duke of Argyle.

“We were everywhere remarkably well received, and hope we were enabled to do some good in helping Government toward a right settlement of the question. If they have only the courage to *act*, and that firmly, there will be no fear of success. They seem still, however, to hesitate about committing themselves out and out to legislate for Scotland. They have determined to begin with England; and the 4th of April will show what you are to have.

“Sir James Graham was at pains to tell us how deeply he regretted his share in bringing about the Disruption. He said ‘he would never cease to regard it with the deepest regret and sorrow as the saddest event in his life that he should have had any hand in that most fatal act.’ He assured me that Lord Aberdeen’s sentiments on that subject were exactly the same as his own. He came over the subject again and again; and of course it was entirely of his own doing, as we would never have dreamed of alluding to the subject.”

## CHAPTER X.

### THE DISRUPTION TIMES.

“THE necessity which presses upon you to resign your situation as ministers of a national institution, has arisen entirely from external causes.....It has been forced upon you by a new and unconstitutional tightening of the bonds of civil obligation. You have felt the framework of the *Establishment* becoming too contracted for the movements of the *Church*; and amidst the progress of a gradual but alarming system of encroachment, you have seen with dread that what was intended as an alliance was about to become a servitude.”

So wrote the Marquis of Lorne (now the Duke of Argyle), in a famous letter which he addressed to Dr. Chalmers on the 6th of May 1843. The Marquis did not see his way to follow out the convictions which he then appeared to express, to their practical issue; but Dr. Chalmers was not so inconsistent. He took precisely the same view of the crisis which his correspondent did; and on the 18th of the same month which brought him this encouraging letter, he became the leader of an exodus whose object was to secure outside the walls of the Establishment that liberty of ecclesiastical action which was found to be impossible of attainment within.

“For Church extension,” said he, addressing a great meeting in Edinburgh two months before the Disruption—“for Church extension I knocked at the door of a Whig Ministry,

and they refused to endow. I then knocked at the door of a Tory Ministry ; *they perhaps would have endowed, BUT THEY OFFERED TO ENSLAVE. I NOW THEREFORE TURN ASIDE FROM BOTH, TO KNOCK AT THE DOOR OF THE GENERAL POPULATION.*"

It was the whole story we have been reviewing, in a nutshell ; and what follows in this biography, in so far as it illustrates the character and complexion of a period, is just an account of how the last of these three experiments succeeded. At one time the belief was universal that if anything great was to be done for the Church or for religion, States or Kings or Princes behoved to be the doers of it. When Luther, for example, began to realize the greatness of the work to which he had been providentially called, he conceived the grand and audacious plan of not merely fighting a defensive battle in Germany, but of carrying the Reformation into Italy, the headquarters of the Pope himself. But for the execution of this plan he looked to some of the dukes or margraves who seemed inclined to play the part of patrons to the new movement ; and they were too timid to take any step which might lead to political complications. If, says the historian, he had, on the contrary, disclosed his scheme to a few poor men with the love of God in their hearts, and sent them over the Alps with the message of the gospel, who knows what a different tale there might have been to tell to-day of the history of religion on the Continent ! Luther had just the same faith in kings, and the same want of trust in the people, which we have seen displayed in the various negotiations which were carried on by the Church of Scotland with the Whig and Tory politicians of England ; and he missed, in consequence, a great opportunity. The infatuation of our statesmen has prevented the maintenance of a like illusion up to the present hour. But for the obstinacy of Lord Aberdeen, Sir Robert Peel, and Sir James Graham, we might have been liv-



ing at this moment under the unbroken belief that religious ordinances cannot be maintained in a country, or its waste places reclaimed, without Parliamentary patronage and a dole out of the public exchequer. The experiment which Chalmers was in a manner forced to try—that of appealing to the general population, or in other words asking the Church to help itself—has not been made under absolutely favourable conditions. The problem really requiring solution was this, Can the Scottish people, apart from State aid, sustain in an efficient way a national and fully equipped ecclesiastical organization? Circumstances prevented that problem from being dealt with in all its breadth. The nation was not unanimous. For the sake of those who did not sympathise with the Evangelicals, the framework of the Establishment was kept up. By-and-by, too, Conservative politicians, seeing the evil effects, so far as the strength of their own party was concerned, of the course followed in a past generation, sought to hark back, with the professed object of getting again on the old lines. And various other things occurred to embarrass and hamper those who in providence seemed called to work out the experiment of establishing a free Church with national dimensions. But, in spite of all the difficulties, the possibility of the thing has been demonstrated. All the more, indeed, that the hindrances were so many, has the success been so signal and conspicuous. Whatever else the history of the Free Church in Scotland has done, it has certainly done this,—it has proved that the Church of a nation may safely dispense with the material help of a State, whenever the conditions of that help come to be incompatible with its own integrity or its own independence.

A disruption had become inevitable. The law, as interpreted by a majority of the Judges, required the Church to

take its directions on all points of duty from the Court of Session, and the Legislature imperatively refused to give any relief. The Claim of Right was rejected in the House of Commons by a majority of 211 to 76; and on the very day that the intelligence of this division reached Edinburgh, two significant illustrations of its practical bearing came from the Scottish Law Courts. The Act of Assembly deposing the Strathbogie ministers was reduced and set aside, and the minority in the Presbytery of Dunkeld was authorised and ordered to proceed to the ordination of Mr. Clark. That is to say, the Court of Session was not content to inflict civil pains and penalties upon the Church because it refused to do what the law required. *It itself assumed spiritual functions*, — on the one hand removing an ecclesiastical censure, and on the other constituting by its own irregular act, and that for a most sacred purpose, a court of Christ's Church.

When the debate was over in the House of Commons which issued in the emphatic rejection of the Claim of Right, the deputation from the Church of Scotland, which was then in London, met together to consider what next was to be done. The deputation consisted of Dr. Patrick Macfarlan of Greenock (the holder at the time of the richest benefice in the Establishment), Dr. Robert Buchanan, Dr. William Cunningham, Dr. Robert S. Candlish, Mr. Alexander Dunlop, and Mr. Buchan of Kelloe. It was a solemn moment, and was felt to be so. But not much consultation was needed. With one voice they agreed that nothing now remained for them but to return home and to prepare for that separation from the State which had become a manifest necessity. There was still some talk about relief, but the principles that had been enunciated had made it transparent that nothing was to be expected which could really meet the emergency.

“Whatever measure may pass,” said Mr. John Hamilton,\* one of the noblest men of the period, “however far it may go, it will be interpreted to the Church and enforced against her by the judgments and decrees and compulsors of the now supreme and sovereign Court of Session.” And a State Establishment offered on such terms was held to be not worth accepting. “Let statesmen establish or disestablish the Church as they choose,” said Dr. Candlish, addressing a great and enthusiastic meeting in Edinburgh a month before the crisis, “THEY HAVE NO RIGHT TO ENSLAVE HER.” The cheering with which the sentiment was received indicated what was the key-note of the Disruption; and it was to secure the coveted liberty of action and government and discipline that the notable event occurred which has nowhere been more graphically described than in the Journal of Lord Cockburn. We quote his account rather than that of any partisan, because it will be received, perhaps, with greater confidence by the general reader:—

*June 8, 1843.*—Dr. Welsh, Professor of Church History in the University of Edinburgh, having been Moderator last year, began the proceedings by preaching a sermon before his Grace the Commissioner in the High Church, in which what was going to happen was announced and defended. The Commissioner then proceeded to St. Andrew’s Church, where the Assembly was to be held. The streets, especially those near the place of meeting, were filled, not so much with the boys who usually gaze at the annual show, as by grave and well-dressed grown people of the middle rank. According to custom, Welsh took the chair of the Assembly. Their very first act ought to have been to constitute the Assembly of this year by electing a new Moderator. But before this was done Welsh rose and announced that he and others who had been returned as members held this not to be a free Assembly; that therefore they declined to acknowledge it as a Court of the Church; that they meant to leave the very

\* Mr. Hamilton died a comparatively young man. Like Mr. Dunlop, he sacrificed his professional prospects as an Advocate for the sake of the Church. When he was taken away, Dr. Candlish, in whose congregation he had been an elder, wrote to Dr. Buchanan that he had lost the friend who had, more than any other, supplied to him the place of a brother.

place, and, as a consequence of this, to abandon the Establishment. In explanation of the grounds of this step he then read a full and clear protest. It was read as impressively as a weak voice would allow, and was listened to in silence by as large an audience as the Church could contain. Whether from joy at the prospect of getting rid of their troublesome brethren anyhow (which they professed), or from being alarmed (which to a great degree was the truth), the Moderate party, though they might have objected to any paper being read even from the chair at this time, attempted no interruption, which they now regret. The protest resolved itself into this, —That the Civil Court had subverted what had ever been understood to be the Church; that its new principles were enforced by ruinous penalties; and that in this situation they were constrained to abandon an Establishment which, as recently explained, they felt repugnant to their vows and to their consciences.

As soon as it was read, Dr. Welsh handed the paper to the Clerk, quitted the chair, and walked away. Instantly what appeared to be the whole left side of the House rose to follow. Some applause broke from the spectators, but it checked itself in a moment. One hundred and ninety-three members moved off, of whom about one hundred and twenty-three were ministers, and about seventy elders. Among these were many upon whose figures the public eye had been long accustomed to rest in reverence. They all withdrew slowly and regularly, amidst perfect silence, till that side of the House was left nearly empty. They were joined outside by a large body of adherents, among whom were about three hundred clergymen. As soon as Welsh, who wore his Moderator's dress, appeared on the street, and people saw that principle had really triumphed over interest, he and his followers were received with the loudest acclamations. They walked in procession down Hanover Street to Canonmills, where they had secured an excellent hall, through an unbroken mass of cheering people, and beneath innumerable handkerchiefs waving from the windows. But amidst this exultation there was much sadness and many a tear, many a grave face and fearful thought, for no one could doubt that it was with sore hearts that these ministers left the Church; and no thinking man could look on the unexampled scene, and behold that the temple was rent, without pain and sad forebodings. No spectacle since the Revolution reminded one so forcibly of the Covenanters.

Having got rid of the "pestilent men," the Moderate party had it all their own way; and they used their recovered power vigorously, and on their principles, with one exception, sensibly. *1st*, They abolished the Veto; *2nd*, They replaced the Strathbogie ministers; *3rd*, They excluded the *Quoad Sacra* and the Chapel of Ease ministers; *4th*, They quashed all the sentences of their opponents which were obstructing friendly presentees, presbyteries, or delinquents, and proclaimed a general jubilee to all the afflicted by the Wild; *5th*, They resolved to apply to Government for legis-

lation; 6th, They testified their want of confidence in themselves by rescinding the Act of last year which gave ministers a discretion in occasionally opening their pulpits to Dissenters. This was the step in which they were foolish. It gave offence unnecessarily, but chiefly to Dissenters, which probably they liked.

*But they could not answer the Protest.* They twice attempted it, and twice failed, none of their committees or volunteers having been able to produce anything satisfactory; and at last they parted, engaging to bring forth an excellent answer before the meeting of their Commission.

Those who had withdrawn were joined by about ninety-three theological students from the College of Edinburgh; by about three-fourths of those in Glasgow; and by a majority of those in Aberdeen. But the most extraordinary and symptomatic adherence was by about two hundred probationers, being probably about a third of the whole probationers in Scotland.

Whatever the exact result may be, it is certain that a sum will be obtained, and has indeed been secured, for the present uses of the Free Church, at least twenty times greater than what was ever raised at once by voluntary contribution for any purpose in Scotland.

Erastianism and Patronage being odious to the people, the Free Church, which opposes these, has more Whiggism in it than Toryism; but being founded purely on religious and not at all on political principles, it has plenty of both; and it is distinguished from all past or existing sects of Scotch Presbyterian Dissenters in this,—that its adherents are not almost entirely of the lower orders. They have already Peers, Baronets, and Knights, Provosts and Sheriffs, and a long train of gentry. The Lord Provost of Edinburgh walked with them from St. Andrew's Church to Canonmills, where the late Provost of Glasgow and the Sheriff of Mid-Lothian joined them. And that extraordinary procession was dignified by about eight old Moderators, two Principals of Universities, and four theological Professors. It has been often said that Presbytery is not a religion for a gentleman; and it is certainly true that hitherto such of our gentlemen as have not been of our Church were nearly sure to be found among the Episcopalians. This is the first time that our gentry are not only not ashamed of Presbytery, but not ashamed of it with the additional vulgarity of unendowed dissent.

Their sentiments towards the Dissenters were narrowly watched. Chalmers made one rash speech on the subject, but explained himself right next day; and all appearances are favourable to the hope that if the two sects which have been driven at the distance of a century from their parent Establishment do not speedily unite, they will at least co-operate. The only obstacle is that most of the old Dissenters are now Voluntaries; whereas all the members of the Free Church have hitherto thought, not merely that an Establishment was expedient, but that its erection was the

duty of the civil magistrate. This principle, however, will abate under disestablishment; and though Voluntaryism prevails among other Dissenters individually, it is not one of their standards as a religious community. The Dissenters, after hitherto promoting the fracture of the Establishment by every possible calumny of those who have left it, are now trying to complete its suppression by covering the same persons with praise, and transferring their abuse to those of the Church whom they have hitherto been flattering for resisting them.

In some views these self-immolations by the ministers are surpassed by the gallantry of the two hundred probationers, who have extinguished all their hopes at the very moment when the vacancies of four hundred and fifty pulpits made their rapid success almost certain.

Yet these sacrifices have been made by churchmen, and not by a few enthusiastic ones—and with no bitterness; with some just pride, but with no boasting, no weak lamentations, but easily, contentedly, and cheerfully. I have conversed with many of them, especially of the obscure country ministers, who are below all idea of being ever consoled by the fame and large congregations which may support a few of the city leaders, and their gentleness and gaiety are inconceivable. But the truth is that these men would all have gone to the scaffold with the same serenity. What similar sacrifice has ever been made in the British Empire? Among what other class, either in Scotland or in England, could such a proceeding have occurred? The doctors? the lawyers?—Oxford? the English Church?—the Scottish lairds? It is the most honourable fact for Scotland that its whole history supplies. The common sneers at the venality of our country, never just, are now absurd.

The Moderates solace themselves by fancying that their return to power makes the Church safe. Their opponents predict that the single fact of this return to power implies that the Church must be speedily ruined. Both are probably wrong. The notion that the secession has done positive good to the Church—which is what some sulky railers actually pretend—is nonsense. Neither is it true that the Establishment cannot survive even the immediate effects of the very peculiar blow by which it has been smote. It is no doubt sorely crippled. What was its soul is gone, and gone to animate a hostile power. But for the present it will survive all this. It is for the future that it has to tremble. The charm that was in the very words, “The Church of Scotland,” is broken. To a greatly increased extent it has ceased to be the Church of the people. The contrast between the popular zeal of Dissent and the official coldness of Establishment is always against any Church; but besides this, what was the Church of Scotland has been placed on a lower level at once, by its being cast off in the face of day by thousands of those who were lately its best friends, led by above a third of its most eminent ministers, the honourableness of whose secession sets them greatly above their renounced brethren. These

pious men have proclaimed by their conduct that in their opinion an Establishment is not indispensable either for public order or for religion. They have opened a rival market for ecclesiastical ability, which will enable it to stand the competition of the Church better than any Scotch Dissenters have yet been able to do. They have dignified Dissent both by their conduct and by the rank of their followers. Theirs is the only Presbyterian battery which has yet played upon the Church from aristocratic ground. Nor is it only in Scotland that the recent transaction will operate. It is the greatest fact that has yet occurred for all the enemies of ecclesiastical establishment. It is their case. The mitres of England may tremble for it. If it be true that the Church of England cannot be destroyed without revolution, this is the most revolutionary event in modern British history. Protestantism was our first reformation; Presbytery our second; this erection of Presbytery freed from the State is our third.

And the failure of adjustment brought matters to this point,—that Presbytery, as understood by the Church, is inconsistent with the genius of modern law.

It is now certain, and indeed admitted by their own public explanations, that down to the very latest moment, nay, after the fatal divorce had actually taken place, though before they had heard of it, Government did not believe that the *threat*, as they styled it, would be carried into effect. There were some important Edinburgh men in London at the time, who had interviews with the leading public men, all of whom, they attest, first sneered at the idea of clergymen throwing away the loaves and fishes, and then were confounded by an act of magnanimity so far above their conceptions. The fact that the coming catastrophe, though at last as certain as the rising of the next day's sun, was not believed by Government, is of itself sufficient to prove their indifference. How *could* they be *truly anxious* for adjustment when they saw no danger? No men could be more strongly admonished. But they opened their ears and their eyes only to one side, and these *friends of Churches* have blown up the best ecclesiastical Establishment in the world.

No individual power could have reared this Free Church. It is the result of a confluence of circumstances. But the men who have had the deepest share in directing these circumstances and in moulding the results have been Chalmers, Candlish, Alexander Dunlop, and Graham Spiers. Neither of the clergymen could have succeeded without the two laymen. Dunlop, in everything except impressive public exhibition, is superior to them both. Calm, wise, pure, and resolute, no one ever combined more gracefully the zeal of a partisan with the honour of a gentleman. His sacrifice is fully as great as that of any of his clerical friends; for the absorption of his time and thought by the Church, in the service of which he has never accepted of one farthing, has, I fear, ruined his practice. I trust that a scheme now under consideration for getting him to write the

history of these memorable transactions will succeed. He is the only person qualified to do it with the intelligence of an actor, and yet with the candour of a disinterested spectator. Yet was even he surpassed by the apostolic Spiers, whose calm wisdom, and quiet resolution, and high-minded purity made his opinion conclusive with his friends and dreaded by his opponents. He had no ambition to be the flaming sword of his party, but in its darkest hours he was its pillar of light. Amidst all the keenness, and imputations, and extravagances of party, it never occurred to any one to impeach the motives, or the objects, or the sincerity of Graham Spiers. On looking back at the whole matter, what I am chiefly sorry for is the Court of Session. The mere purity of the judges it would be ludicrous to doubt. They all delivered what each, after due inquiry, honestly believed to be the law; but passion sometimes invades the Bench, and when it does it obstructs the discovery of truth as effectually as partiality can. The majority of the Court may have been right at first, and to a certain extent; but they soon got rabid,\* insomuch that there seemed to be no feeling except that of pleasure at winging Wild-Churchmen. The apology was that they were provoked by their law being defied; but a court has no right to be provoked. Admitting that the law as laid down ought to have been obeyed, there is no rule which condemns those who are injured by its judicial decision from openly questioning its propriety; and the opposite rule can scarcely apply to the collisions of rival jurisdictions. Where two supreme authorities clash, they cannot be both obeyed; and there is a class of great public questions, involving high public rights, claimed by the people at large, where, though submission to decision may be the rule, disregard of it cannot be wondered at or severely condemned, and will often be applauded even by the peaceably disposed. What more would the Stuarts have required to legalize their tyranny than that the people should have been obliged to obey all that the judges decided? The Court of King's Bench decided that ship-money was lawful; but Clarendon says that when the people "heard this demanded in a court of law as a right, and found it, by sworn judges of the law, adjudged so, *upon such grounds and reasons as every stander-by was able to swear was not law*, they no more looked upon it as the case of one man, but the case of the kingdom; nor as an imposition laid upon them by the king, but by the judges, which they thought themselves bound in conscience and public justice not to submit to.

The general conviction among candid men, that the Court of Session had not always delivered the law, and had scarcely ever done so in a judicial

\* What a curious illustration is here furnished of the fancifulness of the theory that the State and the Church were the two parties in the quarrel, and that the Court of Session was a dispassionate third party who had no interest but in discovering and declaring the meaning of a "contract." On the authority of one who was himself behind the scenes, we are here told that the arbiters themselves "soon got RABID!"



manner, operated as strongly in favour of the Free Church among one class of the people as its evangelical principles did among another. It is this conviction that has given it the aid of such of its adherents as are not religious, but who instinctively resist what they think injustice. Many a thousand pounds, and many a good name, has this feeling got it. The Scotch Court was no doubt supported by the House of Lords—that is, by four English lawyers; and much good did this do it. They only got two or three cases to consider, and these they decided on principles flowing from the law of English King-headed Episcopacy.

Dr. Buchanan was a member of the General Assembly of 1843, and took a leading part in its proceedings. What that part was the published reports tell us, but the reader will be glad to receive also a more private and confidential account of his experiences during those eventful days, and such an account is fortunately furnished to us in the following extracts from letters addressed to Mrs. Buchanan:—

“*Edinburgh, May 16, 1843.*—You will be happy to hear I reached this in safety. I had Mr. Crawford, Crawfordland, in the same carriage, which made the journey the more pleasant. There was a prodigious multitude in the train, and a perfect scramble for the luggage on arriving at Edinburgh. There had been a meeting last night—the first for consultation—Dr. Chalmers in the chair, who made an admirable statement. In the course of the evening Dr. Gordon made a most powerful and impressive speech, which was received with the utmost enthusiasm and unanimity. It is most encouraging to see so much decision and so much of one mind among ministers and elders. It augurs well.”

“*May 17.*—It is quite wonderful to see the perfect unanimity which prevails. Men seem fully to have made up their minds, and to be quite prepared for the great crisis of to-morrow. It is also comforting to observe the entire mutual confidence and affection which prevail among the ministers and elders who have assembled. All seem to feel like *brethren*, and to be deeply impressed with the conviction that God has some great work for us to do, since he has been so evidently and so wonderfully preparing the hearts and minds of all to encounter, calmly and cheerfully, the events that are before us. I forget if I told you that the Protest we are to give in to-morrow to the Assembly is prepared, and was read over several times yesterday at the meetings and unanimously approved. It is a most admirable document, drawn up with great precision and beauty, and very solemn at the close. Dunlop, to whose pen we are so much indebted, drew it up. We meet at one o'clock to-day for the

purpose of signing it, and finally arranging about the way of tabling it to-morrow. Probably there will be only a brief statement made by Dr. Welsh, and then the Protest given in at once.

“You will see many interesting things in to-day’s *Witness*. Isaac Taylor’s letter you will read with satisfaction; it is striking and beautiful. Hugh Miller’s article on ‘State Carpentering’ is also extremely good. If I can find time I will write a few lines again at night.”

“*May 17, half-past seven evening.*—I am here in John Hamilton’s house, where I came to dine and snatch a few minutes before going back to the evening meeting. We had the signing of the Protest this forenoon. It has been resolved that on leaving the *Old Assembly* to-morrow we should go, not to the New Church\* in Lothian Road, but to the great building at Canonmills. The impossibility of finding room for the multitude of elders and others who wish to be admitted is the reason for this change. It is truly a most eventful time; and it is most comforting to see how men’s minds seem to be prepared for it. We are all to go to the levee to-morrow, and to be quite respectful to the Queen’s representative—*all the more* that we mean to leave him in the Assembly.”

“*May 18.*—The eventful day has at length come,—a day that will be memorable in the annals of this kingdom and of the Christian world. All the preparations are now made. The signing of the Protest was continued last night, and was resumed this morning, and will go on till twelve o’clock. Between three and four hundred ministers had signed by the time I left St. Luke’s Church last night; the entire number of signatures will not be ascertained till mid-day. The meeting last night was like all those that preceded it—full of harmony and mutual love; while there was much solemnity, there was at the same time the greatest cheerfulness. Men seemed to be enjoying the calm consciousness of discharging a high and sacred duty.

“It is finally agreed we are not to say a word in the Assembly. *Everything* is to be done by the Moderator, Dr. Welsh.”

“*May 18, half-past seven evening.*—I have just time to say everything has happened in such a way as to make our hearts overflow with gratitude to God. His hand has been most visibly present in the blessed harmony with which this great movement has been made. Immediately after the prayer Dr. Welsh rose, and having briefly stated the nature of the step he was about to take, and the grounds of it, he read the Protest.

“It was listened to in solemn silence. The instant he was done he left the chair, and we all followed solemnly and in order. From St. Andrew’s Church to Inverleith Row the streets were lined with a dense throng, and every window and staircase crowded, and the most intense excitement was exhibited among the people. On arriving at Canonmills, the spectacle of the enormous hall, filled to the roof with the vast assemblage, was most

\* Built hastily for Dr. Candlish’s congregation.

impressive. After a beautiful prayer by Dr. Welsh, Dr. Chalmers was chosen Moderator amid deafening applause. He gave out the last sixteen lines of the 43rd Psalm, which was sung with the utmost ardour and devotion. Thereafter Chalmers prayed with most impressive power and sublimity. He then addressed us from the chair, in a style of wisdom and eloquence worthy of the greatest event of modern times. Thereafter the business of the Assembly was arranged. When Dr. Welsh took the chair in this vast assembly, next to him, on the left, was the Provost; next, Dr. M'Farlane; next, Dr. Candlish. On his right, next to him, Dr. Chalmers; next, Dr. M'Kellar; and next, myself. It was a high privilege to be in such a place. We hear the Commissioner's speech was Sir James Graham's letter over again. Altogether, the events of the day are so marvellous that none could fail to say solemnly within his own heart, 'Verily, God is in this place.' To-morrow I shall write more calmly; at present I have no time, and I am under an excitement of feeling too great for a calm consideration of the events that have taken place. I cannot yet describe them so clearly as I shall be able to do to-morrow."

"*May 19.*—I was quite unable to write you this morning. We had to-day, along with the devotional exercises for which this day was specially set apart, some admirable speeches from the deputies from the Irish Presbyterian Church. The members of the deputation all spoke ably and impressively. To-night we are to take up the concurrence in our Protest of the elders and deacons, the preachers and students of divinity. The motion has been put into my hands, and, totally without preparation, I must venture on it. Dr. Gordon is to second the motion; then, after the concurrence is taken, Candlish is to conclude the whole. I intend to make the Queen's speech the subject of my statement, and to try to show it up,—*of course*, with all the deference due to Royalty, or rather to the Government, whose letter it really is. It is Sir James Graham over again. And this is what we were to wait for !!!"

"*May 22.*—I arrived in all safety here [after the Sabbath], and had Dr. Smyth and some other friends as my companions. On getting to the Assembly in the Lothian Road Church, I found them discussing various matters connected with the schemes of the Church. This last year, £35,000 in all was raised for the different schemes in spite of all our distraction and difficulties, which is £9000 more than the year before. The expectation is confident that even in the midst of all our troubles *more* will be raised for the Church schemes than we have done when living at *ease*. It was announced by 'Monzie' in the Assembly to-day that the Dowager Lady Breadalbane has subscribed £1000 to the Free Church. This is marvellous, as she was hitherto opposed. We thereafter had a private meeting of ministers to consider the draft which is to be submitted *publicly* to the Assembly to-night about the form of our final separation from the Establishment. My *present* feeling is, from the form in which it has been arranged, that I shall

not appear again in the Tron Church, and that I shall have to arrange about opening our new place of worship on Sunday first. I expect to see some of our Glasgow people at the Assembly to-night to fix about it, and shall write you to-morrow morning what I decide on. Of course, if I determine to open the *new* place on Sabbath first, I shall have to return myself to open it. The crowds at the sermons here yesterday were enormous. Candlish preached *inside* Canonmills in the evening to 3500 people. C. Brown and Mr. Chalmers of Dailly *outside* to two congregations of 1200 to 1500 each. Guthrie in Cunningham's Church."

"*May 22.*—The Moderate Assembly have to-day *declared our parishes vacant!* This of course makes it impossible for me to preach in the Tron Church again. Dr. Brown of St. John's and I have agreed to take the City Hall between us for Sabbath first, and to put both our congregations into it at least for one Sabbath. He preaches in the forenoon, and I in the afternoon and evening. I have sent a draft of a hand-bill to Mr. William Brown to advertise, and also to paste up through the streets, and have also written instructions as to all the necessary arrangements. The Moderates have been very prompt, which is all the better for us.

"Mr. Ewing, Levenside, wrote a letter to Dr. Chalmers to-day, which was read in the Assembly, intimating that he casts in his lot with us, and subscribes £2000. This letter will be valuable for the testimony it bears to our principles."

"*May 24.*—You would be disappointed at receiving no letter from me this morning, but I was so engrossed last night that I had not a moment to write. We were at the Assembly till near midnight; and the work of yesterday was the very solemn work of completing everything by a formal deed, which, after prayer to God for strength to make this sacrifice to truth and duty cheerfully, we signed publicly in face of the Assembly, thereby renouncing our status and emoluments in connection with the Establishment. *Now*, therefore, I am no longer minister of the Tron Church or Parish, though still, blessed be God! minister of the glorious gospel of Christ, and pastor, I trust, of a flock ready to follow me to such new place of worship as we may by-and-by procure. We had a meeting of Glasgow ministers at eight o'clock this morning, and resolved that our *new* places of worship should all be opened and occupied by us, God willing, on Sabbath week, but that we should supply our *late* pulpits on Sabbath first, either personally or by substitute. For myself, I am quite resolved *not* to preach again in the Tron Church; but I shall send a minister to do so on Sabbath first, and to intimate to the congregation that those who intend to adhere to the protesting Church and to follow me, will meet the following Sabbath in such place as shall *before then* be fixed on."

To a proposal of Dr. Buchanan, made on the very day of the Disruption, is apparently due an arrangement which has

now continued in the Free Church for a generation—the devotion, namely, of a large part of the second day of every Assembly to religious exercises. But the outstanding incident of his life at this time is his delivery of what the *Witness* describes as “a singularly able and eloquent address” on the principles of the Church. It had been agreed that the evening of Friday the 19th of May should be devoted to an exposition of these principles; and when that evening came the vast hall at Canonmills was crowded to excess. To Dr. Buchanan was (quite unexpectedly, as he tells in one of his letters) entrusted the moving of the first resolution, which was as follows:—“That the Assembly do now invite the concurrence of the elders, and deacons, and probationers, and students of divinity, who have been requested to be present at this meeting, in following out the separation from the Establishment.” We cannot give the whole speech here, but the peroration is well worth reading, as containing a particularly vivid exhibition of that doctrine which some minds find it so difficult to grasp, that a Church virtually surrenders its liberty and independence when it concedes to another power than itself the right to define the limits of its jurisdiction.

“The State,” said he, “is willing to allow us exclusive jurisdiction in spiritual things; but in regard to the question what things are spiritual and what are civil, they tell us they are to be the sole and sovereign judges. We know there was a time when the independence of our ancient kingdom of Scotland was at stake, and when its rights and liberties were endeavoured to be wrested from it by the power of England. Imagine then that after the Balliols, who were prevailed on to surrender their country’s rights to England, had disappeared from the scene, and the heroic spirit of a Bruce had come up to the rescue of his country’s liberties, and infused the spirit of patriotism into the hearts of his country’s sons,—imagine

that when Bruce had come to Bannockburn, and marshalled his host in front of the powers of mighty England, prepared to restore that liberty and these rights, or perish in the attempt to do so,—imagine that, even while the two armies stood lowering on each other, ready to commence the deadly onset, England had sent her servants to Bruce with this intimation : We do not dispute that there is a kingdom in Scotland ; we will allow that Robert Bruce is Scotland's rightful king ; that within it Bruce shall have exclusive jurisdiction ; but if a question should arise as to the limits of the two kingdoms, England reserves to herself the sole right to draw the line and to point out the boundary—(much applause)—that question must be determined by England alone, and at that spot to which the truncheon of Edward points must be the limit of the Scottish kingdom. What answer would Bruce have returned to an announcement such as this ? He might indeed have looked around him, as we have often done in these eventful times, to see if, in the sight of England's chivalry, there were any hearts failing for fear, and might have said to him in language which has been rendered familiar by our national poet,—

‘ Wha wad be a traitor knave,  
Wha wad fill a coward's grave,  
Wha sae base as be a slave,  
Let him turn and flee.’—(Loud cheers.)

But while I say that this might have been the befitting language of Bruce in struggling for the liberties of his country, it is not the fit language for the servants of Christ in maintaining the prerogatives of the Lord. It becomes not us to taunt any man with the name of coward. ‘Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall.’ And if we know ourselves, if we know our own frailty, we will be ready to say that by the grace of God we stand ; and if any of our brethren have given way to temptation at this great crisis, we

will not upbraid them, we will not aggravate the anguish which their own minds must feel, but in such circumstances will only pity them, and pray for their restoration." (The Rev. Dr. concluded amid great applause.)

On the last day of the Assembly some conversation took place on the subject of a loyal address to the Queen, and on that occasion also Dr. Buchanan spoke some most memorable words.

"With regard to the State," he said, "I confess, Moderator, I am not careful with regard to the details of any legislative measure which may be either spoken of in the Houses of Parliament or ultimately passed into a law. What I look to, and what the Assembly looks to, is *the principle on which legislation must necessarily proceed from the State* after having assumed the position it has taken in reference to that Claim of Right that was offered by the General Assembly. They have laid down the principle that the State is supreme; that it is not an ally standing in a co-ordinate position to the Church of Christ, but that the instant the connection between Church and State is formed the Church loses, so to speak, its individuality; loses its own distinctive characteristics and prerogatives, and becomes a mere part and parcel of the State itself. This is laid down unequivocally in the late letter of Her Majesty to the Assembly.....It matters not what legislation the State may offer on this footing. So long as the State maintains and asserts principles like these, we have no desire for any connection with the State at all."

It is also not a little significant that the one official duty which Dr. Buchanan was required to discharge in the Disruption Assembly was to give in a Report of the *Committee of Correspondence with other Evangelical Churches*. While, as Lord Cockburn points out, one of the first acts of the new Established Assembly was to cut off all connection with other

Churches, one of the first acts of the Free Church Assembly was to seek to draw closer than ever to the other Churches of the Reformation.

“It has been,” said Dr. Buchanan, in submitting his Report, “it has been the unhappy practice of the Churches of Christ in times past to think more of the points on which a difference of opinion exists than of those greater and more important doctrines in which they agree. If the Churches had cultivated communion with each other on the ground of their agreement in the great cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith, the very fact of their cultivating that communion in the light of the spirit of Christian love would enable them to see sooner eye to eye as to their lesser points of disagreement.”

To a superficial eye it may seem as if a great gulf had come to divide the once almost intolerant advocate of Establishments from the chairman of a committee aiming at the union of all Nonconforming Presbyterians. But a look beneath the surface reveals the deep underlying consistency. The one anxiety always felt by him was to secure evangelistic efficiency for the Church, and so early as 1843 he who had been fighting for Expansion and Liberty added another legend to his flag, and sought thenceforth for Unity.

Almost incessantly engaged as Dr. Buchanan had been in the public work of the Church, one could not have been surprised if his labours abroad had proved injurious to the interests of his congregation at home. But this does not appear to have been the case. It is indeed strikingly indicative of the high and unselfish spirit of the time, that the office-bearers of the Tron Parish loyally held up the hands of their minister while he was pleading with the statesmen of the day—now for the extension of the Church, now for the preservation of its liberties. These expressions of confidence were naturally greatly valued, and some



of them remain unto this day. We give one as a specimen :—

‘ GLASGOW, 25th January 1843.

“ REV. AND DEAR SIR,—We the Subscribers, Elders of the Tron Church, having met and taken into consideration the Resolutions of the late Convocation of Ministers, fully sympathizing in the circumstances of difficulty in which our National Church is placed, have drawn up and signed a declaration of adherence to these Resolutions; which we beg now to enclose to you, with the request that you will transmit the same to the Committee in Edinburgh.

“ In thus bringing before you our feelings in reference to the Church of our fathers, we gladly embrace the opportunity of expressing to you our cordial sympathy and approbation in the course you have yourself pursued, and the sacrifices you have made in these trying and difficult times; and that it is our earnest prayer that the Lord may give you much of His presence and grace, to enable you to persevere in the same firm and judicious course.

“ Assuring you of our continued Christian affection and esteem, we remain, Rev. and Dear Sir, yours very faithfully,

“ WILLIAM BROWN, Elder. “ WILLIAM RIGBY, Elder. “ JAMES M'GROUTHER, Elder. “ JAMES M'CALL, Elder. “ ROB. PHIMISTER, Jun., Elder. “ WILLIAM LOCHHEAD, Elder.		“ GABRIEL WALKER, Elder. “ ALEX. LAIRD, Elder. “ ROBERT BURNS. “ NATHL. STEVENSON. “ WM. LAMONT, Elder. “ WM. M'LAREN, Elder.
--	--	--

“ TO THE REV. DR. BUCHANAN.”

With such a spirit prevailing in the congregation, there was not much likelihood of disappointment when the crisis came. And, in point of fact, the response made to the call to join in the exodus was gratifying beyond all expectation. We are indebted for the following interesting account of what took place in connection with the Tron Church at the Disruption period, to one who has himself since done much good service in the parish as an office-bearer of the Free Church :—\*

“ On the 14th of May 1843, Dr. Buchanan occupied the pulpit of the old Tron Church, Glasgow, for the last time. I was present at both diets of worship, but cannot recall anything special in the services, except that in the afternoon the text was 1 Peter iv. 17—‘ For the time is come that

\* Mr. Morison, of the firm of Collins & Co.

judgment must begin at the house of God.' There was, of course, special allusion to the solemn and peculiar circumstances in which the Church was at that time placed, with a pointed application, setting forth the duty of every member of the Church to realize the responsibility of the times, and to decide and act accordingly.

"At the close of the service, just before pronouncing the benediction, Dr. Buchanan made a short statement to the congregation regarding his own resolution as to the impending crisis in the Church's affairs. He referred to the rejection of the 'Claim of Right' by the Legislature in the month of March preceding; and that as this was the final decision of the Government to the Church's claim, there seemed no other course open to the Church, consistent with true allegiance to her Divine Head and Lord, but that of separating from the State, whose terms of Establishment were contrary to the Word of God and the Church's own Standards.

"He further intimated that in all human probability he would before next Sabbath have ceased to be a minister of the Establishment, but that he would most probably be permitted to occupy the pulpit of the Tron Church once more; but that it would be merely to inform the congregation of what had taken place during the week, and to state what arrangements had been made for their accommodation for the future.

"Before next Sabbath, however, the great crisis had come, and what had been anxiously expected by some, and so stoutly denied as ever likely to happen by others, had become an accomplished fact.

"Dr. Buchanan having, along with so many others, signed the Protest and Deed of Demission, had thereby ceased to have any legal right to appear in the pulpit of the Tron Church. He seemed, however, to have entertained the hope that he might have been allowed to occupy his old pulpit once more; but on the Monday after the Disruption the Assembly of the Established Church passed a resolution declaring the parishes of all the ministers who had signed the Protest vacant—thus interposing a legal barrier to his carrying out his intention or hope of appearing once again in the old familiar place.

"This prompt action on the part of the Assembly of the Establishment rendered it necessary for Dr. Buchanan and those of his office-bearers who adhered with him to take steps at once to secure a place of meeting for the congregation. This was no easy matter, as only one or two days were available for the necessary inquiries and arrangements. On Saturday, however, June 1st, it was announced that the congregations of St. John's and the Tron would meet together for worship in the City Hall, the largest place of meeting at that time in Glasgow. The venerable Dr. Thomas Brown of St. John's was to preach in the forenoon, and Dr. Buchanan in the afternoon and evening.

"Dr. Buchanan had been detained in Edinburgh on the business of the Church till far on in the evening of Saturday; coming home, we believe, to Glasgow by the last train, when he had no opportunity of learning how

matters exactly stood—at least, he was not aware of what kind of reception he was to get next day. I have heard him tell with what an anxious heart he left his house in Richmond Street on the Sabbath morning of the 21st May, but that all his fears were completely dispelled when he came to the head of Candleriggs Street, the principal entrance to the City Hall. The large, eager, anxious crowd which at that early hour thronged the street, told that the excitement and enthusiasm he had witnessed in Edinburgh during the previous three days were not confined to the actual scene of the Disruption, but were as intense and deep in the west as in Edinburgh itself.

“Not estimating the extraordinary feeling which had taken hold of the community, I had not considered it necessary to go to the City Hall till twenty minutes before eleven o’clock, when I found it utterly impossible to get even near the outer door of the building. Several hundred people were at that early hour crowding the street; and I was told the hall was completely filled, and large numbers were eagerly inquiring where Dr. Lorimer, Dr. Forbes, or Dr. Henderson were to preach.

“I was again at the City Hall door about one o’clock, when the congregation who had worshipped in the forenoon was dismissed. Many of these, however, preferred remaining in their seats, enduring a long fast, and what in most circumstances would have been a weary waiting, to losing the chance of hearing Dr. Buchanan. By great exertion and hard squeezing I got inside the hall at a quarter past one o’clock, but could only obtain standing room in the west gallery. The hall was at that time (three quarters of an hour before the time of public worship) completely packed. It was estimated that there could not have been fewer than four thousand people present. The position I occupied was one well adapted for seeing the audience, but I greatly feared the speaker’s voice would be lost at such a distance. I had only recently come to Glasgow from a small village in Stirlingshire, and had not been accustomed to see large masses of human beings together. I was greatly interested in watching the crowd below in the body of the hall, as well as that thronging the gallery around me. What struck me most was the evidently suppressed excitement and subdued earnestness of the mass. No one could fail to see that there was a deep feeling of anxiety on almost every countenance; but there was scarcely any one who cared to give expression to their feelings by conversation; even the usual custom of whispering to one’s neighbour, common enough on ordinary occasions, was hardly to be noticed. There was, however, a flutter of excitement when at two o’clock Dr. Buchanan entered the hall. After taking his place on the platform, he commenced the services in the usual way, his whole manner betokening a sense of deep solemnity. His text was Exodus xiv. 15:—‘Speak unto the children of Israel, that they go forward.’ The first part of the discourse was a clear, graphic description of the position of the Israelites—pursued by the Egyptians, hemmed in on the right and left by the mountains, with the Red Sea before them.

This sketch was one of those masterly historical descriptions which all who attended Dr. Buchanan's ministry knew he so greatly excelled in. So vividly was the whole scene described, that for a while nearly all remembrance of the occurrences of the last few days were forgotten—so completely did he throw himself into his subject. When he had thus gained his audience, and brought them into complete sympathy with himself and his subject, he then applied it to the circumstances in which the Church was placed,—giving, in a brief, comprehensive manner, an account of the various stages of the conflict in which she had been engaged, and the position into which she had now been driven; and that to us, as unto the children of Israel, the word of the Lord was, 'Go forward.'

"It is impossible, at this distance of time, to convey an adequate idea of the profound impression this discourse made on those who heard it. Dr. Buchanan was then almost in his very prime; and though his head had grown prematurely grey, he had all the vigour and elasticity of his youth. Coming so recently, too, from the exciting scenes of St. Andrew's Church and Tanfield Hall, he was glowing with the enthusiasm of the great event in which he had taken so conspicuous a part, and of which he was to be the future historian. He rose at times to passages of great eloquence, delivering them with a fire and warmth of manner which he only allowed himself to give way to on great occasions. It is not too much to say that his words that day stirred many a heart like the sound of a trumpet, and that some who were faint and hesitating were fairly captivated by his eloquence and power, and from that day unhesitatingly cast in their lot with the Free Church of Scotland, as the party of progress and the hope of their country for the future.

"For a few Sabbaths after the Disruption the congregations of Free St. John's and the Free Tron continued to worship together in the City Hall. This, however, was found to be inconvenient in many ways, and especially as the place was too small for two such large congregations. Dr. Brown's congregation therefore found another place of worship in Blackfriars Street; and the Tron, under Dr. Buchanan, was left to occupy the City Hall till the new church in Dundas Street was opened. This did not take place till the summer of 1844.

"After Free St. John's congregation left the City Hall, the real strength of the Free Tron became manifest; for though no doubt existed that the great bulk of the congregation had left the Establishment, it remained to be seen whether they would remain as a united congregation, especially after the excitement of the Disruption was over. If any fears were ever entertained on this point they must have been speedily dispelled, for Sabbath after Sabbath the City Hall was respectably filled with large and attentive audiences. There could not have been fewer than fifteen to eighteen hundred present every Sabbath; and this continued during the whole time the congregation remained.

“At the Disruption there were thirteen elders in the Tron Session ; and of these ten separated along with Dr. Buchanan, while the relative proportion of the congregation was even greater. By October 1843 the congregation was so organized that the city was divided into convenient districts, these being allocated to the elders, with lists of the members in each.”

At this stage, marking so definitely the opening of a new page in the Life, we may go back for a moment to recall some points of personal interest which the nature of the narrative did not admit of being taken notice of at the time.

“Will you hold up your hands if I tell you,” writes Mr. Buchanan to his friend Mr. Dunlop on the 18th of December 1840, “that the Senatus of Glasgow College has just conferred upon me the degree of D.D. ? I have this moment had a note from Professor Ramsay, announcing the fact. It was altogether unknown to me, his proposal, and was, he says, cordially and unanimously agreed to.”

In the following year a vacancy took place in the Church History Chair of Glasgow University. The right filling up of so important a post was, of course, a matter of keen concern to the Evangelical majority in the Church. But the appointment was in the hands of an unfriendly Government. The vacancy occurred in the height of the conflict, when men were preaching in Strathbogie in open defiance of Court of Session interdicts. And the difficulty was to find a candidate who was at once on the right side and not absolutely obnoxious to the State authorities. By universal consent Dr. Cunningham was hailed as the fittest man ; and as long as there was any hope of his receiving the post, no other ventured to present himself from out of the ranks of the Evangelicals. But when it was made unequivocally known that there was no chance of his being honoured as he deserved, attention was turned to the claims of Dr. Buchanan, who had served the Church as heartily, but who, as it happened, had

not broken the *cordon* which the judges had drawn around Strathbogie. Dr. Buchanan himself was earnestly in favour of the proposal that he should stand for the Professorship. He was at the time harassed and disheartened by the pressure of public business, and he longed for the quiet and composure of a Chair. But even he was held to be too dangerous a person to receive anything like a political distinction, and the current of State favour was allowed to flow in another direction. It is very curious, however, to look through the letters of that period, and see at how many points the chains were then fretting.

“I spoke to Drs. Welsh and Candlish,” writes Mr. Dunlop, “about the Glasgow Chair, and both agree that if Cunningham’s appointment be hopeless, you are decidedly the person whom the friends of the Church should endeavour to have placed in it.” “I am quite satisfied,” he writes again, “that Cunningham’s appointment would be quite hopeless, and as soon as he arrives I hope to get him and our other friends to concur in giving up the idea altogether. I have been told here that Government will listen very mainly to the request of the Liberal Professors in the University, but that they look to *Dr. Forbes*. If it had been the Chair of Mathematics or Natural Philosophy, I could have understood this.....Candlish has gone to Huntly to open the new church there. He was served with an interdict before he started.” “Cunningham,” he reports at a later date, “is reluctant to abandon all hope of the Professorship. I believe it to be perfectly hopeless, however, and as I presume the Liberal Professors won’t stir a finger for him, I really can see no reason why they should not be allowed to follow their inclinations as to you. The Tories are vicious against the appointment of Candlish [to the chair of Biblical Criticism in the University of Edinburgh]. I trust, however, the Government won’t show the

miserable weakness of yielding to their clamour." The Government, however, did prove as weak as Mr. Dunlop hoped it would not be. Dr. Candlish's appointment was cancelled, and the following was written in consequence:—"After what has fallen from Lord Normanby, we are here clearly of opinion that it would only be degrading ourselves and courting insult to allow any application from Glasgow for any of our friends, whether individually they may have broken the interdict or not. It would also be subjecting them to a misrepresentation, already used here, that the leaders were trying to get into snug quarters before the storm. What else we may have to do requires some consideration; but, black as things are, boldness and decision are more than ever our only course.....The petition and complaint against Candlish [for opening the new church at Marnoch] was printed, but on hearing that the Government had done their work for them, the advisers of the seven [Strathbogie ministers] countermanded it." Two days after, Mr. Dunlop writes again: "There is nothing to prevent their appointing Candlish which does not apply to you; and if they could be so bullied as to appoint you, they could as easily be bullied to appoint Cunningham himself. I hold the attempt absolutely hopeless, and even were it otherwise I would not descend to make it. In my own case, I have written to stay any proceedings in a matter pending for my own benefit, and even if voluntarily offered I don't think I could, in my present frame of mind at least, accept an appointment. Candlish has written a noble letter to Lord Normanby. It goes off to-night, and I hope will appear in the London newspapers of Monday."

In tracing the history of a public man, and meeting constantly the expression of his anxieties about outward events, one is apt to forget that he moves also within an inner circle where the surrounding circumstances are not less

influential in their way than those which appear to the external world. Dr. Buchanan experienced, during the years we have been reviewing, the usual vicissitudes of family life; and one trial in particular came upon him in the midst of the correspondence of which a sample is given above. His wife died on the 29th of April 1841, and during the two years which followed—while the conflict was at the hottest—his fireside was without the cheer which had been hitherto maintained in it by the sympathy and support of the dearest friend of his youth. Happily the breach was made up in March 1843, when he married again. His second wife—Miss Stoddart—who survives him, proved all through his after-life a true helpmate, and contributed not a little to his effective performance of the manifold duties which, as time wore on, came to be laid in increasing number upon his shoulders.

“I have,” writes Mrs. Buchanan, “a very perfect recollection of the continual demands made upon Dr. Buchanan’s time after the Disruption. Our home for the first year of our married life was in Richmond Street, and he used sometimes to say that he might almost as well live in the street as in his study, which was very accessible to callers. His absences from home were unavoidably very frequent—in Edinburgh (often), and on deputations to Ireland, England, and throughout Scotland. At the same time, the care of his own flock was by no means overlooked.”

It was indeed a busy time. Though the Disruption was in the most real sense an act of faith, and many went out under the constraint of conscience who literally knew not what was to become of them, there was no presumptuous fanaticism about the transaction. When the crisis was seen to be inevitable, such provision was made for it as was dictated by an enlightened common sense. Under the direction



of Chalmers, associations were organized for the raising of money and for other Church arrangements; and nothing was neglected which seemed likely to aid in the great business of launching and sustaining the disestablished Church. In this service many workers were needed, and conspicuous among these, in the west, was Dr. Buchanan. The same unwearied activity which had been shown in the endeavour to preserve to Scotland the benefit of a free Establishment, was now directed to the upbuilding of the Church in its despoiled and separated state.

The importance of Glasgow in connection with the Free Church movement was recognized from the outset, and emphatic evidence of that was given in the resolution to hold a special General Assembly there within the year of the Disruption. October was chosen as the month most suitable for this purpose; and so early as nine o'clock in the morning of the seventeenth day of that month, every available place in the City Hall was filled by an eager and interested audience. Dr. Chalmers, the past Moderator, preached from Nehemiah xi. 16—"And Shabbethai and Jozabad, of the chief of the Levites, had *the oversight of the outward business of the house of God;*" after which he proposed as his successor in the chair Dr. Thomas Brown of St John's.

Here, in this Assembly, we come on many of the springs from which issued the fuller streams of after-days. The Disruption Assembly had necessarily a great deal of the aspect of a demonstration about it. Much substantial business indeed was done; for the leaders of the movement of 1843 were not only not mere enthusiastic dreamers, but were among the most thoroughly practical men of their day. But the Church in May had little time to realize itself. It did not even know its actual numerical strength. It had yet to ascertain how the people throughout the country were to regard the sacrifices

made on their account, and all was yet dark as to the amount of work requiring to be faced, and the character of the difficulties needing to be overcome. It is deeply interesting, therefore, to pass into the second Assembly of the Free Church, and observe the result of five months' experience.

1. Dr. Candlish, as Convener of the Acting Committee, was now able to report the following as to the available ministerial force in the Church, and the extent to which there was a demand for its services:—"First as to *Congregations*—Number of congregations of adhering ministers, 449; of congregations supplied with ministers since the Disruption, 47; of congregations with ministers called, 29; of congregations still unsettled, 90; of preaching stations, 139: total, 754. *Labourers*—Ministers outed, and remaining in their old charges, 432; ministers removed to new charges, 18; ministers unsettled or called, 15: total, 465. Probationers ordained since the Disruption, 30; probationers adhering at the time of the Disruption, and not yet ordained, 110; probationers licensed since Disruption, and not yet ordained, 28. There are therefore 432 who have left their old charges, and it will thus appear that we have at this moment about 754 stations to be supplied. Of these upwards of 600 are fixed congregations, and several others nearly ripe for the calling of ministers. To meet the 754 places where supplies are to be given, we have 465 ministers who left the Establishment, 30 probationers who have been ordained since, and 240 probationers—in all from 600 to 700 labourers."

2. On the subject of Finance, Dr. Chalmers made a long statement, which is in many ways a memorable one. We can extract from it only one or two sentences. "I have no doubt," said he, "that it is the duty of a Christian Government to supply funds for the support of the gospel, and to see to the future support of the gospel, in the country over which

they are placed. And I would have been very glad to draw from them so long as I cherished the hope that I could get anything from them; but the first Government we had to deal with on the subject refused to endow; and the second would have been very willing to endow, but then they first wanted to enslave. On their terms we could not accept of any assistance; and here then we are reduced to the necessity of drawing from internal and external Voluntaryism alone. I shall be exceedingly delighted with the success of our experiment; and in point of fact we have some reason for looking forward to the sufficiency of these two resources. We waited upon Government for six years, and got nothing for our pains. We were forced, in fact, to relinquish all connection with the latter Government; and turning round to the population of the country, after years of unavailing negotiation with the Government, in a few months the population came back with the magnificent response of £300,000. I look forward now, therefore, with more hope than I did with regret before; and in regard to our friends the Voluntaries, we have come to understand each other better. I am glad to understand they are taking a leaf out of our book. They are beginning to institute a general fund. I rejoice to hear it; for the more our points of similarity are multiplied, the greater likelihood is there of our being amalgamated before all is done. They have taken that leaf out of our book, and we have many a leaf to take out of theirs. Well, then, what is the amount of the difference betwixt us? It is simply in regard to the duty of a third party, with whom neither the one nor the other has any connection in matters of this kind. And what is the general fund? The general fund, if I have taught you to comprehend its functions, is a fund which owes its origin altogether to external Voluntaryism. It is the contributions of the wealthy, and the contributions indeed of all congrega-

tions, going to the support of all the other congregations in Scotland, or *external* coming in aid of what *internal* Voluntaryism will do. I quite agree with Voluntaryism in this generic sense of the term, as comprehensive both of external and internal. Then, I say, the only difference between the Free Church now and the Established Church before, is, that whereas the Established Church was a State-endowed Church, the Free Church, still retaining the principle of an endowment, is a people-endowed Church."

3. It was very natural that great anxiety should have been felt in connection with the question of how, with so much to do in the way of reconstruction at home, the Church was to be able to face the work of carrying on also missionary operations abroad. At the Assembly in May, it was not known even whether it would have any missionaries of its own to support. Dr. Brunton, the Convener of the Established Church Committee, had written at once an official letter to India, expressing an anxious wish for the continued co-operation of Dr. Duff and his co-adjutors in the mission there; and as, until the mail could go out and home, it could not be ascertained what was to be the result, the letters received from Calcutta and other fields during the summer of 1843 appeared in the *Missionary Record* of the Establishment, while the new organ started by the Free Church had to content itself with using such material as it could lay its hands on anywhere. A few weeks, however, before the meeting of the Glasgow Assembly, all doubt on the subject was brought to an end; and Dr. Gordon, the new Convener of the Foreign Missions Committee, was able to make this announcement:—"Your Committee have very little to report in regard to their own proceedings. But, in the absence of the usual missionary intelligence, it is their privilege to record an event which not only gives a peculiar interest to

the first report of your Committee far beyond what any efforts of theirs could have given it, but which will, they believe, be long memorable in the history of your great enterprise. With unspeakable satisfaction, and, they trust, with a feeling of deep and devout gratitude to God, they have now officially to announce, what they ventured in their late address to express their hope of, that ten of the thirteen missionaries in India have declared their adherence to the Free Protestant Church of Scotland." On a later day the Moderator interrupted the proceedings to make an intimation which he said he had received that morning, to the effect that all the missionaries at Madras had also sent in their adherence to the Free Church. There was, then, to be an unbroken mission band in India. But since 1839 efforts had begun for the conversion of Israel also, and in May it was not known in what relation the disestablished Church was to stand to that mission. The venerable Dr. Alexander Keith, the author of "The Prophecies," had been appointed Convener, but he was not able to be present in Glasgow in October, and Dr. Candlish made the following statement on his account:—"I have the pleasure of reporting to the House that all the missionaries and all the agents employed by the Established Church in the conversion of the Jews have declared formally their adherence to the Free Church of Scotland. Not only have the missionaries all declared their adherence, but those other persons, some of them converted Jews, who were agents along with them in this work, have also signified their adherence. We have the concurrence with us, therefore, in the maintenance of our principles, of all the labourers in this department of the vineyard of the Lord. I have the pleasure of reporting, secondly, that as it has pleased God to honour this Church by giving to us the men whom he has raised up and sent forth into the field, so since

our separation from the State he has put it into the hearts of his people at home to contribute so liberally that the Committee are now in possession of funds for the support of the Jewish Mission, on the same scale as it existed before, during the present year."

4. More significant, however, even than all this, was a report submitted by Dr. Chalmers on the addresses which, as Moderator of the first Assembly of 1843, he had received from other Churches. On the 18th of May one more came to be added to the already too great number of Protestant denominations, and to a superficial observer it might have seemed as if the movement of the Free Church had been on the line of disunion and disintegration. "But," says Dr. Hanna, "as there is that scattereth and yet increaseth, so there is that divideth, yet it tendeth to unity. So it was with the Disruption. Blamed by many as a schismatic act, a great prompter to and promoter of division, no public incident of our times has done more to bring together into one the scattered Churches of the Reformation.....Within two years, and around the Moderator's chair, of those Assemblies more Christian ministers of a greater variety of profession, and from greater distances on the surface of the earth, met for Christian fellowship, than have ever congregated in modern times at the councils of any of our existing Churches." "I confess to you," said Chalmers, "that I was much interested by the arrival, one post after another, of addresses and resolutions expressive of approval and congratulations from various Churches, of whose very existence I was not aware till I received their letters. And I think that every man whose heart is in its right place will be delighted with such movements. They are movements quite in my own favourite direction, because one and all of them are movements of convergency; or, in other words, movements which point in

the first instance to union, and as soon as is possible and prudent I trust their landing-place will be incorporation. These movements are not altogether new; but they are, at least, very rare in the Christian world. The movement generally within the interior of Christendom has been a movement of divergency; or, in other words, a movement which led to splits and separations innumerable. It is quite in keeping with the delightful transactions which I trust one and all of us shall witness this evening, that I should communicate the fact of having received, as the Moderator of the Free Church, a number of formal addresses and resolutions from various bodies in England and Ireland, as well as two or three from foreign places. They amount, those I have received directly addressed to myself, to nineteen; and there is one that has been handed into the Clerk since we met; so that, altogether, these addresses and resolutions congratulatory of the movement which has been adopted by the Free Church of Scotland amount in number to twenty."

One of these addresses (that from the Synod of the Original Seceders) was of a specially gratifying kind. It recognized the Free Church as the Church of Scotland to which, if they had lived to see it, the Erskines would have proposed to return; and although in some of the other letters of congratulation received the joy was expressed a little too strongly, as was thought, simply on account of deliverance from any connection with the State, yet it is marvellous to read how lightly the members of Assembly had already come to regard the advantages of an Establishment.

"My friends," said Dr. Candlish, "will bear me witness that I am the very last person who would stand on the rigid assertion of the mere theory of Establishments, for the purpose of keeping up division or schism in the Church. So far from that, it appears to me that the distinct refusal of the States

and Kingdoms of this world to recognize the only principle on which we can consent to have the Church established—their refusal to establish the Church of Christ, while they recognize her spirituality and freedom—leaves us to a very great degree of practical liberty, and a large measure of practical discretion, as to the terms on which we should stand with other Churches. Is the division and schism of the Christian Church to be kept up by a question as to the duty of another party over whom we have no control? Let it be that we maintain our different opinions as to the duty of the State to support the Church, and the duty of the Church to receive support from the State when it is given consistently with spiritual freedom; still shall that question which has become a mere theoretical question in the Church of Christ, and which, so far as we can judge, seems destined to be a theoretical question till the time when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ—shall that question prevent cordial co-operation and harmony among ourselves, and our united action in defence of our common Protestantism against the common foe? The questions that remain among ourselves may stand in part as an obstacle against the union of incorporation; but I rejoice to adopt the words of my respected father, and say that they do not for a moment stand in the way of the union of co-operation.”

But a still more wonderful phenomenon presented itself when some of the leaders in the old Voluntary controversy appeared—Dr. Struthers of the Relief, for example, and Drs. Heugh and John Brown of the United Secession Churches—and openly fraternized with their ancient antagonists, the Church Extensionists. And now all their talk is of combined effort for common ends. “We inhabit,” said one of them, “the same favoured and beloved land; we have the same encouragements and discouragements,—the same coadjutors



and opponents,—the same motto of *Spirituality and Independence* inscribed upon our banners,—and that Lord, who, as Lord, is both ours and yours, points to the same land to be occupied, and says to the one and the other of us, ‘Go ye up and possess it.’ It will not be understood that I wish to precipitate union. I do not think we are yet ready for incorporation. The event, I believe, will come; and I think we may take sin and shame to ourselves that it is not nearer. But as we cannot unite at present, whatever may be the blame attaching to the impossibility, all I suggest is that we keep the end in view, and beware of committing one act, or even uttering one word, that would either retard or embitter the happy consummation.”

5. One more feature in the Glasgow Assembly may be noticed, as illustrating the circumstances under which the Free Church commenced its career. Somehow or other the idea had laid strong hold upon certain great proprietors that the Disruption movement was of the nature of a summer flood, and that as it must soon pass away it would be a thousand pities to give it any artificial help. Such was the conviction, for example, of the Duke of Sutherland; and he and others took up the position of refusing sites for the erection of churches. A letter read by Dr. Candlish gives a graphic picture of the state of feeling in which this intolerance originated:—

“*To the Committee for the Free Church in the Parish of Cawdor.*

“GENTLEMEN,—As factor for the Right Hon. the Earl of Cawdor, and as authorized by his Lordship, I have to state, in reference to your application for a site on which to erect a place of worship in connection with the ‘Free Church,’ that his Lordship, though feeling compelled by a sense of duty to decline granting your request as then made, is now willing, in the hopes that time may compose the unhappy differences on ecclesiastical matters which at present exist in the parish, to allow the erection of a shed or temporary place of worship on the pasture or waste lands at Newton of Budgate; but under the following conditions and reservations,—namely,

that the said erection shall be wholly of (wood) timber, and that it shall be removable by me, or the Earl's factor for the time being, at any time, on giving three months' notice in writing to any one of your number, or to the minister ordinarily officiating therein at the time. Should you fail to remove it yourselves within that time, the materials, if removed by me, as being his Lordship's factor for the time being, to be sold, and—[mark, I pray you, the generous liberality of his Lordship's offer]—the proceeds, if any remain after paying the expenses of the removal and sale, to be lodged in the British Linen Company's Bank at Nairn, or other bank there, for your behoof. [But this is not all: mark the generous and princely manner in which access to and from the church is to be secured to the congregation.] That the consent of John Grant, the tenant of Newton of Budgate, shall be obtained by you to such erection, and that any claim by him for abatement of rent, or for damages on account thereof, shall be borne by you, he expressly relieving his Lordship from any such claim; and that you shall likewise indemnify his Lordship for any damage which may be done to his plantations and fences, as well as his tenants for any damage done to their crops and fences, or property, by persons going to, or returning from, the said place of worship.—I am your obedient servant.”

The indignation excited by such a style of acting was immense, and the vehement cheering which followed any allusion to the subject revealed the existence of an amount of impatience with the site-refusers which might have proved dangerous in various ways if they had not eventually seen it to be best to give in. A note of warning, in particular, was sounded in an eloquent speech by Dr. Begg. “We heard much said last night,” said he, “and very admirably said, of the hateful and odious persecution to which we are exposed in Sutherland and elsewhere, and an excellent resolution was passed on that subject. But I am persuaded that we shall in all likelihood require to aim at more than this before the evil is remedied. If the British Parliament can drive a railway through the English estates of his Grace the Duke of Sutherland, is it not reasonable to ask that the same body should control his individual will, and by Act of Parliament should secure that he shall be compelled if necessary—” (The close of the sentence was lost in enthusiastic cheering). “Something

has been said about the ignorance of his Grace. I cannot hold that a man in his position is entitled to be ignorant of the state of any portion of his property. But if he is ignorant, our deputations to England—especially if they go, as I hope they will go, to the neighbourhood of Trentham Hall, where his Grace resides, and hold, as I trust they will, meetings in his immediate neighbourhood—these deputations will dispel his ignorance. Something has been said of the danger of starting questions about the origin and rights of property ; but the only way to prevent the starting of such questions is for the Legislature to take the matter into its own hands, and by Act of Parliament to do that for the public good which an individual will not do, and as the consequence of not doing which all the interests of the empire are put in jeopardy.”

Dr. Buchanan, though a member of this Assembly, did not take much part in its proceedings. He thought it best, probably, to allow the people of his own city to hear as much as possible from those with whose voices they were less familiar than with his own. In one case, however, he took a prominent lead, and the speech which he delivered in connection with it has some significance. A new Presbyterian congregation had been formed in the west end of London, and a call had been addressed to the then most popular minister in Edinburgh—the Rev. Thomas Guthrie—to go south and become its minister. It was a bold invitation, but it is strikingly indicative of the far-seeing wisdom of the men of those times that the thing was not at once dismissed as preposterous. Mr. Guthrie himself loyally placed his services at the disposal of the Church, and the Assembly fully and intelligently recognized the fact that the claims of the metropolis were such as might well warrant the transference to it of one of its foremost men, even

in the very crisis of the Disruption period. Ultimately the conclusion was come to that the eloquent minister of St. John's could not yet be spared, and the translation was refused accordingly. Dr. Buchanan moved the judgment of the House, and in doing so he said (we can see clearly the results of his experience of London life while engaged on deputation-work in his remarks) :—“It was certain that the Church of Scotland had never been, since the Union, adequately represented in the metropolis. And it might be that the events which had brought them there, and which had separated them from the National Establishment, were a too impressive commentary on the neglect of the Church at home in not providing for a representation of its interests in that city where existed the political influence which regulates the affairs of this great empire. But it was needless to look at these times gone by ; and he was sure that while they might have regretted that neglect at one time, as having, among other fatal effects, injured their influence at headquarters, when seeking a settlement of the great question that so long agitated the Church, they did not, on a larger view of that question, regret its consequences now. It might have been a sinful neglect on the part of the Church, but God had overruled it for good to the general interests of the Church of Christ. Still, if they were to take full advantage of the position Providence had opened for them, they were more than ever called upon to do that which the Church in former times had grievously neglected. They were called upon to have ministers of their Church in that great metropolis—whose influence was felt, not through the empire alone, but throughout the world—ministers qualified not only to preach the Word in such a manner as might edify the particular congregations over which they preside, but qualified to lift up in that great city, and to make known in the midst of that mighty

community, the great principles for which we in Scotland had been called to witness and to suffer. Knowing from personal observation the circumstances in which their beloved friends were in the metropolis—knowing the circumstances, trying and painful, in which they had been placed—he felt bound to express the deep and heartfelt sympathy that filled his breast for them in those painful circumstances, and to indicate—not for himself only, but for that entire Assembly—their cordial and anxious desire that measures might be taken—immediately taken—in good earnest, in order to have this evil provided for,—in order to have this great end satisfactorily achieved.”

It is pleasant at this time of day to reflect that Dr. Buchanan's hopes in regard to the future of Presbyterianism in London have been more than fulfilled. The Scottish churches in England which, till the period of the Disruption, had maintained a feeble existence by hanging on to the Mother Church in Scotland, set up in 1843 for themselves; and there is now on the south of the Border a great and expanding community,\* which has achieved much good already, and which promises to accomplish yet far greater things in the time that is to come.

We have thought it well to give this outline sketch of some of the leading features of the Glasgow Assembly, because they show what the Free Church was at the outset of its history. It is not necessary to refer to the two Assemblies which followed. They met in Edinburgh, and were full of interest, but nothing occurred in their proceedings which it falls in our way specially to notice. The same thing, however,

\* In the year 1876 a union was effected between the English Presbyterian Church (representing the Free Church) and the English Synod of the United Presbyterian Church; and the body has now 267 congregations in all.

cannot be said of the great Free Church Gathering which was convened on the 21st of August 1845 in the Capital of the Highlands. It was an adjourned meeting of the Assembly which had met at Edinburgh in May; and as Inverness was far away from the centre, the members present were not so numerous as usual, but all the leading men (including Chalmers) were there; and as no such event had ever before occurred in all that region, the interest excited was widespread and intense. Dr. Macdonald of Ferintosh was elected Moderator, and he began his part of the work by preaching a Gaelic sermon from the text, Acts xvii. 6: "These that have turned the world upside down have come hither also." There has happily been preserved an account of the meetings in the handwriting of Dr. Buchanan himself. The letters which follow were addressed to Mrs. Buchanan, and give a familiar but very lifelike picture of the history of a week. With a number of others, Dr. Buchanan was, during his visit to the North, a guest of Mr. Forbes of Culloden.

"CULLODEN HOUSE, *August, 1845.*

"The House of Culloden was built about seventy years ago, on the foundations of the old castle which previously occupied its place. It lies about a mile off the Moray Firth. Beyond and above it is an extensive wood, about a mile in breadth; and beyond and above that is the far-famed Culloden Moor, the battle-field on which the hopes of the Stewarts perished. I shall not say more of it till I have seen it, which I hope to do one of these days.

"The mansion-house is large and commodious, the apartments being all of great size and very lofty."

"ASSEMBLY HALL, INVERNESS, *August 25, 1845.*

"I resume my notes. On Saturday the Assembly was occupied in disposing of a number of cases which had come up by reference or appeal for decision; and all of which were settled easily and amicably, without division or vote. These cases afforded a favourable opportunity of exhibiting to our northern friends and to the English strangers who were looking on the judicial proceedings of the Assembly. Some of the latter, I have reason to know, were much impressed with this part of the business. It gave

them a view of the working of our Presbyterian constitution fitted to raise it greatly in their esteem; showing as it did how completely it secures attention to the voice and the interest of all parties who have any right to be represented or considered in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs. Moreover, it served to bring out palpably the *corporate character* of the Church, and to show that it is no local or individual preference that is consulted, but the greater good of the Church as a whole.

“We had no evening meeting, and got home to Culloden to dinner about half-past six o’clock, where we had a very large party, including our friends Sheriff Monteith, John Hamilton, Campbell of Monzie, Nairne of Dunsinane, in addition to the large number of guests residing in the house.

“It turns out that we have Mrs. Hall, the authoress of ‘Scenes in Ireland,’ at present in Inverness. She is writing ‘A Month in the Highlands;’ and I have no doubt, from a letter of hers which I had occasion to see on Saturday evening, that the Inverness Assembly will have some considerable place in her forthcoming volume.

“Yesterday, the Sabbath, was a great day in Inverness—the most exciting since the year of Culloden. Not fewer than seven thousand people worshipped here yesterday with the Free Church. In the Pavilion, Candlish preached a noble discourse\* to an audience of about four thousand. I never heard him to greater advantage; and no wonder—such an audience would have warmed even a Moderate! In the afternoon Mr. M’Bride of Rothesay preached in Gaelic to an audience of Highlanders packed like herrings in a barrel. And this second audience gave way to a third in the evening to hear Guthrie. I have heard more striking discourses from him; but those who were hearing him for the first time thought nothing could be better. While these services were going on in the Pavilion, the three Free churches were all occupied and filled—with Gaelic services in the forenoon, English in the afternoon, and Gaelic in the evening. Our friend Bunting, when in search of the church in which I was preaching, stumbled into the Gaelic church of the Establishment, where, he says, he found a minister expending a very unnecessary amount of zeal, and energy, and noise on about thirty hearers.

“Those who were competent to judge assured us that, if nothing more had been achieved by the coming of the Assembly to Inverness than was gained by the preachings of yesterday, it would have been far more than enough to compensate all the expense and trouble of this movement. There were people in Inverness yesterday from almost every quarter of the Highlands, who will carry away with them impressions regarding the Free Church which they will never forget, and which they will disseminate on their return over the whole Celtic territory. As Roderick M’Leod of Skye said to me yesterday, it was a day of great gladness in Inverness; a day in which

\* Dr. Candlish’s discourse on this occasion was his famous one on “The Heavens.” Dr. Guthrie preached on the True Vine.

the hearts of God's people were mightily refreshed and encouraged, and the fruits of which, I doubt not, will be found many days hence.

"This morning Candlish, Cunningham, Guthrie, and I came in at seven in the morning to attend a conference between the Home Mission Committee and the Highland ministers. The subject was the means of meeting the destitution of the means of grace among the Gaelic-speaking population—the idea, once partially entertained, of ordaining, or at least licensing, without an academic education, some of those pious men who have been for years labouring as catechists in these districts. It was thought, and I think justly, that this would have been a rash and hazardous measure. What was actually agreed on was to increase the number of these catechists, and to bring them more formally under the superintendence of the Church. It was also resolved that Gaelic ministers of competent preaching gifts should be sent to labour in these destitute districts for a month or six weeks at a time, so as to nurse and foster these infant congregations.

"After a hurried breakfast, we had a conference with the members of Assembly at large, on the subject of College business. It was agreed to establish a Theological Professor at Aberdeen, so as to secure proper instruction for those students connected with the north country who cannot go up to Edinburgh; only requiring these students to go at least one session to Edinburgh, to get the benefit of the fuller system of theological instruction there provided.

"Another very interesting step was taken—in appointing Dr. Fleming of Aberdeen, the first naturalist of the day, to the Professorship of Natural Science in our College at Edinburgh. We shall thus secure, in a way never before enjoyed in any theological system in Europe, a full exposition of natural science in its bearings on actual life and on divine revelation. It will place, in short, the curriculum of study for the ministers of the Free Church ahead of every other at present existing.

"At twelve the Assembly met. We have various matters going on since. And at this moment Cunningham is thundering, on the other side of the table at which I write, on the subject of Education. It is proposed that the Free Church should now embark in the cause of Education far more extensively than we have done hitherto. In order to this, some adequate provision must be made for the salaries of the schoolmasters. All are agreed, and Dr. Chalmers very decidedly, that the teachers should be, as soon as possible, connected with the Sustentation Fund. It is the only way of raising the necessary funds. And all our friends are of opinion that it will greatly augment the popularity and prosperity of the Sustentation Fund.

"The attendance at the Assembly is larger than ever; the huge Pavilion is quite full. We are to have the question of Sites in the evening.

"Dr. Chalmers, contrary to expectation, has written to say he will be here to-night, which will throw additional lustre on the Inverness Assembly.



“ We have never yet had an opportunity of visiting the battle-field of Culloden ; but we have made a plan to do so to-morrow morning. I shall not forget to note what we see and hear.”

“ CULLODEN HOUSE, August 26, 1845.

“ If you were in Inverness you would hear every one exclaiming, last night was ‘ *the night* ’ of the Assembly, so far as it has gone. The subject was the Refusal of Sites. There were just three speakers—Begg, Candlish, and myself. People were pleased to say we all did well. I shall answer for my coadjutors. Begg’s speech embraced a graphic sketch of his late tour through the West Highlands, and depicted scenes of hardship and oppression which in a ruder age would have unsheathed many a good claymore. As it is, the better spirit of the gospel, for which these persecuted people are suffering, teaches them to endure wrong. Candlish, especially towards the close, was in his happiest vein. Some of his bursts of vehement earnestness and moral indignation electrified the House. For the report of the speeches I must refer you to the newspapers. The result of the whole was a motion to instruct Presbyteries immediately to report all cases of the refusal of sites for churches, schools, and manses existing within their bounds to the Assembly’s Committee ; to renew their applications to the recusant landlords ; and to bring the whole matter before the Commission in November. So that, if it shall appear that our just claims are not conceded, we may make the necessary preparations for another and more energetic appeal to Parliament.

“ We drove home to Culloden about eleven o’clock at night. The moon, looking through some light filmy clouds, was throwing her silver light along their edges, and streaming it down on the smooth surface of the Moray Firth. The greater part of the heavens was spangled with the bright stars, sparkling with that soft and quivering light which usually betokens the approach of rain. The omen has been too true. I rose this morning before six o’clock and dressed ; but before I had half accomplished my toilette the gathering clouds began to pour down a torrent of rain, and our expedition to Culloden Moor has been as effectually defeated as Prince Charles himself. I regret this the more that I shall have no other opportunity, on this occasion at least, of visiting that memorable field.

“ I have promised to go out this evening to Dochfour, the seat of Mr. Baillie, which, you may remember, I mentioned that we passed as we approached Inverness last week. Of course I return to the Assembly on Wednesday morning, and on that day our proceedings are to be brought to a close. I shall not close this letter till the afternoon, by which time I shall be able to subjoin some account of what is done in the Assembly to-day. We are to have Guthrie’s Report of the Manse Scheme—the fund for which is now about £37,600 ; an amazing sum to be raised in a few weeks from a single Synod of the Church.

“ ASSEMBLY HALL, *Forenoon.*

“ Before leaving Culloden to-day I went down to the lower story of the mansion-house to inspect a place that has a painful history connected with it. The lower story of the house, as I think was mentioned in one of my former letters, formed part of the old castle of Culloden, and is at the present day exactly as it was when the castle stood. It consists of a series of vaulted chambers of enormous thickness and strength. One of these was the dungeon of the castle. After the battle of Culloden seventeen officers of the Highland army, who had been wounded and taken in the fight, were thrust into this dungeon, left with scarcely any food, with their wounds undressed, for three days, and then carted up to a gray stone on the edge of the moor and shot in cold blood. The spot on which they died, and where they were buried, marks by the greenness of the sward over it this stern act which perhaps war can justify, but which undoubtedly condemns war.

“ We are now once more in the Hall, and the business is proceeding. There will be nothing of much interest till Guthrie comes on, and till then I pause.

“ Guthrie has come on. He spoke, I should think, for I did not mark the time, about two hours. Candlish, who can never sit idle, set himself, as the speech proceeded, to record the number of jokes. He made out no fewer than 106! The House was absolutely convulsed; and yet all his wit told with inimitable skill on the furtherance of his cause. With the exception of a single word or two from Mr. Thomson of Banchory and Mr. Nairne of Dunsinane, Candlish and I were the only speakers after Guthrie.

“ The House was most cordial in its reception of this great scheme. We are to have a breakfast to-morrow morning to begin the *practical application* of the subject. I trust it will be successful. We have had a brilliant platform of ladies all day, and indeed it has been always crowded with our fair friends. I hope they will muster strong to-morrow evening.

“ This evening we are to have Dr. Chalmers and the Sustentation Fund. He is looking well, but thinner than when I last saw him. He was greeted with loud and universal cheers when he entered the house.

“ We are now occupied with a Report of the State of Religion in Shetland, and as to the means of meeting its religious destitution.”

“ INVERNESS ASSEMBLY HALL, *August 27, 1845.*

“ At the evening diet of Assembly yesterday the great subject was the Sustentation Fund, and the great hero of it Dr. Chalmers. His address was of great length—too long for his strength—exceeding two hours. It was thoroughly practical. He gave the Highlanders, and especially the Highland ministers, a very good scold for their timidity, or want of out-

spokenness, in pressing this great scheme of the Church. He was at pains to vindicate the scheme from the ignorant and absurd notion which some, and especially in the Highlands, are foolish enough to cherish, that there is something secular and worldly in pleading for such a cause. I have no doubt the address will be useful; and as the doctor's visit was the consequence of a written request sent to him by a number of the Highland ministers, it is to be hoped they will feel themselves pledged to act on his suggestions.

“After that business was disposed of—and I may mention, by-the-by, that the sum collected for the first quarter of the present year (that is, from 15th May to the 15th of this month of August), for the Sustentation Fund, is nearly £21,000—this business being disposed of, we had a report from Cunningham in reference to the College Committee. The appointment of Dr. Fleming to the Chair of Natural Science in the Free Church College was approved. Dr. Fleming addressed the House in an energetic speech, pointing out the importance of having our theological students versed in natural science in these days when, under the cloak of science, falsely so called, infidelity is gaining extensive currency in the literature of the day. As an example of this, he instanced the recently published work on the ‘Vestiges of the Creation.’

“It was past eleven o'clock before we left the town for Dochfour. Mr. Baillie drove himself, and carried us out in little more than half an hour, a distance of between five and six miles. Lady Georgina Baillie (his wife), and some of their other guests, had left the Assembly an hour before in another carriage, and were home long before us. Her ladyship is a daughter of the Duke of Manchester, extremely like her sister the Marchioness of Tweeddale, whom I used to know in East Lothian. His house, in the Italian style, and planned entirely by himself, is very large; and though I am not reconciled to the exterior, it is certainly in all its internal arrangements a beautiful mansion. It is fitted up and furnished in the most perfect style of modern taste and elegance.

“Mr. Baillie is an Episcopalian; but being a religious man, has been revolted by the Puseyism of the Scottish Episcopal Church. He has in consequence attended for some time the Free Church, of which he is now a warm and cordial supporter. He is a frank, unaffected, gentlemanlike man, of, to appearance, forty-five or forty-six years of age. The view from the house of Dochfour is remarkably agreeable, looking, as it does, down into the beautiful vale beneath, where the sweet lake of Dochfour spreads out its silver waters amid beautifully-wooded banks, and above which the rugged mountains on the northern side of the lake tower in rugged grandeur.

“We came into town in time for the Assembly. Guthrie had his Manse Fund breakfast this morning. It was not so successful as it should have been. The Inverness folks are slow to draw their purses. I hear only

£500 was obtained at the breakfast. Still Guthrie is in good spirits about it, and hopes to see a fair return from Inverness after all.

“To-day we are winding up matters in the Assembly. The provision for the destitute localities of the Highlands has been under consideration. The greatest harmony prevails on the subject. Candlish, in presenting the Report of the Home Mission Committee on the subject, delivered a noble address. His references were very telling to the peculiarities of our position—its temptations, perplexities, trials, and difficulties—and our consequently peculiar call to maintain a spirit of humble and entire dependence on the God of all grace.

“I made a communication to the House on the subject of the approaching Conference at Liverpool for promoting Christian Union, and got the Assembly to adopt a resolution commending it to the prayers of God’s people.

“This, with some other matters—particularly giving instructions to a Committee to ascertain whether all our Free Churches are built on proper tenures—having been gone over, the Assembly concluded its business, the attendance continuing to the close large and full of interest.

“To the Moderator’s address I hope to refer in my letter to-morrow from Dunkeld.”

“PERTH, August 29, 1845.

“I must now conclude my notices of the Inverness Assembly—an Assembly which I have no doubt will be memorable in that district of the country and throughout the Highlands at large. The proceedings were concluded, as usual, with an address from the Moderator. It was done in his best style, clear and chaste in its language, firm and faithful in its views and sentiments. He took occasion to refer to the statement I had made in my speech on the Refusal of Sites respecting the question of accepting endowments from a State in alliance with Antichrist, and gave forth a most unequivocal condemnation of all such endowments. What he said may be useful to our Presbyterian friends in Ireland, who are in great danger of compromising their position and character by retaining their *regium donum*. The Assembly rose a little after five o’clock on Wednesday afternoon. Before breaking up, thanks were voted to the Inverness people for their great hospitality and kindness. The Assembly Hall, it was mentioned on the authority of the architect, was seated for 3300, allowing eighteen inches to each individual. There were often crowded into it, and especially on the Sabbath, about 5000 persons. It was gratifying to learn that the whole expense connected with its erection, and with the meeting of Assembly at Inverness, were completely defrayed, and a surplus left, from funds raised for the purpose before the Assembly closed. There was a feeling of universal satisfaction, delight, and thankfulness in every heart that everything had turned out so well. There was really nothing to regret or to wish otherwise. And I hope and believe much good has been done both

to the cause of the Free Church and to true religion in the north of Scotland.

“ There were two services in the evening,—an English sermon in one church by Dr. Makellar, and a Gaelic one in another from Dr. Macdonald.

“ At two o'clock on Thursday morning, after spending about an hour in bed, I found myself on the roof of the mail driving out of Inverness, with Mr. Percival Bunting and Mr. Campbell of Monzie seated beside me. The sky was bright with stars, among which the horned moon, far gone in the wane, enlivened with its silver crescent the serene and beautiful heavens. The light of the dawn began to skirt the eastern horizon as we drove along the pretty little loch of Moy, about twelve or fourteen miles south of Inverness. Four miles further we crossed the Findhorn by a wooden bridge, the substitute of the stone one that was carried away by the floods of 1829. From this point to the Bridge of Carr the road is over a high region of wild heathy hills. As we dashed down one of the narrow rugged gorges that intersect them, the coachman remarked that the goats which usually seek shelter in its recesses were all far up the mountain, and that we might in consequence count with certainty on a fine day. This was the more cheering that at the time a curtain of clouds was stealing gradually across the firmament and alarming us with the fear of rain. As we descended the southern face of this elevated region the sun was approaching the horizon, and far away in the south-east we could descry the huge mountain Ben Macdhui, in Aberdeenshire, lifting its conical head to the sky.

“ When the sun topped the range of mountains to the east, his red rays gleamed like fire from the black rocky ridge which overhung the road on our right. The sight was striking and beautiful. The dark pines, too, of the old Caledonian forest, through which we were then passing, glowed in the morning sun; their red stems, reddening with the morning radiance which they reflected, gave a singular and peculiar effect to the whole scene. It needed only the sight of some startled red deer to have completed the picture, but that item unfortunately was not supplied. As the road approaches the Spey you have the rugged Craigellachie towering above on the right hand, reminding one of the war-cry of the clan Grant—‘ Stand fast, Craigellachie’—*their* country stretching from its base for twenty or thirty miles down Spey. In front and across the river rises the mighty Cairngorm, lifting its vast bulk above the ancient and still extensive forest of Rothiemureus. The summits of this mountain and of the whole range connected with it were clothed in vapoury clouds. On reaching the Spey the road turns westwards, ascending the north bank of the river, and passing Kinrara, sung by Burns, and well deserving his praise. Further on it passes Pitmain or Kingussie, where we saw the large Free church of Mr. Shepherd,—a neat structure, having a congregation to fill it of not

fewer than one thousand people. A mile further on the road crosses the Spey, and ascends one of its tributaries, the Truim, which gives its name to the big glen up which the road winds towards Dalwhinnie. The point at which the road passes the Spey is immediately beneath the savage-looking 'Craigdhu,' a wild rugged mountain, the name of which was the war-cry of the Macphersons in their feudal wars.

"For much local information on all these matters I was indebted to Davidson of Tulloch, who, in full Highland costume, was our fellow-traveller,—a tall, handsome man, very affable and good-natured to everybody about him."

"It is commonly believed and said," remarks Dr. Wilson of Dundee, "that religious controversy tends to repress and deaden the spiritual life. That is not universally true. The influence of a controversy will depend very much on the subject matter of it. The Ten Years' Conflict quickened and strengthened the spiritual life of the Church. It was a period of great revival—the greatest and most extensive that Scotland has experienced in our day. The men who felt how vital the conflict was—who were contending on the one hand for the right of Christ to reign supremely and alone in his own House, and on the other that they should be free to serve him, as they were under the deepest obligations to do, were naturally brought to sit with open ear and heart to listen to his voice, and were lifted up into a heavenly fellowship which cemented the bonds of brotherhood, so that they were of one heart and of one soul; neither said any of them that aught of the things which he possessed was his own."

The same testimony in regard to the character of the Disruption times is given by all who remember them and were in sympathy with the wave of Evangelical influence which swept over the land. A loving, generous, joyful, almost jubilant spirit, seemed to possess the Church, and even at the distance of a quarter of a century we find Dr. Buchanan recalling with lively emotion the peculiar brightness of that happy era. Speaking in the Assembly of 1867, he said:—

“Since those primeval times when, in the first freshness and fulness of their love to the Lord that bought them, ‘they that believed were together, and had all things common, and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men as every man had need,’ there never has been a nobler outburst of joyful, self-denying, large-hearted, loving liberality to God’s cause than was exhibited by this Church of ours in the ever memorable 1843. Oh! it was a blessed time; truly a time of refreshing from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power. Would that the windows of heaven were again opened, and that we were again baptized in that cloud and in that sea! Though nearly the quarter of a century has passed away since that marvellous time, who that had any part in it can look back upon it, even now, without feeling as if no other words could adequately describe it but those of the Sixty-eighth Psalm:—‘O God, when thou wentest forth before thy people, when thou didst march through the wilderness, the earth shook, the heavens also dropped at the presence of God: even Sinai itself was moved at the presence of God, the God of Israel. Thou, O God, didst send a plentiful rain, whereby thou didst confirm thine inheritance, when it was weary. Thy congregation hath dwelt therein: thou, O God, hast prepared of thy goodness for the poor. The Lord gave the word: great was the company of those that published it.’ Never can we be sufficiently thankful for the blessing we then received, and which, through us, was more or less shared in by many other Churches both at home and abroad. Its results among ourselves it will tax the powers of some future Church historian to sum up and to describe:—Nearly a thousand churches built, and almost as many manses and schools; nearly a thousand congregations formed, and as many ministers and missionaries sustained all over the length and breadth of the land;—in a word, the whole equipment of a Christian Church set up and provided for, with its theological halls for the training of candidates for the ministry, its missions to the heathen and to the Jew, and to our own expatriated countrymen in every quarter of the world. In view of all this, not we ourselves only, but onlookers outside of us, have been constrained to say, What hath God wrought!”

## CHAPTER XI.

### PROBLEMS OF FINANCE.

WE are told that the children of Israel went up “harnessed” out of Egypt. Whatever that expression may amount to, it at the least means this,—that the Hebrews did not commence their march through the wilderness as a rabble, without order or method, but under regulations which had been deliberately planned and made known beforehand. A similar statement may be made in regard to the Evangelical party which came to form the Free Church. Its sagacious leaders did not wait till the catastrophe had arrived, before considering how it was to be met and what was to follow. Preparations on a large scale were made in anticipation of the Disruption; and in particular one principle was adopted, and so far applied, which has ever since been regarded as the keystone of our Finance. The principle seems to have occurred with more or less distinctness to two men about the same time; for Dr. Candlish outlined something like it at a public meeting in Edinburgh before he had ever heard of its being entertained by any other person. But it is especially to Chalmers that we are indebted for the exposition and inauguration of the system which has enabled the Free Church to occupy the whole of Scotland, and to which all Churches will certainly look if there should ever come a time of universal disestablishment.



The principle is a very simple one ; its basis being just this, —that the Church of a country ought to regard itself, not as a congeries of separate and independent atoms, but as a *unit*. Carrying out this idea, every Free Churchman was taught from the commencement that it was his duty to contribute to the utmost of his ability to the support of the Church *as a whole*, and to send his contributions to a fund at the centre, from whence they could be diffused as they were needed, even to the furthest extremities of the community. The advantages likely to follow from this arrangement were apparent on the surface. First of all, it was manifestly calculated to foster a generous and unselfish spirit. Next, it opened a channel wide enough for the outflow of the liberality of every individual member of the Church. And, thirdly, it secured the maintenance of ordinances in localities where otherwise it would have been impossible to provide a minister with adequate support. In the Highlands the people joined the Free Church almost in mass ; but if each separate congregation north of the Grampians had been left to itself, the Church would have disappeared from many parishes there within a generation. As it was, the benefits of the central Sustentation Fund were extended even to the Outer Hebrides, and the same dividend was paid to the minister whose people were too poor to contribute more than £50 a year, as to the minister through whose congregation the Church benefited to the extent of thousands.

No Church had before this been in circumstances to make a fair trial of a system so thorough-going and so brotherly. There had indeed been already great disruptions both in England and in Scotland, but the intolerance of the civil authorities, in the days when they took place, rendered anything like an organized scheme of ministerial support impossible ; and with respect to the Scottish secessions which

had occurred in the middle of the eighteenth century, these were small in their beginnings, and too gradual in their growth to have suggested the need for any central fund on a large scale. But in 1843 the problem presented was this,—How to provide for nearly five hundred men at once, and how to sustain the many others whose ordination was likely to be immediately demanded. The necessity for instant action was thus imperative; and happily there was everything in the freedom which the law permitted, and in the loving, trusting, and enthusiastic spirit which was then abroad, to secure a favourable field for the trial of the experiment. After a period of more than thirty-three years the system may well be allowed to speak for itself. When Dr. Chalmers spoke hopefully in the Convocation of raising even so much as £100,000 a year, he saw, he says, a smile of incredulity pass over the faces of his auditors. We may imagine, then, how they would have looked had he taken a higher flight and reached the platform of the present reality. In 1876–77 there was paid by the Free Church, in the shape of stipends to its clergy, the sum of £225,000; and there is no reason whatever for thinking that that sum may not in the course of other thirty years be doubled.

At the Disruption two Committees were appointed—the one called *the Ingathering Committee*, of which Dr. Chalmers was appointed Convener; the other, *the Distribution Committee*, at whose head was Mr. Alexander Dunlop. In 1844 these two Committees were united under the name of “*The Committee for the Sustentation of the Ministry*,”—Dr. Chalmers Convener. This arrangement, however, only lasted for a year. The health of the Convener required that he should retire as much as possible from harassing work, and he resigned office in favour of the Rev. W. K. Tweedie of Edinburgh, in 1845. In the Assembly of 1847 another change was made. Dr.

Buchanan, who had been appointed a member of the Distribution Committee in 1843, and who continued to act in the combined Committee after the union had been effected, was appointed Convener of the Sustentation Fund, in room of Mr. Tweedie, who had also resigned, and the office was from that date filled by him till his death. It will thus be seen how early and how intimately the name of Buchanan came to be associated with the working out of a scheme which has far more than a sectional or Free Church interest; and as the financial problem meets us at the threshold on leaving the Establishment, we shall make no apology for completing what there may be to say on the subject here, although this will necessitate disregard of chronological order.

The special fitness of Dr. Buchanan for the position which he filled for so long a time, and with such distinction, was early recognized by Dr. Chalmers, as the following letters will show :—

*(Dr. Chalmers to Dr. Buchanan.)*

“EDINBURGH, August 30, 1844.

“I wish much to see and to consult with you on the subject of our financial affairs. I am no longer fit for any personal or active superintendence. The doctor interdicts me for the present from all that can fatigue or agitate, and it would contribute greatly to my repose and satisfaction if I could have the Sustentation Fund settled on a right basis, and placed in the hands of a zealous and effective man of business. I do not mean to flatter when I say that I have more confidence in your judgment than in that of most others. I have therefore the greatest wish to see you, and I have the feeling that a great public service might be effected betwixt us. In my feeble state of health I have no prospect of moving from home soon, but the sooner you come to me the better.”

*(Dr. Chalmers to Dr. Buchanan.)*

“EDINBURGH, August 4, 1845.

“Forgive my urgency. I feel it a great acquisition—a mighty strengthener to a good cause—that you should have become a member of our Sustentation Acting Committee. Allow me then to specify a very high service which you, and none but you, can render to the Sustentation Fund. You

know that Glasgow, whenever there is no other element needed for success than pure liberality, greatly outrivals all other places in Scotland. It has done so in regard to the College subscription; it has done so in regard to the Bursary subscription; and it is on the way of doing so in regard to the Manse Fund. It is not, then, from the want of liberality, it is from the sheer want of organization and agency, and a well-worked mechanism, that Glasgow has not attained her right position in regard to the Sustentation Fund; and what I would press upon you, with all deference, yet with all earnestness, is that you would assume it as your special vocation—the fulfilment of it were worth the undivided labour of a twelvemonth—to put Glasgow into right working order, so as that the produce of her Presbyterial associations shall not only come up to but shall overpass those of Edinburgh.

“I take a great liberty, but I feel myself called to it by the sense of a great interest, and by my confidence in your judgment and ability for the undertaking which I have ventured to suggest. Do then, my very dear sir, make a study of the subject. Few things have delighted me more than your testimony to my scheme; and sure I am that, would you give your strength to it, you would achieve not only a great local improvement in Glasgow, but a great and general amelioration of our financial system for the benefit of the Free Church at large.”

The Report submitted by Dr. Buchanan to the Assembly of 1848 thoroughly justified the opinion expressed by Dr. Chalmers and the confidence placed in him by the Church. The new Convener addressed himself to the work he had undertaken in thorough earnest. Accompanied by Mr. Handyside, the Secretary of the Fund, and by one or two other friends as he could secure them, he traversed the whole country from the Solway to the Firth of Dornoch, and held consultations with every one of the sixty presbyteries of the Church. It was, it will be remembered, a memorable year in the history of Europe. Several of the continental kings lost their crowns for ever; and the revolutionary spirit, in the shape of Chartism, caused not a little anxiety even here. With things so disturbed in the political world, trade suffered, and men's minds everywhere were unsettled and preoccupied. And the season altogether was not a favourable one in which to aim at the strengthening of a benevolent enterprise. But the results

of the effort were by no means discouraging. The income of the year before had been £83,117; whereas the income for 1848 was declared to amount to £88,996—showing an increase of £5,879. Dr. Buchanan pointed out that this was a very remarkable increase upon an increase. In 1844 the whole sum collected, including £16,000 in the shape of donations, had been only £68,704; so that within five years the Church was seen to be contributing for the support of its ministry £25,000 per annum more than it gave at the outset of its career. It did not necessarily follow from all this that the dividend would be increased. The number of charges was always growing, and with a constantly enlarging divisor the sum payable to each individual minister could never be certainly calculated by looking at the total amount raised. It did so happen, however, that a sensible benefit was the issue of Dr. Buchanan's labours during the year. The dividend due turned out to be £128; a higher figure than had been reached since the Disruption, and higher too than was attained by the Church during the six succeeding years.

The Assembly was not ungrateful for the service thus rendered to it. The adoption of the Report was moved by Professor Miller, one of the many remarkable laymen of those days who were always ready to place their talents and influence at the disposal of the Church. "Surely," said he, "the emotion which fills the breast of every one who has heard that Report and the accompanying statement, is one of deep thankfulness that, from a season of great depression and distress throughout the country, our Fund has emerged, not only unharmed, but having made an advance, and that not inconsiderable. (Hear, hear.) And while for this we forget not to give thanks to the Great Source of all good gifts, we are bound to acknowledge, also, with much gratitude, that for the present favourable position of this Fund we are indebted,

under God, to the indefatigable labour, to the ceaseless zeal, and to the matured wisdom of the Convener, Dr. Robert Buchanan. (Applause.) God, sir, has been very good to our Church, in lending her fit men for special acts in critical times. Some,—alas! to our short sight, too many,—their mission over, he has taken to himself. There was a Welsh for the Church's exodus; there was a Chalmers to raise, consolidate, govern, and dignify her reconstruction; the name of Hamilton is inseparably connected with the rearing of her temples of worship throughout the land; that of Speirs—alas! only in name and memory present now—is as intimately associated with the obtaining of sites whereon these might be built. These men grace our halls no longer; they have been called to give an account of their stewardship at another and higher tribunal; and who can doubt that on each has been bestowed the gracious welcome: 'Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.' (Hear, hear.) For these men we can never cease to be grateful; but shall we be less so for those that still remain? Men of rare gifts—and, thank God, not few in number—whom I need not name, one of whom stands conspicuously our creditor in thanks on this occasion. (Hear, hear.) This Assembly, sir, surely will but ill discharge its duty, if it take not this opportunity of testifying to Dr. Buchanan, in the most marked and emphatic terms, their entire acknowledgment of the wisdom and zeal which he has brought to bear on their great Scheme, and their deep sense of gratitude and obligation for his effectual labour on its behalf,—labour which has been crowned with success only at the cost of much fatigue, anxiety, and no slight risk to his own health. (Hear, hear.) Aware as I am, sir,\* of your personal objection to noisy plaudits in this place—(laughter and applause)—I am sorely tempted, nevertheless, to seek the

\* The Moderator whose displeasure is thus deprecated was Dr. Patrick Clason.

excitement of a momentary *emeute* against your authority in this matter—(great laughter and applause)—that Dr. Buchanan may at once be assured, and that by no uncertain sound—(great applause)—that he possesses not merely the entire confidence, but also the entire gratitude of this Assembly, and of the Free Church of Scotland, for his faithful, disinterested, and successful discharge of the onerous duties which lay upon him as the Convener of the Sustentation Fund Committee during the past year.” (Renewed applause.)

It was not always, however, that the sky was as serene as it appeared to be to Professor Miller. At a later diet of the very Assembly which was then sitting, the principles on which the Fund was managed were formally called in question, and there then took place one of the many debates through which the Church has had to pass before it was able to work its way to the solid and probably unassailable position which it is now happily occupying. It was not to be expected that so great a machine should get into gear all at once. There was no experience to guide those who were directing it. And the wonder is, not that difficulties should have arisen, or that mistakes should have been made, but that the solution of the problem should have proceeded so smoothly, and should have issued so soon in such remarkable results.

A Sustentation Fund in a Church depends for its success on two things; the one is the existence of some moral earnestness in the members, the other is the adoption of a system which can stand business tests. As Dr. Chalmers used to put it, the former represents the *Dynamics* of the subject, the latter its *Mechanics*. No scheme for the support of the Christian ministry can ever flourish greatly where there is among its supporters little sense of the value of the ministry itself. But it is just as necessary to bear in mind that it is equally vain to expect satisfactory results if the methods used for its

execution are not in their own nature the best fitted for the practical working of the scheme.

In looking through the history of the development of the Fund in the Free Church, it is impossible not to be struck with the fact that Dr. Buchanan seems never to have lost sight for a moment of these two principles for himself. His successor in the Convenership of the Committee, Dr. Wilson of Dundee, referred, after his death, in emphatic terms to the lofty ideal which he always had of the enterprise which he directed:—"The Sustentation Fund," says he, "never presented itself to his mind, nor did he suffer it to be presented to the Church, as merely or chiefly a matter of Finance. He held it forth before the Church, even as he always regarded it, as a great instrument for the Christian welfare of the people—as the means for carrying on and sustaining a Home Mission enterprise by which people of all classes might be brought to the knowledge of divine truth, and established in the way of holiness. To contribute to the Sustentation Fund with such an end in view, constituted of itself a sort of Christian training by which the whole character was elevated, and men were brought both more fully to realize their indebtedness to the Saviour, and the obligation that rested upon them to carry forward the great commission He gave to His disciples, remembering the grace of Him who, though He was rich, yet for our sakes became poor. It is not difficult to perceive how all this might have been reversed—by what an easy and natural transition what was really a sacred might have been converted into a secular work, and the business of the Sustentation Fund might have become little else than a devising of fiscal regulations similar to those which are adopted by benefit and friendly societies. It was impossible, indeed, not to have respect to the fact that the Fund was designed to afford an adequate maintenance to the ministers of the Free Church,



and the increase of it was pleaded for with a view to secure this result. But this was always in subordination to the higher end of continuing an educated and efficient ministry, whose services, by the blessing of God, might be the means of turning men from darkness to light, and of perpetuating to Scotland the rich inheritance bequeathed to us by our fathers."

This statement of Dr. Wilson's is amply confirmed by Dr. Buchanan's own published utterances. In the Assembly of 1850, for example, he had occasion to dwell with some severity on the reluctance shown by ministers to speak to their people on the duty of Christian liberality; and after offering an apology for his frankness, he went on to say:—"It is now three years since this House was pleased to devolve upon me the oversight of the Sustentation Fund; and the more closely and carefully I have studied it, the deeper and stronger has my conviction become, that in the direction to which I have now been pointing will be found to lie the true sources of its strength. Other things, indeed, must conspire and co-operate, as I shall by-and-by proceed to show; but without the presence and the power of a living and laborious ministry all appliances and agencies besides will be of no avail. The assiduities of our office-bearers and collectors, and the wise and well-adjusted machinery of our associations, are all invaluable in their place; but mere husbandry will never bring plentiful and perennial harvests out of a barren soil. A state of spiritual barrenness among our people will defy the efforts and the arguments of the busiest agencies we can employ. Unless men have first given themselves unto the Lord, they will grudge him everything else besides. In other words, the prosperity of this great Fund is inseparably bound up with the piety of our people; and to what, under God, can we look to uphold and increase the piety of our people, if it be not to the pains and the prayers of our ministers? It will be seen

from these remarks, that, according to my humble judgment, by far the most important service which we ministers can render to the Sustentation Fund is by doing the work of evangelists, and watching for our people's souls as they that must give account. In saying this, however, it is by no means intended to imply that we have nothing more directly bearing on the Fund to do at all. To think so were a very grievous error. The duty of upholding the ordinances of God must be expounded and enforced by all those solemn and affecting considerations with which Scripture presses it home on the hearts and consciences of men. The piety that thinks to serve God with what costs nothing—that brings the torn, and the lame, and the sick—must be rebuked, in the language of the prophet, as a 'weariness' to the Lord—as a service which he will despise."

Nor had he in any way altered his opinions in this connection when, twenty years afterwards, in the spring of 1870, he read a paper before the *Statistical Society of London*, in which he gave the results of his long experience of the *Finance of the Free Church of Scotland*. To carry his hearers along with him, he had begun by giving some account of the origin of the Free Church, after which he went on to say:—

"The dynamics of Church Finance do not lie in the physical force which silently backs the tax-gatherer's demand, but in the region of conscience alone. What the Church member shall give, or whether he shall give at all, is a question between himself and God; a question in which he may be advised and exhorted, but on which he may not, by any human force, be compelled. He to whom the offering is professedly brought will not have it given grudgingly or of necessity. It has and can have no acceptance with Him save in so far as it is brought, not by constraint, but willingly. And hence the true secret of abiding success for any system

of Church Finance, however wisely planned, will be found chiefly and ultimately to depend on the Church's own practical efficiency in sustaining and cultivating the moral and spiritual life of its members. Superstition, indeed, may thrive and grow rich among an ignorant population; but in an intelligent community true religion can obtain adequate support for its ordinances and institutions only in proportion as it is accomplishing its high ends in the hearts and minds of men. If this greatest of all the *factors* out of which the result comes be not taken into account, no reliable calculation as to the efficiency of any system of Church Finance can be made. It is for this very reason I have thought it necessary, in the earlier part of this paper, to explain the causes which threw the Free Church on the support of its members, and to bring out the fact that these causes were of a nature to touch powerfully and lastingly some of the deepest religious convictions and sympathies of the Scottish people."

But while upon this point the convictions of Dr. Buchanan were never for a moment shaken, no one was more profoundly persuaded, on the other hand, that it is a mere tempting of Providence for a Church to expect that its spiritual forces will accomplish everything. And if any one wants to discover what has been the secret of the success of the scheme originated by Chalmers, he must ask in what way it has been carried into execution.

Nothing has contributed more, or so much, to the success of the scheme, as the able administration under which it has all along been directed. Dr. Buchanan himself had a unique combination of gifts for the position which he was called by the Church to occupy as Convener of the Fund. His unwearying interest in all that affected its progress, his remarkable business aptitude, his courteous and patient bearing often amidst unreasoning opposition, and his readiness to welcome

suggestions from any quarter, if only they were offered in good faith, commanded the respect and deference of the whole Church.

But unless he had been adequately and efficiently supported by his more immediate fellow-labourers, all these qualities might have failed to achieve the practical results which followed from his incessant care.

The two men who for more than thirty years acted successively as Secretaries to the Fund—Mr. Hugh Handyside, Writer to the Signet; and Mr. George Meldrum, Chartered Accountant—were possessed not only of the experience which the training of their honourable professions supplied for the special duties of their office, but were full of love for the Free Church, and of zeal for this special department of its work. Their professional and social positions gave them great weight both within and beyond the borders of the Church, while their personal characteristics marked them out as unmistakably Christian gentlemen. In the management of the affairs of an immense society within which moral forces chiefly operate, their business qualifications and recognized moral and spiritual worth were simply invaluable.

Mr. George Meldrum, whose removal so soon after the death of his chief was felt as a peculiarly severe dispensation, was of a race that is fast passing away. He had lived through the conflict—he had taken an active part in the pressing work of reconstruction—and as an elder in Free St. George's, under the ministry of his warmly-attached friend, Dr. Candlish, and one of the Church's most trusted advisers, he had done an immense amount of public ecclesiastical service long before he was invited to assume any official position in connection with the General Assembly. His helpfulness, in fact, was so conspicuous, that when a vacancy occurred in the department of Finance, the only question that it was thought neces-

sary to discuss was that of his willingness or otherwise to fill it. "We must have, without your presence, of course," wrote Dr. Buchanan to him on the 15th of May 1868, "some conversation next Wednesday at the Sustentation Fund Committee on the Secretaryship. My heart is set on having you in that post. Now, in view of a conversation on the subject in the Committee, I should like to have a definite idea of the sort of footing on which alone you would undertake the work, and what its financial result would be as compared with past arrangements. Pray give me your mind frankly and without reserve." In the end the matter was adjusted. Mr. Meldrum was appointed by acclamation Secretary of the Fund, and at the same time Depute-Clerk of Assembly; and it is not too much to say that to his earnestness and geniality and perseverance is due in a very large degree the progress which has been achieved of recent years. No one would have been more ready to acknowledge this than Dr. Buchanan himself. He and Mr. Meldrum continued to the last to maintain toward each other the attitude, not simply of partners in a business enterprise, but of warm and affectionate friends. They thought alike on all subjects,—on questions of ecclesiastical polity, on the plans to be pursued in the interest of the Fund, and on the great spiritual ends which were ever to be kept in view in order to the attainment of any real or lasting prosperity. We believe we are safe in saying that, although occupying a position of peculiar delicacy, Mr. Meldrum never made an enemy, or inflicted, by any rash or unkind speech of his, a moment's needless pain. And we are offering no more than a just tribute to his memory, when we take in his life at this point as having constituted a material factor in the history of the success of the Sustentation Fund.

But while thus acknowledging the important influence of a

high-minded and congenial superintendence, it is also most true that the mechanism otherwise of the Scheme was equally adapted to serve its ends. With a Central Board meeting monthly in Edinburgh, containing about a hundred members, lay and clerical in nearly equal proportions, and these coming from all parts of the country; with a correspondent, representing the Board, in every Presbytery; with Deacons' Courts in every congregation; and with possibly ten thousand collectors quietly going their rounds every four weeks to receive the contributions of the adherents of the Church,—there was organized a system which is now probably as nearly perfect as anything of the kind can well be made, and which works with all the smoothness, and regularity, and noiselessness of a machine in which there is no friction. Of course, such a phenomenon as is here presented is only possible in a religious society. It would be vain to hope that, except under the constraint of conscience, ten thousand persons could be got to pay periodical visits to their neighbours for the purpose of collecting money. If the work had to be paid for, it would simply require to be given up. No Government even would face the cost of a collection carried on on such a gigantic scale. But it is a most remarkable and significant fact that, as a rule, it is not difficult to find collectors, and that all over the country are to be found individuals who have cheerfully, and even joyfully, continued to render this service to the Church for a whole generation. It has frequently been said that there is sometimes most beauty in processes of Nature which are too quiet and unobtrusive to force themselves on the public attention. A similar remark may be made in regard to those regions in which spiritual forces operate. To us there seems something more sublime in the steady, continuous, and unwearying prosecution of their little-thought-of labours by the collectors of the Free Church, than in many other more public

proceedings which have called forth universal applause and admiration.

It is not to be supposed, however, that the disestablished Church saw through the whole problem of its Finance from the first, and established the system which is now in operation at once. It had to learn by experience. It made mistakes which it had to correct. It encountered difficulties which it did not anticipate. And the principles which it is now able to lay down with confidence as the basis of whatever action it may take in the future, were only reached after a great deal of thought, and after much discussion.

At the Disruption, under the impulse of the intensely brotherly spirit which then prevailed, the theory seems to have been adopted of an absolutely "*equal dividend*"—that is, it was assumed that the whole funds of all the congregations of the Church were to be sent to Edinburgh, and that these were to be divided, share and share alike, among all the ministers. Six months' experience showed the inexpediency of that system. It furnished no check upon congregations which might be indolent or selfish. It allowed no channel for the outflow of the natural desire of congregations to do something special for their own ministers. And it failed to recognize the fact that the expenses of a person living in a city must necessarily be greater than those of one who has his home in the rural districts. So early, then, as 1844, the process of modification began. Dr. Chalmers, who, in a letter now before us, expresses the strong conviction (very striking then) that it would be good for the whole ministry if some of the incumbents of city charges had as much as £1000 a year—Dr. Chalmers was especially alarmed at the prevalence of what he regarded as the unbusiness-like idea that an equal dividend involved no obligation to *make an equal effort to maintain it*. At his suggestion, therefore, it was enacted by

the Glasgow Assembly that "every minister admitted to a new charge shall receive from the Sustentation Fund the contribution of his association if up to or less than £100, and *the half more.*" The object of this regulation, of course, was to stimulate the liberality of aid-receiving congregations. It had been agreed to aim at a minimum dividend of £150 a year, and the attainment of that sum was placed within the reach of not a few to whom in other circumstances it would have been impossible. The rule, however, did not work well, and its unpopularity grew to be so great that it was abrogated in 1848. But the return to the old system did not issue in any benefit to the Fund. Strenuous efforts were made by deputations and other means to rouse the Church, but the effects were not perceptible. The dividend was less in 1849 than in the previous year, and it continued, as has already been noted, to keep less for six years in succession. During that time another plan was tried—that of what was called (improperly, as Dr. Buchanan was in the habit of saying) the *Rating System*. That is to say, the Sustentation Fund Committee endeavoured to come to an understanding with each congregation as to what sum it might be considered fair to expect from it. But this plan also was a failure, and affected the results in no appreciable degree.

In 1854, however, an experiment was tried which proved more satisfactory. A definite proposal was made to all the members of the Church to increase their contributions by *one-fourth*. The grand recommendation of this proposal to many was, that it was so intelligible. People knew precisely what it was expected of them to do, and as their givings were certainly not yet by any means on a level with their resources, the thing which was in such plain terms asked of them was done with a wonderful amount of cheerfulness. The Fund increased in consequence by over thirteen thousand pounds,



and the dividend was raised from £119, to which it had sunk, to £140.

But the minimum dividend of £150 named at the Disruption was still apparently in the clouds. The Fund kept the ground it had gained, but it made no sensible advance, and it became more and more plain to its far-seeing Convener that something was still wanting to give proper efficiency to the Scheme. His meditations on the subject issued, in 1867, in the regulations under which the system is at present worked. The distinctive feature in these regulations is the existence of a Surplus Fund, which supplies the stimulus needed to keep the congregations up to the standard of their duty. Dr. Buchanan proposed to ask the Church to contribute enough (1) to give to each minister £150 a year; and (2) to provide an overplus for division among those ministers whose congregations gave at certain specified rates *per member*. Here was again a definite object set before the people. They were told that if they each gave at the rate of seven shillings and sixpence a year, or of ten shillings a year, the result would be, in the first place, that the very moderate ideal of the Disruption times would at once be realized; and, in the second, that their own ministers would receive a more or less material benefit over and above the equal dividend. The response was immediate. The very next year the Fund rose £10,000; and it has gone on increasing ever since, until in 1875-76 the sum directly contributed for general sustentation purposes amounted to £166,427, which allowed a dividend of £157 to be paid to 774 ministers, with, in addition, grants out of the Surplus Fund of £36 and £18 respectively to 553 of the first class, and 125 of the second.

Out of all this experience certain principles, as we have said, have been evolved, which may now be accepted as demonstrated. One is this, that very much depends on the

mechanism! While there will be no water if there is no spring, the water in the spring will not be got in any quantity if the laws of nature alone are allowed to act. There is so much to be overcome in human nature, even when it is in a degree sanctified—in the shape of indolence, and selfishness, and inconsideration—that no disestablished Church is safe to depend on the efficacy of mere general appeals. Something definite and intelligible must be set before the people to do—every lawful stimulus to exertion must be taken advantage of—and whatever system is established, it must be superintended unwearingly in every part. But let these common-sense considerations be regarded, and there is no Church with any life and activity in it which need fear to be left to its own resources. It was a new life which the Free Church had to enter on when it went forth from under the protection of the State; and, astonishing as was its liberality, there was then something about it which was so far unreliable. It was open to men to say, and men constantly did say, that the whole thing was an outburst—a passion—a sudden fit of enthusiasm, which would exhaust itself and collapse. More than thirty years have gone, and its Sustentation income has not only risen from £68,000 in 1844 to £166,000 in 1876, but that income comes in with a steadiness which shows that there is now another force than impulse sustaining it. Giving has now become with us a settled *habit*; and although, as has well been said, “*habit has no power of elevation,*” and we need to look to some higher principle when a flight is contemplated, yet habit is influential in sustaining us when we rise: and no more striking illustration could be furnished of the fact than this, that “the Sustentation Fund has never been very sensibly affected by periods of commercial or agricultural prosperity or depression; and when, by some energetic movement on its behalf, the

contributions have been raised to a higher level, it has always been found to continue in that position.”

Before passing from this subject, it may be proper to mention that the incomes of the ministers of the Free Church are not wholly derived from the Central Sustentation Fund. There is also within that Church a system of *supplements*, under which each congregation contributes directly to the support of its own minister; and it may interest some to learn how near an approach has already been made in a Church without State endowments to the condition of a Church in which such endowments are still enjoyed. The following is from a very interesting and able statistical report which was submitted, in May 1876, to the General Assembly by Mr. Meldrum:—

“A return recently made by order of the House of Commons, and published by its authority, furnishes the means of making a comparison between the income of ministers of the *Free Church* and the livings of ministers of the *Established Church of Scotland*. That return embraces the income of parish ministers and ministers of parliamentary churches. The total number in the return is 1044, but of these 74 are blank, leaving 970 charges, in regard to which the following particulars are given, viz. :—the stipends from teinds and other sources,—the sums legally payable for communion elements,—and the annual valuation of each manse and glebe as stated in the assessment roll of the parish. The return does not include *quoad sacra* and mission charges. The following table exhibits the platform charges\* of the Free Church (omitting colleagues) set over against those parish and parliamentary charges of the Establishment.

	Free Church.	Established Church.
Number of ministers whose stipends are less than £200,	329	261
Number at and above £200 and under £300, ... ..	355	250
"          "      £300      "      £500, ... ..	130	432
"          "      £500,      ...      ...      ... ..	27	27
	841	970
The average stipend in the Free Church is ... ..	£245	0 0
"          "      Established Church, ... ..	284	0 0

\* The platform charges are the ordinary charges of the Free Church, the ministers of which draw the equal dividend. There are other charges in a transition and exceptional condition.

“It will be observed that the comparison here is made between the platform charges of the Free Church and the parochial and parliamentary charges of the Established Church. The non-platform charges of the Free Church left out of view are about 90 in number. In the case of the Established Church, the *quoad sacra*, mission, and other charges amount to a much larger number—probably three hundred. The reporter has not been able to find materials for instituting a comparison of the *whole ministerial charges* of the two Churches, but there can be no doubt that the advantage in favour of the Established Church shown in the above abstract would be very much diminished. The addition made to the average stipend of Free Church ministers since 1867 is about £50. It only therefore needs another such advance to place the ministers of the Free Church fully on a par, as regards money stipend, with the parochial ministers of the Establishment.

“It would be out of place, and aside from the object of this report, to prosecute further the present inquiry, but it would be easy to show that as regards *manse* the Free Church is fairly abreast of the Establishment. *Glebes*, of which there are in the Established Church nearly 900, of the annual value of about £28 each, are as yet comparatively few in the Free Church; although the number of such pertinents of the living, or of local endowments in another form, is increasing.”

In one of the very last letters written by Dr. Buchanan, he speaks with fervid thankfulness of the great success which had thus attended his efforts in connection with the Sustentation Fund. The letter was addressed to Mr. Meldrum, and is dated the 24th of March 1875 :—

“The state of the Fund, though not all we wished, is still satisfactory. If we keep hold of our increase of £10,000 till May, it will give us an income of £162,000,—which will be £40,000 ahead of 1867, the year this effort began. In other words, our people will in this connection have done *practically* as much for our Fund since 1867 as if they had given us a capital of *a Million of Money*,—twice, that is, the amount of Mr. Baird’s great gift to the Establishment. In the form of an annual contribution it is far better and safer for the Church and for the *ministry* than if it had come in the form of a millionaire offering or of a State subsidy. How miserable that, with such experiences of God’s faithfulness and of his people’s liberality, — should be doting on his selfish dream of getting the teinds for a new Established Church !”

It will be seen from this letter that Dr. Buchanan’s views had changed considerably since 1838, when he was seen knocking

importunately at the door of Downing Street for a dole out of the public funds. He still believed in the lawfulness of State endowments in proper circumstances, but he had come seriously to doubt their necessity and utility in the present condition of the world. He had lived long enough to have seen a fair trial made of the third alternative\* of which Dr. Chalmers had spoken. The appeal had taken place "*to the general population,*" and the result had not been disappointing. The Sustentation Fund had been subjected to the strain of every description of breeze, and had proved itself seaworthy in all weathers. Vicissitudes in trade—times of spiritual revival and declension—bitter ecclesiastical controversies—the wear and tear of not always good-natured criticism and discussion—and above all things the *vis inertia* of an indolent and self-indulgent time;—it had encountered them all, and it had not only held its ground, but had gone on steadily, though it might not be always rapidly, increasing. But the possibility of working such a system with a measure of financial success was not the only discovery which Dr. Buchanan believed to have been made. He was persuaded that the moral effects of such a scheme had been in many ways good and wholesome; and his assurance of this made him—toward the end of his life, especially—peculiarly jealous of any movement which seemed to take the direction of a reunion on any terms, in present circumstances, with the State. It was his profound conviction that God had been speaking to the Free Church in his providence,—that the amazing measure of success which had attended it was meant to convey an intimation of His will in regard to its immediate future; and that its whole history before the Disruption and

\* The three methods of extending the Church which Dr. Chalmers had tried were,—(1) An appeal to Whig politicians, (2) An appeal to the Tories, and, (3) An appeal *to the general population.*

after was well fitted to make it hesitate about diverging from the line on which it had been placed through no choice of its own, even although the Government were to express its willingness to concede its *Claim of Right* to the uttermost farthing. He had even his doubts about the utility of partial endowments; and he never showed any favour, in consequence, toward a proposal made in certain quarters for a reunion of the Scottish Churches on the basis of an appropriation of the National Ecclesiastical Funds, as far as they would go, to the sustentation of the whole Presbyterian clergy of Scotland.

“For three centuries,” says he in his paper read before the Statistical Society, “the primitive Church made its way in the world, in so far as its means of temporal support was concerned, without any help whatever from State countenance or aid; and during these centuries it not merely stood its ground, but made conquests upon a scale with which it would perhaps be difficult to find anything in its subsequent history that could advantageously compare.....The voluntary oblations of the Christian people were chiefly relied on for the supply of the Church’s temporal wants. These oblations, according to the authorities quoted by Bingham, were of two sorts,—the *weekly* oblations that were made by those who came to partake of the eucharist, and the *monthly* oblations that were cast into the treasury of the Church. To these were added, as the converts to the Christian faith multiplied, gifts of lands or houses,—which, indeed, became in the course of time so considerable as not only to have tended to secularize the clergy, by involving them in the care and management of this ever-accumulating property, but also to dry up the weekly and monthly offerings, these being supposed by the people to be less urgently required. Referring to this tendency of the one source of support seriously to injure the other, Bingham

takes occasion to make the following significant statement :—  
' If any one is desirous to know what part of the Church revenues was anciently most serviceable and beneficial to the Church, he may be informed from St. Chrysostom and St. Austin, who give the greatest commendations to the offerings and oblations of the people, and seem to say that the Church was never better provided than when her maintenance was raised chiefly from them. For then men's zeal prompted them to be very liberal in their daily offerings. But as lands and possessions were settled upon the Church this zeal sensibly abated; and so the Church came to be worse provided for under the notion of growing richer,—which is the thing that St. Chrysostom complains of in his own times, when the ancient revenue arising from oblations was in a great measure sunk, and the Church, with all her lands, left in a worse condition than she was before.' That experience of the primitive Church would seem not indistinctly to indicate that the Free Church of Scotland was well advised in founding, as she did, her financial system, not on two sources of revenue, but only on one."

What we chiefly admire in all Dr. Buchanan's utterances in this connection is the noble and generous confidence which he placed in the Church and the Christian people. This trust may have been the fruit of mere enthusiasm, but even those who have themselves least sympathy with it will readily allow that there is something worthier of respect in such a faith than in the spirit which has led others to speak as if the very organization which Christ himself established for the conversion of the world could never be trusted to fulfil its mission without the support of the secular arm. The peculiarity, however, in the present case, is that Dr. Buchanan was no mere enthusiast or dreamer. He was, in the best sense of the expression, a sober man of the world, notoriously dis-

tinguished for his business-like qualities, his calm judiciousness, and his common-sense. And it is therefore a fact worth making known, for the benefit of any Church which may be looking with apprehension into the future, that such a man, after an experience of seven and thirty years, has left it on record that in his opinion there is no cause to fear for the interests of religion when the Christian people are left to sustain these solely out of their own resources.

What led Dr. Buchanan to speak as he did on this subject was, doubtless, an additional fact which it is necessary to remember if we are to have a complete view of the financial experience of the Free Church. The fact is this, that the burden laid on the people of sustaining their own ministers had an effect, in connection with other schemes of Christian benevolence, the direct reverse of what, according to mere human calculation, might have been anticipated. If a man is giving literally up to the limit of his ability, then it must necessarily follow that the diversion of his liberality into a new channel must dry up one or other of the old channels through which his charity had been accustomed to flow. And if the resources of the Scottish nation had been drawn upon to the uttermost before the Disruption, then the new demand made after the benefits of an Establishment had been taken away could not but have issued in the suspension of all missionary effort in the Free Church. But we are a long way yet from the point of contributing to Christ's cause literally "as God hath prospered us." There is still lying behind an immense reserve of unexhausted capabilities. And since 1843 we have learned a somewhat startling lesson,—namely, that it is not those who have most done for them who do most for others, but that a principle rules which seems to be the direct converse of this. The Free Church was called on in Providence, not merely to sustain the five



hundred ministers who came out, but an ever-increasing number of men who were settled in fresh charges.\* It had also to establish and equip theological seminaries for the training of its students.† The pressure of the times also necessitated its carrying on an extensive education scheme. And it required hundreds of thousands of pounds to rear over all the land the material structures needed for the execution of its work. Yet (and this we regard as by far the most notable point in the history of our finance) the Church has not done less for the propagation of the gospel abroad than it did before the burden of the support of its ministry was thrown upon it, but *immensely more*. In illustration of this, two things only need to be mentioned: one is, that the Free Church has done more for the Colonies and the Continent

\* The following Table shows the progress made by the Church since the Disruption:—

Year.	Amount Contributed to Sustentation Fund.	Number of Ministers Participating in the Fund.	Amount of Dividend Paid each Year.	Year.	Amount Contributed to Sustentation Fund.	Number of Ministers Participating in the Fund.	Amount of Dividend Paid each Year.
1844	£68,704 14 8	583	£105	1861	£112,093 5 0	859	£138
1845	77,630 12 0	627	122	1862	112,616 6 5	872	137
1846	82,681 17 4	672	122	1863	114,292 19 9	885	137
1847	83,117 16 10	673	120	1864	115,784 19 6	894	138
1848	88,996 9 5	684	128	1865	119,450 3 11	903	144
1849	87,115 3 4	705	123	1866	120,296 11 5	902	143
1850	89,764 3 6	729	123	1867	121,725 0 3	917	144
1851	91,527 8 8	736	123	1868	131,312 10 5	923	150
1852	90,794 10 5	745	122	1869	132,125 16 7	942	150
1853	90,885 8 0	759	121	1870	131,262 19 1	947	150
1854	94,635 10 6	765	119	1871	137,398 11 9	948	150
1855	103,535 17 3	786	132	1872	138,061 11 1	957	150
1856	108,972 12 5	790	140	1873	136,779 19 8	969	150
1857	108,638 4 5	811	138	1874	152,112 8 4	975	150
1858	108,920 7 0	825	138	1875	163,696 16 0	972	157
1859	110,141 11 8	827	138	1876	166,427 9 3	1014	157
1860	109,259 17 11	846	135				

† There are three of these,—one in Edinburgh, another at Glasgow, and a third in Aberdeen. Endowments to the extent of over £150,000 have been provided for them; and the system of education is more complete than in the Universities. There are thirteen professors.

than any other Presbyterian Church in the world; and the other is, that its Foreign Missions have since the Disruption continued to expand, until its income has risen from £6,000 a year in 1843 to £52,000 in 1875. Although it may sound like a paradox, therefore, it is the sober truth that, *in the interest of the conversion of the world, the Free Church could not afford to re-connect itself with the State.* The teaching of its experience has been this, that whatever hardship it has itself been compelled to endure, its disestablishment has been for the advantage, on the whole, of the kingdom of God. No one was more impressed with this than Dr. Buchanan; and it was as a practical man, having an eye not to abstract theories, but to the testimony of undoubtedly ascertained facts, that he was always ready to assert that the Free Church had found an absolutely better method of doing the work of Christ in modern society than if it had the help of State Endowments.

It would be impossible to convey in these pages anything like an adequate impression of the amount of time and thought and hard labour expended by Dr. Buchanan on the enterprise which he superintended from 1847 to 1875. His correspondence alone on the subject was enormous; and it is most touching, in looking through so much of it as we have seen, to observe with what heartfelt satisfaction he heard of anything that was of an encouraging nature in connection with the Fund, and how keenly he felt the conduct of any who, by their carping criticism, cast needless difficulties in his way, or by their half-heartedness and indifference threw cold water on his most hopeful and generous propositions. The Chair of the Convenership was not always an easy seat, and nothing but his strong faith in God, his loyalty to his Church, and the profound conviction which possessed him that he was working out a great practical problem whose

solution might be of advantage to other communions besides his own, could have supported him under the toils and anxieties to which he was subjected.

“The discussion of yesterday,” he writes to Mr. Meldrum on the 17th of April 1867, referring to the launching of the great scheme which resulted in an increase within less than ten years of £40,000 per annum to the Fund—“the discussion of yesterday was not promising. Anything more unintelligent than the remarks of Mr. —— and Mr. —— could not well be imagined. As to ——, he can ‘aye objek,’ as Professor Miller used to say long ago. Of course, if the scheme is simply *tolerated*, it would be a sheer absurdity to attempt to work it. Nothing but a cordiality of the most marked character could give us a chance of success. If the wet-blanket system of yesterday is followed to any extent at next meeting, I shall withdraw it from the Committee altogether, and say my say about it in the Assembly on my own individual responsibility. In that case, I shall probably present it as my last contribution toward the improvement of the Sustentation Fund.”

His scheme was launched under happier omens than he thus feared it would be; and in February 1870 we find him writing that he has been greatly cheered by the response. “I have never,” he says, “on the occasion of any former circular, received from so many treasurers such hearty and earnest letters of sympathy, and expressing such a desire to make progress.” And his zeal continued unabated to the last. Three days before his death, he wrote as follows to Mr. Meldrum:—

“ROMA VIA ANGELO CUSTODE,  
March 27, 1875.

“MY DEAR MR. MELDRUM,—Looking forward to the Assembly, I have begun to turn over in my mind one or two things which induce me to write this letter. I really feel that we ought to be putting things in trim for the appointment of a successor in the Convenership of the Committee.

The only thing that has hindered me from taking steps in this direction sooner is the difficulty of finding the right man, and who would have general acceptance with the Church. You may remember I spoke of Whyte of St. George's some time ago. I still think favourably of this idea. His general ability, his being at the head of our greatest congregation, and the decided interest he takes in the Fund, all speak greatly in his favour. I have an impression that he may plead the arduous and responsible nature of his charge as a reason for not undertaking any important extra work. But I hope this might be got over. I may be wrong, but I rather think the congregation would like to see him in the office in question. And if he be disposed to say, Not *now*, but *by-and-by*, I would be contented to retain the Convener'ship—if spared—for a couple of years longer, on condition of his taking the Vice-Convener'ship. Between ourselves let me say, I am now within *less* than two years of having completed fifty years of my ministry, at which date—if I live so long—my purpose is to withdraw from all Assembly *official* work, if not from Church work altogether; and I would therefore make up my mind to hold on to my connection with the Committee for a couple of years (*D.V.*) on the footing of having a Vice-Convener to lean upon, and to look to as my successor. I don't think it is wise to be leaving so important an appointment to be made on the *sudden*, and, it may be, without due consideration.

“Will you talk this over privately with Maclagan and Dr. Wilson?”

“If you and they approve of this general idea, I can communicate it to the Committee at its meeting the day before the Assembly meets.

“In prospect of some review I may possibly make of the past history of the Fund, and of my connection with it, at next Assembly, will you kindly let me know—(1st) When Dr. Tweedie came into official connection with the Committee, and whether it was from the first as Convener, or as *Vice*, to Dr. Chalmers?

“(2nd) Also, how long Chalmers' *half-more* scheme continued in force, and when it was laid aside?

“(3rd) When the resolution of the so *miscalled* Rating Scheme was adopted, and when it was withdrawn?

“I think it a highly important fact that the Assembly, as the supreme administrative body in the Church, has not only always *claimed*, but again and again has exercised, without challenge, the right to alter or modify the constitution of the Fund.

“I shall be glad to hear at the earliest how the Fund stands at the end of the eleventh month.

“I have caught a *chill*, which brought on a bilious attack which has a good deal annoyed me; in consequence of which I am writing this with the paper lying on my knee, at the fireside, though it is a glorious day. The attack is passing off, and I hope to be all right in a day or two.

“We are going down to Naples on Monday week, for four or five days,

to see the magnificent bay, with its beautiful surroundings, and to help Mr. Gray, the *interim* minister, to form a Deacons' Court. I hope this will set me completely up again.

“With kindest regards to Mrs. Meldrum, in which Mrs. Buchanan joins,—Yours ever affectionately,

ROBERT BUCHANAN.

“G. MELDRUM, Esq.

“Please send me, on receipt of this, a copy of Monereiff's Report on the Reformed Presbyterian *union*, if it is in print. If it is not, it should be put in type at once. R. B.”

The introduction of such a letter at this stage of his Biography may seem to be an anachronism. But if the important subject spoken of in this chapter was to be dealt with to advantage at all, it was clearly necessary to look at it historically. If the currents of the present day do not deceive those most competent to judge of them, events are certainly tending towards the dissolution everywhere of those ties which now unite the Church and the State. And in view of that, the experience of the Church which was disestablished in 1843 may not be without its significance and value. That Church did not die for lack of State endowments. Its whole income for the last few years has been considerably over £500,000. And there is no comparison between the amount of the work it is now doing for God in its separated state, and the work it achieved when it had the support and fostering care of the secular arm.

## CHAPTER XII.

### THE WRITING OF THE STORY.

IT was obviously desirable that a historical record should be prepared of the remarkable ecclesiastical revolution that had taken place in Scotland. This was demanded at once by the importance of the principles that had been involved in it, by the interest of the events that had occurred, and by the far-reaching consequences which were seen to be certain to follow from it.\* And there were two men who were naturally

\* One of the consequences foreseen is referred to in the following letter addressed by Dr. Cooke, of Belfast, to Sir Robert Peel, two days after the Disruption:—

“My Dear Sir Robert Peel,—A solemn sense of accountability to God and of duty to his Church in these lands compels me once again to bring before you the affairs of the Church of Scotland. I formerly ventured to foretell, in the face of all contrary information which you had received, that at least four hundred ministers would retire in case no relief bill were conceded. I have this day seen the roll of the protesters. It contains four hundred and twenty-five names, and includes the greatest and best of Scotland’s ministers. The enthusiasm, though passionless, is great; and the enthusiasm of Scotsmen is no bubble of an hour. Would God you had taken my humble advice, and prevented this calamity when prevention was so easy! Would that I could even yet persuade you to avert calamities still greater. I am a Presbyterian by conviction; yet, for my friends’ and brethren’s sake, I am as anxious to prevent the overthrow of the Established Church of England and Ireland as I was to prevent the Disruption of the Established Church of Scotland. Yet here I would not be misunderstood. I profess no affection for Prelacy, but I do for many prelates and godly ministers; and so long as they do God’s work in upholding true Protestantism and opposing Popery in the garb of Puseyism, so long would my ‘aversion of them that are given to change’ lead me to preserve what is practically settled rather than incur the fearful risk of theoretic improvement. But that the Disruption of the Church of Scotland, which is held to be the fault of the Government, will be followed by the overthrow of the other, I entertain no more doubt than I do of my own existence. The evil will begin in Ireland; it matters little where it will end. In Ireland, this Disruption is felt by every Presbyterian

looked to as specially qualified to undertake the duty in question. We refer, of course, to Dr. Buchanan and Mr. Alexander Dunlop. Both of them had, without consultation with one another, entertained from a very early period the idea of writing a history of the conflict; and when, in 1846, the former communicated to the latter his settled purpose of beginning the undertaking, Mr. Dunlop's reply was to the effect that he had not himself yet entirely abandoned the thought of writing on the subject, and that he could not promise to be of any service to his friend until his own political prospects had been made more clear. His wish was to enter Parliament; and if he failed in that, he was desirous of reserving for the leisure of the later days of his life the congenial task of placing on record his thoughts about a movement which he had done so much to direct. As it turned out, Mr. Dunlop did get into Parliament, and his closing years were spent usefully and honourably as a statesman. But one cannot help regretting that he was thus prevented from doing something, at least, in the line he indicated. The History might have been left, as it came to be, in the hands of Dr. Buchanan; but there would have been ample room, and a cordial welcome, for a companion volume, on the Philosophy of the History, by Mr. Dunlop.

as an injury inflicted on himself. But can anything now be done? I know not; but surely something may be attempted. The remedy I would therefore propose is this,—the total extinction of Patronage by purchase, and the concession of the same spiritual independence to the Church Courts in Scotland as the Presbyterians of Ireland enjoy.

“I do, even at the eleventh hour, most earnestly entreat you to consider these things. Do not listen again to those who at least attempted to deceive you before. What now has come of Dr. Leishman's and Dr. Cook's predictions, against which I warned both yourself and Sir James Graham? They have been proved worse than nothing and vanity. For God's sake, I beseech you, trust such fallacious prophets no more.

“I fear I shall still continue to speak and to prophesy in vain. But my accuracy in the past ought to gain me some credit for the future; and, be the result as it may, I feel that I have done my duty.”

Dr. Buchanan, besides having a very intimate personal acquaintance with the course of the events which he was required to describe, was far from being unpractised at this time in the use of the pen. We have had occasion to refer to various publications of his already; but in what has been said a very incomplete idea has been given of his literary achievements. Besides his Lectures on Establishments, for example, he had published Lectures on Popery and on the History of the Jews. He was also, in the crisis of the controversy, a constant leader writer in the *Scottish Guardian*; and when he was in London on deputation work, he spent a considerable portion of his time in endeavouring to enlighten the English mind through the columns of the *Morning Chronicle*, the *Standard*, and the (Wesleyan) *Watchman*.

His book "The Ten Years' Conflict" did not appear till 1849; but the wonder is that, with his many distractions, he was able to complete such a work even then. For while he was in the middle of his labours he was appointed Convener of the Sustentation Fund Committee, and spent the greater part of the summer of 1847 in travelling over Scotland.

Two letters now beside us give a good indication of the spirit in which the work was proceeded with. The first is from Sheriff Gordon of Banff, and suggests the idea of his having spared no pains to equip himself for the task; the other is addressed to his old friend, Mr. William Brown, and reveals the sense of dependence he had on the direction of a higher Mind. Mr. Gordon's collection of the literature of the period was particularly full and comprehensive, and he placed the whole at Dr. Buchanan's disposal. The mass of information thus despatched to Glasgow is summarized in the following list:—

- 19 Vols. Pamphlets, large set, bound.
- 5 Vols. Pamphlets, small set, bound.
- 128 Pamphlets and Papers, unbound.



2 Vols. Auchterarder Case, Court of Session.  
 1 Vol. Lethendy Case.  
 1 Vol. Session Papers, Auchterarder Case.  
 Sydow on Scottish Church Question.  
 Noel's State of the Case for the Church of Scotland.  
 Report of the Stewarton Case.  
 Erastus, with Preface by Dr. Lee.  
 The Late Secession, by Dr. Macfarlane.

To Mr. Brown he said:—"As I proceeded with the work, it was my constant and earnest prayer that I might obtain from above the needed wisdom for the execution of so important and responsible a task, and that it might prove such a work as the Lord would approve and bless. The distractions in the midst of which I carried it\* on were often most overpowering; so that my heart many times all but failed me. But I was helped through with it; and sometimes with such a felt experience of the help I wanted, as was very encouraging and wonderful even to myself."

The object of the work, as the author himself indicates in his Preface, was to explain the causes and to trace the history of the Disruption of the Established Church of Scotland. "The principles," he adds, "involved in that ecclesiastical convulsion have an immediate bearing both on the constitution and prerogatives of the Church of Christ and on the great question of its relation to the civil power. The subject is therefore one of catholic importance, and it derives additional and peculiar interest from the character of the present times. In one form or another the points at issue in the 'Ten Years' Conflict' are at this moment, in almost every nation of Europe, the questions of the day."

After explaining the "Nature of the Question," he proceeds to trace its fortunes through the Church from the Reformation.

\* As the book approached completion he sometimes worked, he tells, *sixteen hours a day*; and it is not wonderful that under such circumstances his health should have suffered. The publication was followed by an illness by which, for a time, he was laid aside from duty.

Coming to more recent times, he describes the Assembly of 1834, when the reign of Moderatism ended, and shows the happy fruits of Evangelical ascendancy. The Conflict then begins with the Auchterarder Case, and throughout the Second Volume we have a graphic picture of how the battle then went on. At last the fighting ceases. We come into the new world of the Convocation and the Disruption Assembly. And the whole concludes with a last look of that Establishment which it is found necessary to abandon. The importance of the work as a contribution to the Church History of Scotland cannot be doubted, and one may safely predict that, as time goes on, it will increase rather than diminish in recognized value.

Some opinions expressed about it at the time of its publication will be read now with not a little interest. The following is from Mr. Dunlop :—

“ EDINBURGH, *June 15, 1849.*”

“ I was not able till yesterday to begin to indulge myself in the perusal of your ‘ Conflict,’ which I have now nearly finished. It has afforded me very great delight. The introductory part is most admirable and complete, both as a succinct and clear and most interesting summary of the past history of our Church, exhibiting distinctly her characteristic features, and as a foundation for the new portion of it of which you have become the historian. Of this part of the work I am not so impartial a judge, because in the circumstance of my being engaged while reading it in fighting over again battles in which I was a combatant there is a special interest which the bulk of readers will not feel; but I shall be surprised if it do not deeply interest every reader, however little concerned with the Conflict itself. For myself, I have read it with such interest as to have had no time to act the critic as to the legal and constitutional discussions detailed, but no defect or error struck me as I went through it—though I shall, of course, give a more heedful attention to this branch of it on a future occasion. I sincerely congratulate you and the Church on your work.”

Here is another, from Mr. Smith of Jordan Hill, whose work on the Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul is so well known to students of the *Acts of the Apostles* :—

“ YACHT ‘RAVEN,’ ARROCHAR, *June 9, 1849.*

“ You will, I trust, excuse me, residuary though I be, for expressing to you the interest and admiration with which I read your History of the Ten Years’ Conflict in the Church of Scotland. It is indeed too interesting; for I could not lay it down till I finished it, and thus exhausted what I meant to be my study on the voyage.

“ You are fortunate indeed in a noble subject, but your Church is also fortunate in a historian; for, independent of the interest which it excites, it appears to me, who took different views from you in some respects, to be a perfectly fair statement of the events and principles at issue, so clearly stated that we may hope that the objects for which you struggled may be comprehended by English readers. I never met English hearers who could.

“ I never can think with patience on the conduct of our Conservative statesmen, and very little with the party in the Church with whom I was in the habit of voting, for not combining to procure an enactment which would have insured the principle of Non-Intrusion. I am happy to reflect that in my humble sphere I did my best. If I had been in the thick of the battle as you were, I have often thought I would have left the Church; but I went abroad in 1839, and did not return to Scotland till 1846. I was, however, in England in 1841, and acted cordially with John Hamilton, Dr. M’Kellar, &c., as a member of the Non-Intrusion Committee.

“ Nothing gives me greater pleasure than the justice you have done to the attempt made by my late right-hearted and clear-headed friend, the Duke of Argyle.”

Still more interesting are the following notes by Professor Miller. We give them all, although it is only the last which specially refers to the book of which we are now speaking:—

“ Lord Jeffrey, in July 1849, talked much with me about the Disruption; and his general tone indicated great disappointment and discontent with the conduct of his leading political friends in that matter, both in the Lords and Commons.

“ *Inter alia*—He told me that he believed the opinion of Lords Cottenham and Brougham was not an honest one. They had not studied the case fully when it first came before them; having been told, on authority they placed confidence in, that the question was both a trumpery and a temporary one, that it would soon be heard of no more, and that it was of vital importance for the public weal that the decision of the court below should be sustained. They decided accordingly; and Lord Jeffrey’s impression and belief was that, so far as they had studied the question on that occasion, their conviction was opposed to their decision; that they stifled this for the *majus bonum—non ecclesie*.

“Subsequently, that this conviction deepened; but from pride and other considerations they resolved to adhere to their original decision, unsound though they knew it to be; the more especially as they still believed that the excitement was evanescent, and that there would be no disruption.

“Lord Jeffrey had personal and repeated dealings with Lord John Russell on the Church question. He warned him (Lord John) of the danger and folly of the course he and his friends were pursuing in that matter. And Lord John always received this objurgation with a ‘pooh pooh.’ On one occasion Lord Jeffrey was specially urgent, saying, ‘Take my advice, my lord; you know me to be a safe man in such matters—no bigot—no zealous and enthusiastic religionist—no partizan. And I warn you that you are committing a great blunder, and that in consequence you are on the eve of a great calamity.’ ‘Nonsense,’ replied Lord John; adding, ‘How many, think you, will come out? Twenty or thirty?’ Lord Jeffrey at once answered, ‘We will not count them by units, if you please, or by tens, but by hundreds. And as many of these as there are digits on that hand will remain stanch to their principles.’ Lord John still remained unbelieving; declaring *his* conviction that, if there was a break-up at all, only a few turbulent, hot-headed spirits would leave, whose absence they would find a great relief. And on that he acted.

“Lord Jeffrey at my request read ‘The Ten Years’ Conflict.’ He was much delighted with it, and told me so more than once; commending the work especially for accuracy, impartiality, argumentative power, skilful arrangement, and general literary merit; adding: ‘As to the last, you must remember that my opinion is worth something. I am entitled to be considered a judge in that department.’ But the merit which he chiefly dwelt on was what he termed *courage*; explaining that no difficulty or objection was ever flinched from or evited, but was always met and mastered in a manly and masterly way.

“More than once he said, ‘There is no work of the kind of greater merit, so far as I know.’”

We may also give a pleasant reminiscence sent to us by Mr. William Brown. The value of Mr. Reddie’s testimony will, we have reason to believe, be very specially appreciated in Glasgow:—

“An important testimony to the sound foundation of constitutional law on which the leaders of the Church rested, the able manner in which that legal foundation is set forth in Dr. Buchanan’s history of the Ten Years’ Conflict, and all the proceedings of the Church were based upon that foundation, may be had in the opinion, mature, though casually given, of the late Mr. James Reddie, advocate, one of the best lawyers of his day, who

was long Town-Clerk of Glasgow, and whose judgment commanded respect both in the Court of Session and in the House of Lords.

“The writer, who had been Dean of Guild, and was then a member of the Town Council, and was also Mr. Reddie’s personal friend during two or three years before the Disruption, had frequent occasion to see Mr. Reddie at his chambers, when the latter took the opportunity several times seriously to impugn the proceedings of the Non-Intrusion party, and to say they were all wrong in point of law, and were ruining the Church. His visitor, of course, demurred to this, and quoted the judgment of Lord Moncreiff and some other eminent lawyers against it; but Mr. Reddie always concluded by asserting that the whole weight of the lawyers in the country is against you.

“Late in life Mr. Reddie became an invalid, and so great a sufferer he could actively engage in nothing. He could still attend to reading, and had many books read to him; one of these, which was lent by the late Dr. Henderson, was ‘The Ten Years’ Conflict.’ It was read to him by his daughter, and he took a very attentive interest in it. When it was finished, he said to Miss Reddie, ‘When you return that book to your friend, you will give him my thanks, and say I am now satisfied that the Free Church leaders were right *in point of law.*’”

Among those within the Free Church itself who were moved to express to the author their opinion of his work, no one was more elaborate or more generous in his criticism than Sir Henry Wellwood Moncreiff. Dr. Buchanan carefully preserved several long letters of his, in which the whole book is carefully and in detail reviewed. One extract from these letters is of some personal interest :—

“I have so many reasons for being gratified with your fourth chapter, that I am rather unwilling to criticize it at all. Your manner of alluding to my grandfather, at pp. 205, 206, is far too agreeable for me to be impartial in judging of the portion of your work where the allusion occurs. Still I think I do not go beyond the general opinion when I say that no portion of it seems more happily adjusted, or more suitably and skilfully expressed, than your series of sketches beginning with Robertson and ending with McCrie. I consider your picture of Dr. Andrew Thomson to be the only one extant which truly and sufficiently portrays him. The brevity of the sketches is one of their great recommendations; and I have nothing to desire respecting that of my grandfather, except, perhaps, that I might have felt it satisfactory, if you had thought it worth while, for the sake of strangers, to advert to the very great length of the period over which his course of service extended, as having enabled him to accomplish far more

than he could otherwise have done. But I make this remark simply in the spirit of faithfully recording whatever has occurred to me, and not because I am otherwise than fully satisfied and pleased with your felicitous description."

Last of all, we give a note from a statesman to whom the Free Church has been in various ways deeply indebted, and whom Dr. Buchanan always regarded with the warmest admiration,—Mr. W. E. Gladstone :—

"On my arrival in town for the opening of Parliament, I have found awaiting me the copy of your work on the history of the Free Church of Scotland which you have done me the honour to present to me.

"I beg you to accept my best thanks for this mark of your kindness, and to assure you that I look forward with much interest to making myself fully acquainted with the contents of your important work, at which I have already had a rapid glance.

"A friend of mine, a conscientious and earnest-minded French Roman Catholic, well acquainted with our country and language, once told me that, amidst his discouragements in witnessing the progress of unbelief in so many quarters, he had found a singular comfort in the testimony borne by the ministers and members of the Free Church of Scotland to the authority of conscience and of positive religious belief.

"I claim, therefore, no special credit when I assure you that, differing myself from the Free Church in some points of belief, I nevertheless find in it very much that claims from me both sympathy and honour, much that deserves attentive study, much that holds out the promise, under God, of future good in times when it appears as though, notwithstanding many signs of good, the masses of professing Christians were gradually relaxing their grasp of truth, and their belief of the gospel as indeed a revelation given to man, and not proceeding from him, and independent in itself of all his impressions concerning it."

"For the work which he has so happily achieved," says a Critic of the time (the late Dr. James Hamilton of London, as we have some reason to believe), "Dr. Buchanan possessed singular advantages. With all the arcana of that eventful story he has the minute acquaintance of an immediate actor; and yet, from the mildness of his nature and his habitual self-possession, he has learned to view it with much of a spectator's

dispassionate eye. Instinctively a gentleman, he has withal the generous chivalry which characterizes the nobler combatants in every strife, and which makes them foremost to do justice to antagonists worthy of themselves. And in many of the narrator's artistic qualities these volumes betoken no mean accomplishment. Eloquent without rhetorical effort, the story is told with delightful continuousness, and a dramatic unity pervades it to the close. Intractable materials have been handled with consummate skill; long debates are condensed into vivid dialogues, and by a rapid recital, or on a current of lively description or earnest feeling, the reader is tided over the more tedious technicalities. It is the story of a modern incident, and therefore the writer does not affect a stately or antique style; but in dispensing with the tragic stilts there was no danger that he would forget the inherent dignity of his theme. Accordingly, by writing a book, the honest expression of a cheerful but earnest mind, Dr. Buchanan has at once secured good-will for his sprightliness and sympathy in his seriousness. It is a noble production; and by its masterly ground-work of principles has given catholic importance to a local feud, just as its preliminary sketch of Scottish Church History shows that, instead of being a mushroom movement, the Revolution of 1843 has a root deep as the martyrs' graves, and a vitality enduring and intense as is the nation's heart."

The success of Dr. Buchanan in connection with this historical effort led him, a few years later, to contemplate another work of a similar kind. What its character was intended to be will be gathered from the outline which he drew up, and copies of which he circulated, with a view to the collection of suitable material. The prospectus before us now is in print, and its completeness shows how thoroughly the plan

of the book had been thought out in his own mind. The reader will look through it with a melancholy interest:—

THE TEN YEARS' REBUILDING; OR, THE BREACH MADE  
BY THE STATE REPAIRED BY THE PEOPLE:  
BEING A SEQUEL TO  
THE HISTORY OF THE DISRUPTION OF  
THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

---

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.—The Church Disestablished; a Preliminary Sketch.

SECTION FIRST.—DISRUPTION SACRIFICES; or, the “Great Price” of the Church’s Freedom:—

CHAP. I.—A Houseless Ministry; or, the Leaving of the Manse. (*Illustrative Cases*—Showing the severity of the trial.)

CHAP. II.—A Churchless People; or, the Congregation in the Fields. (*Cases*—Preaching and dispensation of the Sacraments in the open air—Hardships to which congregations were thus exposed.)

CHAP. III.—Domestic Trials; or, “Five in One House Divided—two against three, and three against two.” (*Examples*—Showing painfulness of conflict between feeling and duty.)

CHAP. IV.—Public Wrongs and Private Persecutions; or, the Site-refusers and their Kindred Oppressors. (*Cases*—In which sites were refused, and the consequent hardships of ministers and people—oppression of landlords in coercing tenants to conform to the Establishment, and of masters in coercing servants.)

CHAP. V.—The Unseen Victims; or, the Martyrs with no Scaffold and no Stake. (*Cases*—Of ministers losing their health, or dying, under the pressure of the hardships to which the Disruption subjected them—like cases of members of congregations, from exposure to the severity of the weather where sites were refused.)

SECTION SECOND.—DISRUPTION BLESSINGS; or, the Payment of the “Great Price” acknowledged with a Great Reward:—

CHAP. VI.—The Large Adherence of the People to the Church’s Testimony for Christ. (*Cases*—Of congregations, and of whole districts of country—statistics of Free and Established churches, then and now, in these localities—the promptitude with which the people came out at the Disruption—adherence of all the Church’s missionaries, and of most of her colonial ministers and congregations.)

CHAP. VII.—The Cordial Sympathy of other Churches. (The Deputations at the Glasgow Assembly, and at Canonmills Hall, in 1843—Letters of sympathy—feeling manifested in America and on the Continent.)

CHAP. VIII.—A Time of Reviving and Refreshing—the People Hungering



and Thirsting for the Word. (*Examples*—Cases of spiritual fruit—favour shown by Divine Providence in the weather of 1843, when the congregations were mostly worshipping in the fields.)

CHAP. IX.—Enlarged Opportunities of Usefulness opened for the Church at Home and Abroad. (*Cases*—Of access to Moderate parishes, and good resulting—acceptance of the Free Church in the colonies, and in foreign countries.)

CHAP. X.—Unanimity of the Church's Councils, and Energy of her Proceedings.

CHAP. XI.—The Breach Repaired; or, the Free Church of Scotland as she now is.

SECTION THIRD.—EFFECTS OF THE DISRUPTION:—

CHAP. XII.—Social Effects of the Disruption.

CHAP. XIII.—Political Effects of the Disruption.

CHAP. XIV.—Religious Effects of the Disruption.

CONCLUSION.—CHAP. XV.—The Hand of God in the whole Movement.

Among Dr. Buchanan's papers are various proofs that he had done something toward the execution of this plan. He made a tour in Sutherlandshire in 1853, with a view to seeing the state of the Highlands with his own eyes; and the Journal then kept by him is still preserved. He also received from various quarters narratives detailing the experiences of country ministers at the Disruption. But the pressure of other occupations became too much for him, and the idea had in the long run to be given up. There is some reason, however, for thinking that he never wholly abandoned the thought of reviewing the history of the Free Church. He indulged the hope that in the late evening of his life he might be able to carry out his long-cherished plan, to some extent; and there can be no doubt that, if he had done so, the work would have been more valuable than even one written earlier. But the day never came; and his reputation as a historian rests wholly on "The Ten Years' Conflict."

## CHAPTER XIII.

### MISSION WORK IN THE WYNDYS.

It has been the distinction of Glasgow, that during the last half-century it has produced a larger proportion of liberal-hearted men than perhaps any other city in the kingdom. Of these, one of the earliest to make his influence felt was Mr. William Campbell of Tillichewan. He was among the first to catch the generous spirit of Chalmers; and he lived long enough to bring forth fruit in old age. In 1855, for example, we find him presiding over a meeting which had been convened for exactly the same ends as had led him, twenty years before, to propose a scheme of his own to the then unbroken Church of Scotland. At the earlier period he had planned to raise £140,000, with a view to the erection of one hundred new places of worship throughout Scotland; at the later date he is seen acting as the chairman of a building society, whose object was to meet the spiritual destitution of the particular city in which he lived.

Mr. Campbell, in his opening speech, referred to the history of Church Extension in Glasgow. Forty years before, he said, Dr. Chalmers had come to the city and found only seven parish churches for a population of nearly 200,000. Shocked at this inadequate supply of the means of grace, he had pressed on the Magistracy and Town Council the duty of adding to the church accommodation; and had so far succeeded,

that at his solicitation they built St. John's, and purchased St. James's. But the disproportion between the supply and the need was still far too great, and as the movements of the constituted authorities were too slow to meet the emergency, certain laymen resolved to take up the cause and prosecute it at their own hand. Mr. William Collins took the lead in this enterprise, and the success of it was triumphant. Within five years twenty new churches were built in Glasgow by voluntary contribution, and the available sittings of the Establishment were increased from 7000 to 18,000. Nor was this great multiplication of places of worship found to be superfluous. The population was all the while rapidly growing; and many, it was ascertained, had not been attending church, simply because there was no church in their neighbourhood.

“We have got a new scheme now,” Mr. Campbell went on to say—“that of Dr. Buchanan; a scheme *which goes deeper into the mass of the community than did the scheme of Mr. Collins*; for while his was rather adapted to accommodate the middle classes, Dr. Buchanan's is intended and fitted to reach down to the very roots of society.” Mr. Campbell added that he was more hopeful of the lower class than of those who were not so degraded in their social position; for they were so friendless, so unhappy and depressed, that it was the consolations of the gospel alone which could bring them any comfort.

How Dr. Buchanan came to undertake the scheme here spoken of is very well told by Mr. Morison, to whose recollections of work in connection with the Free Tron Church we have already been greatly indebted. But before giving his account, it may be well to interpose here two things—(1) some reference to a great work of church building which the Disruption necessitated, and to which Mr. Campbell had

no occasion to refer; and (2) some description of the territory whose amelioration the Tron Free Church felt itself called upon, after a time, to undertake.

In 1843, a large proportion of the ministers in the city of Glasgow "came out." Those who held parochial charges were, of course, at once required to find accommodation for themselves and their congregations elsewhere; but it was thought extremely hard that the new churches, which had been raised chiefly by the exertions of Mr. Collins and the Evangelicals, should be abandoned by the very persons who had so recently erected them; and an effort was made by these parties to establish a claim to them in a court of law. The effort failed. Their title in *equity* was in most quarters recognized; but, with a blind belief in the certainty of relief from Parliament, they had almost universally bound their churches to the Establishment whatever it might happen to be; and at so late a date as 1849 a decision in the House of Lords was given which compelled ten fresh congregations to leave the sanctuaries in which they had up till that time been worshipping, and to face all the difficulties of finding other places in which to rest. This circumstance greatly extended *the ordinary building era* in Glasgow over the time it had occupied elsewhere, and to it, perhaps, we are to attribute the fact that the work of Church Extension proper did not commence there till almost ten years after the Disruption. In the interval, however, between 1843 and 1853, the framework of the Church was completely restored,—twenty-eight new Free churches having then been built in the city and its neighbourhood at a cost of about £107,000,—and now as this busy time was drawing to a close the missionary spirit began to stir, and to seek expansion in the breaking of fresh ground.

With regard to the territory in which the Tron Free

Church commenced operations, here is what is said about it by Mr. Maccoll: -

“The Wynds\* had a sunken population of nearly 12,000,—six times the maximum of Dr. Chalmers for a district,—and that population bordered on and insensibly melted into districts quite as sunken and quite as populous. Glasgow, unlike Edinburgh, had this population much more inconveniently removed from the wealthy, educated, and helpful classes. The Wynds were the lowest moral level of a large and rapidly extending surface. They were constantly receiving the drainage or dregs of nearly half a million. Half the population of the district or more were Roman Catholic. It had been difficult and indeed dangerous for decently-dressed people to pass through certain portions of the district without insult and outrage. The Saltmarket and the Bridgegate were constantly crowded from morning to night with hundreds ready for riot. The houses were dilapidated, the closes filthy; pauperism, crime, indecency, drunkenness, fanaticism, brutality had here their home.....A great gulf was forming and yearly widening between the Wynds and the West End. The streams of busy life, like mighty rivers, had long been making new channels through a richer soil, and those large, cozy depths were thus less and less within reach of the main routes of those who go down to the sea of city life. Unless something were done quickly, and on some scale adequate to the increasing necessities, not only would the work be soon beyond the resources of any labour and means at the command of the benevolent, but the black seething bog might burst upon the green fruitful borders that were still with difficulty retained. The Wynd work was thus not only deeply important, but critical.”

The prospect thus pictured was certainly a sufficiently alarming one, and we cannot help feeling glad that when the problem of the reclamation of this wilderness did come to press itself with overwhelming urgency upon such men as were called to grapple with it, the day had gone by when it was thought indispensable that municipal or parliamentary money must be got for the support of a missionary agency. What a miserable thing it would have been if Dr. Buchanan had been obliged once more to betake himself to London and renew his appeals in Downing Street or St. Stephen's! Happily he had by this time learned a better way. The

\* “Work in the Wynds.” By the Rev. D. Maccoll. London: Nelson & Sons.

Christian people had proved to be immensely quicker in their sympathy and readier with their help than the politicians. He addressed himself to them, and with their aid he entered on the prosecution of a scheme whose marvellous success is one of the memorabilia in the history of domestic missions.

The roots of the scheme appear to have lain deeper than is generally supposed.

“The first missionary efforts,” says Mr. Morison, “of the congregation, after being organized, were directed to the Old Tron Parish, then and for many years one of the most sunken and wretched in the city. In November of the year of the Disruption the Session of the Free Tron rented a school in Miller’s Place, a small street in the very heart of the parish. A day school was at once begun here, while the building was utilized on Sabbath evenings by Sabbath schools and also a preaching station. The service at these meetings was conducted every second Sabbath by Dr. Buchanan, in addition to his regular ministerial work. On the Sabbaths when he was not present the elders conducted devotional services. This may be looked upon as the first efforts of the Free Tron congregation, which were afterwards to develop into what was afterwards known as the ‘Wynd Mission.’

“During this winter, in addition to all his public work and his pastoral duties connected with a large and scattered congregation, Dr. Buchanan held a class on Sabbath evenings for young people, at which there were over one hundred constantly in attendance. The new church was opened during the summer of 1844 (I think in June of that year); the Rev. Dr. Robert Gordon preached in the forenoon, and Dr. Buchanan in the afternoon. Before the new church was opened there had been an election of deacons, so that when the congregation got settled in the church all the various agencies of an

active and vigorous Christian congregation were in full operation.

“ In March 1845 Dr. Chalmers delivered a lecture in the Free Tron Church on the subject of ‘ Congregational Local Missions;’ and immediately thereafter the Session of the Free Tron took up the subject and resolved to concentrate their efforts in a *limited* portion of the Tron parish, requesting the agency then existing to co-operate with them in carrying out this scheme.

“ In 1845 Dr. Buchanan and his Session admitted as a communicant the Rev. Mr. O’Loughlin, who had been a priest of the Church of Rome in Ireland. Shortly after this, Mr. O’Loughlin was engaged by the Session to act as a missionary and Scripture reader amongst the Irish Roman Catholics residing in that part of the Tron parish which had been selected as the local mission field of the congregation. Mr. O’Loughlin continued to labour in this capacity for several years with great acceptance.

“ Shortly after this it became necessary for the Session, in prosecuting their work in the missionary district, to engage a regular missionary, in order that the work of *visitation* might be more efficiently done. This was done, in conjunction with the Glasgow City Mission, by the engagement of a divinity student (Mr. Allan), who continued to labour to the satisfaction of the Session and congregation until after he was licensed to preach the gospel.

“ In 1847 an important association was formed in connection with the congregation. It was composed of young men who formed themselves into a society for the purpose of extending the Redeemer’s kingdom both at home and abroad. This proposal at once met the cordial approval of Dr. Buchanan and his Session; and it is worthy of notice that this movement began amongst the young men themselves without

being suggested by the Session or Dr. Buchanan, showing how thoroughly Dr. Buchanan had imbued his congregation with his own zeal and enthusiasm in the cause of missions. This society still continues to exist, and has been the means, under the blessing of God, of doing much good both at home and abroad. This association had the privilege, during Dr. Buchanan's ministry in the Tron, of supporting the Rev. Lal Behari Dey during the time he was prosecuting his studies for the ministry. This accomplished native is now an ordained minister of the Free Church in Bengal.

“The educational efforts of the congregation were not confined to the Miller's Place school—a large hall in the Bridge-gate having been acquired and fitted up as a schoolroom, with efficient teachers, male and female; while another school, built for the purpose by a few of the large-hearted office-bearers connected with the Free Tron,\* was begun in the Old Wynd. Both of these schools did most excellent and efficient work, and it was on the success of the latter that Dr. Buchanan founded the theories which he developed in his popular and effective lecture on ‘The Schoolmaster in the Wynds.’

“In the beginning of 1850 an important step was taken by the Session of the Free Tron on the suggestion of Dr. Buchanan. This was the appointment of Mr. James Hogg as missionary in the Tron parish. While the Session had reason to be satisfied with the labours of Mr. Allan and Mr. O'Loughlin, yet as both of these gentlemen could give but a portion of their time to the work, it necessarily followed that the results were comparatively small. The attention of Dr. Buchanan had been directed—through the late Rev. Andrew Gray of

\* Mr. James Stevenson mentions that this school was originally an old candle-work, which was acquired by the late John Blackie, Esq., senior, head of the eminent publishing firm of that name, for £500, and transferred by him to the congregation.



Perth, we believe—to Mr. Hogg, as a man of no common force of character, united to genuine piety, great natural abilities, and indomitable perseverance. Dr. Buchanan was not long in seeing how eminently suitable such a man as Mr. Hogg was for the work which he and his Session had in hand. Mr. Hogg was at once unanimously and cordially appointed as missionary of the congregation in the Wynds and Bridgegate. It is not necessary to advert to the importance of this appointment, as it has become a matter of such public interest, marking as it does an epoch in the history of Home Mission work in Glasgow and other large towns throughout Scotland. For years Mr. Hogg laboured in season and out of season, by day and by night, organizing visitors, visiting himself, lecturing, preaching,—in fact, devoting his whole time and energies to his work. It is hardly too much to say that Mr. Hogg almost lived in the Wynds for years. His duties were to visit in the Wynds for five days in the week, hold at least one prayer-meeting on a week night, preach two discourses every Sabbath, besides taking an active interest in the educational operations of the congregation in the parish. These comprised two large and well-attended day schools, and a large staff of Sabbath-school teachers, with many hundred scholars of the very poorest and most ignorant class. In all these manifold and arduous labours Mr. Hogg had the cordial support and help of Dr. Buchanan. This work, under the Session and Mr. Hogg, had been so successful, that in October 1851 application was made to the Presbytery for leave to dispense the communion of the Lord's Supper to those who had been gathered into the mission. The attendance at the Sabbath evening service in the Bridgegate Schoolroom at this time was over 200; while it was calculated that over 350 individuals, all adults, were connected with the mission, all of whom had either been utter strangers to social worship or who had long ago fallen from

it. After a careful consideration of the whole case, in which Dr. Buchanan himself tested the fitness of those who wished to be admitted to the Lord's Supper for the first time, it was found that fifty-nine persons were, after repeated examinations by Dr. Buchanan and members of his Session, judged fit and proper, so far as religious knowledge and character were concerned, to be received into the communion of the Church.

“This first sacrament of the infant Church of the Wynds took place on December 7, 1851, and created a good deal of interest in the district. Dr. Buchanan bore testimony to the great interest and solemnity manifested by the communicants and the congregation present. The satisfaction of Dr. Buchanan and Mr. Hogg on the occasion were not without some slight drawbacks; not, however, from the communicants or the worshippers, but from the rude and sunken population in the neighbourhood, and whose good for time and eternity was the object of their labours. During the service, on the evening of the first communion, an attempt was made to disturb the meeting by throwing stones at the windows, breaking the glass, and creating a noise outside with most abusive language towards the worshippers. The Session were obliged to apply to the police for protection against such conduct in future.

“Without giving a history of the Wynd Mission and all its various agencies, it may be sufficient to state that the work was so vigorously and successfully carried on that by May 1852 there were no fewer than forty-six new applicants for admission to the Lord's Table in the Mission Station. Before the end of this year, 1852, Dr. Buchanan and his Session were taking steps to secure a site for a new church to be erected in the Tron parish for the accommodation of the large and steadily increasing congregation gathered together by Mr. Hogg. The communion was again dispensed in the Bridgegate Schoolroom on Sabbath, December 5, when 116 communicants

partook of that holy ordinance, all of whom had no connection with any church before."

The work thus described—the need for it, its difficulties, and its successes—had been all the while watched with anxious attention by Dr. Buchanan; and as it proceeded, the conviction grew upon him that, in the lanes and byways of our great cities, a state of things was prevailing despicable to the Christian Church, and menacing in the highest degree to the stability of society. Although, then, he had in hand already the direction of a scheme sufficient, one would have thought, to tax all his energies, and although he had just completed a work which had cost him many months of laborious study, he plunged afresh into a new enterprise, which, we have good reason for believing, moved him more deeply than anything else in his whole ministerial life. We find nowhere in any of his other speeches or writings such passion, such keen and overpowering emotion, as appear in his appeals in connection with the evangelization of Glasgow.

What seems to have soon impressed him in a peculiarly lively way was an idea to which Lord Macaulay afterwards gave expression in a brilliant address to the citizens of Edinburgh. "I remember," said the eloquent historian, "that Adam Smith and that Gibbon had told us that there would never again be a destruction of civilization by barbarians. The flood, they said, would no more return to cover the earth; and they seemed to reason justly, for they compared the immense strength of the civilized part of the world with the weakness of that part which remained savage, and asked from whence were to come those Huns and from whence were to come those Vandals who were again to destroy civilization? Alas! it did not occur to them that civilization itself might engender the barbarians which should destroy it; it did not occur to them that in the very heart of great capitals, in the

very neighbourhood of splendid palaces, and churches, and theatres, and libraries, and museums, vice, and ignorance, and misery might produce a race of Huns fiercer than those who marched under Attila, and Vandals more bent on destruction than those which followed Genseric."

So spoke Macaulay in 1852. Two years before, on the 30th January 1850, Dr. Buchanan delivered a public lecture,\* under the presidency of the then Lord Provost (Sir James Anderson), in which he showed that the barbarism of the Wynds was already threatening the peace and well-being of the more orderly districts of the city. "Blythswood Hill and Bridgegate," said he, "are not more than a mile apart, and yet, practically, they are nearly as far asunder as the antipodes.....But it is unwise and unsafe to leave unquenched the smouldering fires which are spreading under our feet..... And the forms in which our sins are finding us out in this matter teach us at what a cost we are indulging our selfish ignorance and unconcern as to how men live in such districts as the Wynds."

His illustrations as to the expense entailed upon a city by indifference to the moral condition of its waste places, were taken from the amount of the outlay that had been required during the previous year for the maintenance of pauperism and the suppression of crime. He had ascertained that the regular paupers had numbered 25,000, and the casual poor numbered 30,000 more. To meet the wants of so many, an assessment had been required of £106,000. "Here," said he, "is a standing army devouring the substance of their more sober and industrious fellow-citizens. Were this frightful multitude seen approaching the city in battle array to levy their subsidy of £106,000 by force of arms, even the peace-

\* Afterwards published, and widely circulated, under the title of "The Schoolmaster in the Wynds." Glasgow: Blackie & Son.

ful citizens of St. Mungo might be moved to make an effort, at least—like Bailie Nicol Jarvie in the Clachan of Aberfoyle—to get their rusty ‘shabbles’ out of their decaying sheaths. As it is, the clamour, though very loud and angry, is confined to the strife of tongues in ward and parochial board meetings—finishing not unfrequently with fresh expenses in the courts of law. If, indeed, this mass of pauperism were the result of inevitable misfortune, and if the money expended on it were *doing anything whatever to cure it*, burdensome as it is, it might be patiently and even cheerfully borne. The evil, however, is one which, unhappily, has no such alleviations. Let any one examine the rank and file of that huge army, more than 70,000 strong, which has come, like a cloud of locusts, upon the city, and when he has told off all those whose pauperism can be traced, without effort, to idleness, improvidence, and intemperance, there will be little more than the mere skeleton of the army left behind.”

Regarding the crime of the city, statistics of a like uncomfortable kind were given. During 1848, so many as 24,000 arrests had been made; and the cost of the Police Department had been over £74,000.

What made the outlay in connection with both organizations peculiarly grievous was, as Dr. Buchanan pointed out, this fact,—that *neither of them was remedial*. They did nothing whatever to cure the evils they were instituted to meet; and he contrasts the great and unsatisfactory expenditure on their maintenance with the miserable amount which was devoted to the support of religion and education. Pauperism and vice were costing Glasgow more than £180,000 a year; while to religion and education there was being given, on a liberal computation, considerably less than £40,000 a year.

Having thus cleared his ground, by showing that the agencies then in operation were not adequate to the meet-

ing of the case, the lecturer proceeded to indicate "a more excellent way." To bring about a real and lasting amelioration of the condition of the more destitute classes of society, the material to be wrought upon must, he held, be the rising generation; and the problem, accordingly, which he set himself to discuss, was "how most speedily and most effectually to secure an enlightened and Christian education for the children of the poor." He believed that his experience in the Wynds had supplied him with the key to that problem; and the remainder of his address was devoted to a detailed narrative of what had been done there.

The interest of his account turns mainly on the description which he gives of two plans which were tried for filling the school planted in the Old Wynd. The *attractive* plan, as he calls it, proved quite unsuccessful in a district where the desire to learn did not exist in an active form; and all the results that were satisfactory followed from the other method, that of *aggression*. The first step was to form an educational association, whose object was declared to be "to disseminate the advantages of a scriptural education among the working-classes, to induce them to avail themselves of the means afforded for that purpose, and to co-operate with parents in securing this most desirable end." By this association a band of visitors was organized, who were required to ascertain for themselves, in a direct way, the state of education in their respective districts, and to remove, as far as possible, all difficulties out of the way of children attending the school. And still further to aid in this work, a number of individuals were secured who, though not able to give active personal service, were willing to help with their sympathy and means. These last were called *patrons*; and their duty consisted, not merely in paying the fees of destitute children, but in taking a kindly interest in the general welfare of those whom they

undertook to assist. Dr. Buchanan had a special favour for this last arrangement, and he dwelt upon it in his lecture with some emphasis. "The kind benefactor," says he, "who has become, according to this system, the patron of some poor, helpless, neglected youth, goes and meets him at the school; speaks to him a few encouraging words; follows him to his humble and comfortless home; introduces himself to the parents as the friend of the child; wins his way to their confidence by the mere fact that he comes in such a character; awakens their self-respect by making them feel that those above them take an interest in the well-being of their family; and thus, by degrees, bridges over that widening and perilous gulf which, in those modern times, has been more and more separating and estranging from one another the upper and lower orders of the people."

The school established in this spirit, and carried on in the ways that have been indicated, proved to be signally successful. Out of it grew also other elevating agencies, which materially contributed to the amelioration of the district. And Dr. Buchanan, as he looked on, became so satisfied that *one* effective method at least had been discovered for meeting the evils of the city, that he felt constrained to make known the results in a public way, for the benefit of others. "The Schoolmaster in the Wynds" ran through several editions, and there can be no doubt that it helped materially to stir into quicker activity the missionary spirit that was shortly to manifest itself with increased earnestness throughout the country.

We are very sure that the thus taking the whole city into his confidence did not tend to lessen his interest in the Wynds, or to make him slack his hand in actively seeking their good. Evangelistic efforts continued to be prosecuted in them during the year 1850; and on the 30th of Sep-

tember of that year we find him giving expression, at a *soiree* of the mission held in the premises at Bridgegate, to feelings which indicated an increasing hopefulness in the enterprise. "What do I see here to-night?" said he. "Not all the fruit, but at least an encouraging specimen of the fruit which has been gathered by our Christian agency. Had we attempted to bring together the young as well as the old, we must have gone, I think, at once to the City Hall (applause), for I don't know any other apartment sufficient to accommodate the multitude which we could have gathered around us (applause). But we have, in addition to a number of sympathizing friends of our own beloved flock, another congregation full of the deepest interest to every philanthropic mind, and especially to every Christian heart. In his blessed parable of the lost sheep, Christ tells us of the joy in heaven when those wanderers who have gone furthest away from the fold are brought back on the shoulders of the Good Shepherd to the green pastures and still waters of Zion. It is of such wanderers that this flock is mainly made up; and who can estimate the value of an enterprise which, by the blessing of God, may prove instrumental in arresting even one of those wanderers before his feet have stumbled on the dark mountains?"

But the whole subject of the evangelization of the masses had now assumed, in Dr. Buchanan's eyes, a magnitude and an importance which rendered it impossible for him any longer to confine his attention to the consideration of the best way of educating the young, or of carrying on most effectively congregational missions. He resolved to bring the matter before his Church; and on the 8th of January 1851 he delivered before the Presbytery of Glasgow a speech \* which

\* "The Spiritual Destitution of the Masses in Glasgow; its Alarming Increase, its Fearful Amount, and the Only Effectual Cure." Glasgow: Blackie & Son.



was afterwards published as a pamphlet, and scattered broadcast over the land.

“When Dr. Chalmers,” said he in this speech, “preached his famous ‘Princess Charlotte sermon,’ and sounded the alarm in the ears of one of the largest and most influential audiences that ever assembled in this city, its population was considerably less than 150,000; it now verges on 400,000. Here, then, the question arises, What has been done meanwhile to make provision for the spiritual wants of this additional 250,000 souls? The answer to that question is one that should not merely humble and grieve, but alarm every mind that is capable of understanding it. All the ministers and churches that have been added during the last thirty years, would not have more than sufficed to overtake the religious destitution which existed in this city twenty years ago. This is no random assertion, but an obvious and undeniable fact. Take the population of Glasgow twenty years ago at 200,000. Every one at all acquainted with the subject will allow that 2000 people furnish an ample field for the labours of the most active Christian minister. At this rate, the Glasgow of twenty years ago would have needed at least an hundred ministers and churches to do anything like justice to the religious instruction and pastoral superintendence of its inhabitants. I am not able to say exactly what number of ministers and churches it had then; but this I know, that, including all denominations who even profess to be evangelical, it has scarcely more than a hundred at this hour! In other words, instead of being abreast of the population of 1851 in respect of the means of grace, we are at this moment barely abreast of the population of 1831.

“Fearful as such a state of things is in looking to the past, it becomes still more fearful in looking to the future. I have been speaking in these remarks of what has been going on during the last thirty years. During the first ten of these years—that is, from 1821 to 1831—the population increased at the rate of about 5000 a year. During the second ten of these years—that is, from 1831 to 1841—it increased at the rate of 8000 a year. During the third ten of these years—that is, from 1841 to 1851—it is believed, on good grounds, that the increase will average 12,000 a year. Let any man consider these facts, and then, if he has courage to look forward at all, let him try to picture to himself the state of Glasgow when another thirty years shall have run their course. If the same ratio of increase holds on—and I know of no good reason for doubting that it will—we shall have in thirty years a population nearly equal in numbers to that of Paris; and most assuredly, if the Christian Churches do not speedily arouse themselves, it will be by that time like Paris in more respects than one. We may have the numbers of the French capital, but we shall have their infidelity, their Popery, their licentiousness, and their lawlessness too. If our efforts did not keep pace with a population growing at the rate of

5000 a year, how are such efforts to do alongside of a population growing at the rate of from 12,000 to 15,000 a year? If in the race of the last thirty years we fell at least twenty years behind, how tremendously and how ruinously shall we be distanced in the next thirty years to come! 'If thou hast run with the footmen, and they have wearied thee, then how canst thou contend with horses? and if in the land of peace, wherein thou trustedst, they wearied thee, then how wilt thou do in the swelling of Jordan?'\*

"It is such considerations as these that have brought me to the conclusion that it is impossible to let this subject alone. I feel, what I am sure all my brethren feel along with me, that it will not do to put it any longer aside. We have yielded too long to that sense of helplessness and hopelessness which its numerous difficulties are apt to engender in the mind. It is our selfish indolence and sinful want of confidence in God that are at the bottom of this despondency. All things are possible to him that believeth. If we had faith as a grain of mustard-seed, we should be able to remove these mountains. Let us be done, then, with idly lamenting that things are in so pitiable a case. Let us not think that we can retire, each man within the enclosure of his own flock, and enjoy our own privileges in quiet and comfort, without caring for the desolations of many generations that are lying all around us. If the Christianity of our congregations do not make head upon the surrounding ungodliness, that surrounding ungodliness will make head upon our Christianity. If we do not break forth upon the desert, the desert will break in upon us. When iniquity abounds, the love of many waxes cold. Spiritual religion cannot thrive in an atmosphere foul with corruption. It concerns ourselves and our people, therefore, that we become vigorously and systematically aggressive upon the ignorance and irreligion that are accumulating all around us; and it is in the hope of being enabled to say something which, by God's blessing, may stir up us and others to such an enterprise, that I now venture, in much weakness and fear, to bring the subject formally before the Presbytery and the Church."

Dr. Buchanan then proceeded to describe more particularly the actual moral and spiritual condition of the city, referring particularly to what he had ascertained in a direct way as to the state of the Tron parish. He then went on to speak as follows:—

"I would ask the Presbytery to consider this state of things; I would implore every branch of the Church of Christ in this city to consider it.

\* Jer. xii. 5.

Confident I am, that an equally searching investigation to that which is now going on in the Tron parish would reveal a state of things hardly one whit less dreadful in countless other districts of the city. I am thoroughly convinced that at the very least one fourth part of the entire population of the city is in a state, both socially and religiously considered, substantially similar to that which I have now described; and that another fourth is, at the utmost, only one or two degrees better. In other words, my deliberate conviction is, that one half of the population of this great city are living in utter neglect of the ordinances of God's house—that their Sabbaths are spent in idleness and sin—that this alarming state of things is incessantly and rapidly increasing, and that nothing is doing which even pretends to be a remedy for this enormous and overwhelming evil. Is it any wonder that intemperance, pauperism, and crime are coming in upon us like a flood-tide, and threatening our city with disgrace and ruin? I am well aware that to prove the existence and extent of the evil is, at least in this Presbytery, the easiest part of my task. It is when we turn to seek for the remedy that the real difficulty begins. At the same time, let me here observe that we can never hope to get anything like an adequate remedy provided, unless we press the necessity for it strongly and earnestly upon the public mind. I believe it is only by looking the evil in the face, and setting ourselves deliberately and carefully to study it, that we shall, by God's blessing, get our own minds into a right state of feeling regarding it; and till we are ourselves thoroughly aroused, we cannot hope to arouse others who are further away from the scene."

With regard to the *remedy*, he at once announced that he had no new specific to suggest.

"I know of nothing," said he, "that will do but the scheme which Knox devised at the Reformation, and which Chalmers laboured to restore in our own day. Churches and schools upon the parochial or territorial system, will, by God's blessing, give us back a humanized and Christianized population in the outfields of our city, and nothing else will. In saying this, I am not to be understood as at all undervaluing those other means which have a more direct bearing upon the outward and physical condition of the degraded masses whom we desire to benefit. I am far too deeply alive to the formidable nature of those obstacles which dirt and drunkenness put in the Christian minister's or missionary's way, to be indifferent to any measures by which these obstacles may be lessened or removed. I am the friend and cordial advocate of all those sanitary and lodging-house schemes by which cleanliness and comfort may be promoted in the dwellings of the people. I am, moreover, the relentless enemy of those countless dram-shops and pawn-shops, which are the curse of the community, and am ready to come with heart and hand to the help of those who, like the

magistrates and justices of this city, are labouring so laudably and so zealously to abate a class of nuisances which are among the chiefest nurseries both of our city's pauperism and our city's crime. With my whole soul I bid them God-speed. I do not enter, however, on the consideration of these and such-like measures here—not merely because they do not lie so properly within our province as a Church Court, but because I am thoroughly persuaded that they will totally and utterly fail to effect what they are aiming at unless they be accompanied at every step with those higher influences which flow from the Christian school and from the house of God. The real question, then, in my view of it, being this,—How are we, soonest and most effectually, to establish schools and churches in the morally and spiritually destitute districts of our city?”

For the consideration of this question he proposed that a Committee of Presbytery should be appointed, and that the subject should also be brought formally under the notice of the General Assembly. And he ended thus:—

“There are only two other observations which I wish to make before I conclude. The one is for those who are not of our own communion. I wish it to be distinctly understood that, if I have made no reference to the labours of other bodies in the destitute districts of the city, it is not because I either ignore or undervalue them. I know that many congregations not of the Free Church both feel and manifest an anxious and enlightened concern in this cause. I do not attempt to describe their efforts, simply because I am not in a position to do them justice. I hail them, however, as fellow-labourers. I rejoice to know that they are in the field to some extent already, and I shall rejoice still more to see their exertions multiplying side by side with our own. Certain I am that nothing short of a levy *en masse* of whatever there is of living Christianity in the city, in all the branches of the Church of Christ which it contains, will suffice to make head against the augmenting ignorance, and ungodliness, and Popery, and infidelity with which we have to deal. My other observation is for the members of our own Church. Some of them will perhaps be startled by this movement, simply because it is adding another to our already numerous schemes, and because it may aggravate the difficulty we already feel of carrying them on. Here, they may say, is the beginning of new demands upon both our money and our time. To such a complaint I have no other answer to make but one, but it is one that seems to me to be decisive. My answer is, that this movement, whatever it may cost, is a matter of life and death. If we do not destroy this evil, it will destroy us. I do not think any one that knows me will give me the character of a schemer, or look

upon me as indifferent to the welfare and prosperity of our Church. I am not one of those who think the Free Church is either able or called on to do everything. I know that our means are limited; I know that as yet, at least, they have not been found equal to the due support of our existing ministry; and I think I will get credit when I say that I am not the man to embark in enterprises which, however excellent in themselves, cannot be undertaken by us without weakening and undermining our own institutions. I am jealous of all new schemes. I deeply feel the danger of imposing upon our Church a burden heavier than it might be found to have either divine grace or worldly resources to bear. But, with my mind all alive to such considerations as these, the question remains, What are we to do with these perishing thousands in the very city where we dwell? Are we to stand by and see the people perish? Are we to see religion fallen in our streets, and to pass by with averted eyes on the other side? I believe the curse that fell on Meroz of old will come upon us if we dare to follow so selfish and so sinful a course. The widow of Sarepta shared her last meal with one whom she saw ready to die, and her little store grew into a life-long supply. Let us be assured it will not fare the worse with the Free Church of Scotland that, in the midst of all her straits, she is found willing to share her scanty resources—her five loaves and few small fishes—with the multitudes who are fainting and perishing around us from a famine of the bread of life.”

Both Presbytery and General Assembly responded with the greatest cordiality to the appeal made to them. A Committee of the former Court was immediately appointed to consider what measures it might be wisest to take in the circumstances; while in the General Assembly held in the May following, after stirring addresses had been delivered by Dr. Buchanan, Dr. Anderson Kirkwood, and others, a motion was adopted expressing a hearty sympathy with the movement, and authorizing a collection on its behalf to be made throughout the whole Church.

The enterprise had now assumed dimensions which gave promise of something substantial being accomplished. A new *Building Society* was instituted on the 29th of December 1851, with a capital already subscribed of £10,000; and the very first business of this society was to look out for a site for a new church in the Wynds. “This district,” say

the directors, "could not possibly have been either overlooked or delayed. There, under the able and indefatigable exertions of the Rev. Dr. Buchanan, and the members of his Session and Deacons' Court, an interesting congregation had already been formed, and had just been brought to that point when a permanent building has become necessary for their accommodation. In this locality the greatest difficulty has been encountered in procuring a site,—arising chiefly from the smallness of the buildings belonging to single individuals, and the consequent difficulty of dealing with more proprietors than one. They are glad, however, to be able to report that they have at length obtained a most eligible site, situated between the New and Back Wynds, with an excellent approach from King Street, and a front toward a new street proposed to be formed by the Magistrates and Town Council to connect the two Wynds. The ground which has been acquired has for many years been occupied as a green-market, and is the actual site of the former Wynd Church, which was taken down more than forty years ago, when St. George's Parish Church was erected in its stead."

We give these particulars about the early history of the Wynd Church, partly because that church became the first root of a banyan tree—a most fruitful "Mother of Churches"—and everything connected with its origin is interesting, and partly because there is something curious in the circumstance that a new place of worship, which has proved to be a spring of blessing to the whole surrounding district, came to be erected on the very spot from which the old parochial church had been removed as unsuitably situated.

"Glasgow," says Mr. Maccoll, "began its history in the Middle Ages, first as a fishing village by the banks of the Clyde, and then as the seat of an archbishop, whose castle and cathedral, with various convents, crowned the heights

toward the north. The University by-and-by was reared midway in the High or main street leading down to the river, and the lordly houses of the nobles and lairds of the surrounding country gradually ranged themselves between. The Wynds, grouped near the Laigh or Low Kirk, otherwise St. Mary's—called also the Tron, because of the weights and measures tested there—were at first the streets, clean though narrow, between the well-built mansions, with their gardens and orchards that gave air and room for life. These Wynds opened from the Trongate to the Bridgegate, and for many a day the good city clustered round. In the Bridgegate, close to the main bridge, were the mansions of lairds and merchants. Here stood the first Merchants' Hall; beside which rose, two hundred years ago, the noble spire that still looks down upon the Guildry Court, and which has seen the city, then of 8000 inhabitants, spread almost out of sight with its present half a million. *Among the churches early planted was the Wynd Church, a large and much-frequented place of worship, where the judges on circuit went, and where the fashion and wealth of the city appeared.* So much was this the case, that even in modern times the young men who cared little for religion would jest about going to the High Kirk in the morning, and to the Wynd (wine) in the afternoon!

“But gradually, as the city extended, the Wynds fell into other hands. St. Andrew's Square, to the east of the Salt-market, for long the Buchanan Street or Regent Street of Glasgow, and Glassford, Virginia, and Miller Streets, received into larger mansions the richer men, and the orchards and green places in the Wynds became built over to make the most of the ground. The Wynds thus became arteries to long winding veins or *closets*, as they are fitly called, running up and down through the thick-built spaces, dense with flesh and blood; and only thereabout, when you carefully felt

your way, could you make out any vital pulse at all. *At length, some sixty or seventy years ago, the Wynd Church was removed, and its site turned into the Kail (or Green) Market, and the present St. George's was built in Buchanan Street,—many of the people bewailing that it was removed so far into the country!*"

The movement was now fairly begun, and from 1854 onwards we have to chronicle a series of moral victories to which there is no parallel in the story of modern evangelization. But it must not be thought that the ship's sails were filled at once with prosperous breezes, and that no obstacles presented themselves to its leaving the harbour and getting fairly out to sea. So far was that from being the case, that the first three years after the close of the half-century were all expended in earnest and laborious efforts to overcome opposition, to awaken the conscience and heart of the country, and to procure the means for carrying on operations on anything like an adequate scale.

"Dr. Buchanan's pamphlets on these subjects," says Mr. George Troup, who, in 1857, was editor of the *Daily Mail*, and took a deep interest in the work, "form the most complete exposition of the morally lower section of Glasgow life that we possess."

These pamphlets contain statements of all the facts fitted to make an impression on a Christian community; they meet every conceivable objection that could be made to the carrying out of the schemes proposed; and they are full of eloquent appeals to those tender and compassionate emotions which found expression in Jesus Christ when he saw the city of Jerusalem and wept over it.

"Moderator," said he, addressing the Assembly of 1851, "in your prayer this evening you adverted to an incident related in the New Testament, in which we are told that, on a certain memorable occasion, when



our Lord drew near to Jerusalem and beheld the city, he wept over it. There is something unspeakably touching in that scene. It is not merely the depth and tenderness of Christ's compassion that affects the mind, but the peculiar combination of circumstances which appears to have called it forth. Before him stood the city, and around him the exulting throng of its inhabitants, who had come forth to meet him, all unconscious and heedless of the dreadful doom that was impending over them. The contrast between their light-hearted acclamations, as they shouted, 'Hosannah to the Son of David,' and the overwhelming sadness of those awful judgments that were already at hand,—it was this that would seem to have melted the Saviour into tears. I have often thought of that contrast, in traversing the streets and lanes of the city to which the overtures now lying on the table of this Assembly specially refer. Let any one whose mind is truly alive to the realities of the spiritual and eternal world cast his eyes over that mighty city. Let him stand on one of those adjacent eminences from which its vast extent can be best surveyed, and how impressive is the spectacle that stretches out before him! What multitudes of immortal beings are moving to and fro beneath that smoky canopy that hangs like a dismal cloud over the immense area of human habitations, and blackens, for miles around, the very face of heaven! What a hubbub of multifarious sounds, all significant of busy and laborious life, is coming up from these huge factories, and clanging forges, and crowded streets! What an immense and exhausting expenditure of all the energies of the human frame and spirit is incessantly going on within the limits of that densely-peopled space! Those blazing fires, whose fierce glare even the noonday sun has failed to quench,—how many of the sons of toil are sweltering around them! That portentous forest of gigantic chimneys, with volumes of smoke waving like funereal plumes above their heads,—to what an incalculable amount of mechanical power does their presence testify, and what thousands upon thousands of pale-faced women and hard-handed men must that power incessantly employ! Those long lines of masts, with their flags fluttering in the breeze above the house-tops, and telling from what various and far-off nations they have come, how impressively do they speak of the vast store of merchandise which the city yields, and of the immense supplies which the wants of its multitudinous population demand! Surveying this sight from the distance, it may seem to speak only of prosperous enterprise,—of manufacturing skill,—of commercial wealth and power; and the observer, if he be interested in what he is looking on, may be tempted to exult in the thought that that which a century ago was little better than a village, is now the second city of the greatest empire in the world. But could he take a closer view of the scene before him,—could he, as with the omniscient eye of the Saviour, penetrate into the interior of every home and of every heart,—could he lay bare those haunts of dissipation and abodes of profligacy, and dens of filth and crime, with which the city

abounds,—could his ear catch the sound of those profanities and blasphemies which are issuing from a thousand tongues,—could he follow the footsteps of the countless crowds who rush from their factories and workshops to consume the wages of toil in the excesses of intemperance, while wives and children are starving in rags and wretchedness in their miserable dwellings,—could he estimate aright the amount of heartless selfishness and unthinking gaiety that peoples, in other quarters of the city, its splendid streets, and terraces, and squares, and that neither knows nor cares how its poorer population live, nor what they become, if only they will not add to those burdens which pauperism and crime have already imposed,—could these terrible features which so extensively characterize the city's social and spiritual state be unfolded to his view, with what altered feelings would he look on the spectacle before him; would he not see something now of that which made the Saviour weep over Jerusalem of old? What avails the city's unparalleled progress in population, and in all those arts which minister to its prodigious productive power, so long as this advance in one direction is marked by more than a corresponding retrogression in another—what avails it that wealth is accumulating in one quarter, while poverty is deepening at the opposite extreme—what avails it that that plain, which once was solitary, is now full of people, when every year is filling it fuller of misery and sin—what avails this flush of commercial prosperity, while the city is forgetting the true secret of its strength and glory, and is ceasing to flourish by the preaching of the Word? Is there not something in contrasts like these that may well recall the remembrance of the weeping Saviour, and dissolve the thoughtful observer in tears?"

As to the kind of men needed for mission work in the waste places of our great cities, Dr. Buchanan had no doubt that they must be of a quality not inferior, but superior to the average :—

“In dealing with this question, it is indispensable that we make up our mind, once for all, that if we are to work to any purpose on so rough and forbidding a soil, we must have workmen of the very highest order that our Church can supply. It is vain to think that either raw and inexperienced youths, or men of dull mediocrity, can cope with the difficulties of such a position. There is not only the *vis inertiae* of long-established indifference and stupid ignorance to contend with, but there is the quick wit of subtle sceptics and bold free-thinkers to meet every day and to answer on the spot. Popery, too, must be faced at every turn; for, ignorant as the common crowd of its adherents are, it has in every street and lane its practised disputants, who have all the commonplaces of controversy at their tongue's end, and who must be foiled at their own weapons if any progress is to be

made among the votaries of that soul-destroying superstition. Moreover, the only preaching that will either attract or arrest such a population is the preaching of a vigorous thinker, who can both convince the understanding and speak home to the heart. We must have men of this class, or our enterprise will come to naught. Let it not be said that in uttering such a sentiment we are magnifying the arm of flesh, and forgetting that it is not by might nor by power, but by the Spirit of the Lord of hosts, that sinners are converted unto God. In the moral and spiritual, as much as in the natural and material world, God proportions his instruments to his ends. He never wrought a great reformation in any city or country by the agency of inferior men. We honour God most when we serve him with our best."

With such men and the blessing, he had no fears for the issue. What was now required was such a reformation as had taken place in the land in a former age:—

"Scotland, three hundred years ago, was morally and religiously a dry land and a desert. The gigantic superstition from which Luther had emancipated half the continental nations still threw over our native land its withering blight. A Popish sovereign was on the throne, backed by all the power of France. The national clergy were the priests of Rome. The people, habituated to a state of ignorance and license, neither felt, nor knew, nor desired to terminate their spiritual bondage. The smoke of those fires in which a Hamilton, a Wishart, and a Mill had been barbarously consumed was still darkening the air, when twelve heroic men, headed by one still more heroic leader, met in the first General Assembly of the Reformed Church of Scotland. Before these few but dauntless men—men full of faith, and of the Holy Ghost, and of wisdom—the long-established hierarchy of Rome, the power of foreign armies, the intriguing policy of a hostile Court, the opposition of a selfish nobility, and, more than all, a nation's ignorance and barbarism, one and all gave way, and Scotland, outwardly so rough and wild,—

‘ Land of the mountain and the flood,  
Land of brown heath and shaggy wood,’—

became the foremost of kingdoms for intelligence, piety, and virtue. With such facts written on the page of History for our admonition and encouragement, why should we despair concerning the evils of our own day!—why should it seem to us a thing incredible that even such a city as Glasgow should be cleansed from its pollutions? If God but give us the faith and fortitude, the self-denial and singleness of heart, which animated his servants of old, difficulties tenfold greater than any which in this work oppose us would speedily be overcome, and righteousness run down our streets as

waters, and judgment as a river, and Glasgow flourish again by the preaching of the Word."

But there were objections to offer, of course. There never has been any great enterprise since the world began which has not been obstructed at its start by men demonstrating, to their own satisfaction, that its success was impossible. And on the effort now made to ameliorate the condition of Glasgow much cold water was thrown, after the usual manner. The opposition thus made to his scheme—much of it offered in perfect good faith—Dr. Buchanan could not afford to ignore; and to overcome it, as far as was possible, he published "*A Second Appeal on the Spiritual Destitution of the Masses in Glasgow.*" It is not worth while now to take up the roll of the objections which he there discusses *seriatim*. But we cannot pass by the opening sentences of the pamphlet. They seem to us to be among the noblest he ever wrote. We appear to hear in them again that "HERE I STAND" of Luther which he had employed just before the Disruption, when he began to see that the reconciliation of the Church and State was impossible.

"In taking up this great agitation," said he, "I need hardly say that from the very first I laid my account with difficulties. It needed no great sagacity to foresee that there would be many lions in the path. Men are not easily persuaded to face any question that threatens to make demands on their money or their time. The dullest fancy will find out reasons by the score for turning away from it. It did not, therefore, in the very least surprise me to find the proposal that was sketched in my former statement subjected to a great deal of criticism, and calling forth a multitude of objections. I did my best to sustain the shock of cold water which, when I went forth to solicit subscriptions, was discharged in pailfuls upon me; and to remove the wet blankets which, one after another, were thrown upon the scheme. At one time, indeed, I did feel so chilled and disheartened, that I would almost have been tempted to abandon the enterprise in despair, had it not been for a short sentence which I met with in the Bible, and which struck upon my ear with all the force and solemnity of a message from God. I had been thinking of that striking passage in

the Book of Proverbs—"If thou forbear to deliver them that are drawn unto death, and those that are ready to be slain; if thou sayest, Behold, we knew it not; doth not he that pondereth the heart consider it? and he that keepeth thy soul, doth not he know it? and shall not he render unto every man according to his works?" I had been thinking, I say, on these pregnant words—words so terribly descriptive of the condition, spiritually considered, of the sunken and degraded masses of our city population, so suggestive of the worthless excuses which men make for their own selfish apathy in the midst of such evils, and so full of warning and withering rebuke to those by whom these hollow excuses are pleaded. Wishing to see the connection in which the passage stands, I turned up the place, and found, immediately preceding it, this pungent saying: 'If thou faint in the day of adversity, thy strength is small.' That sentence made me ashamed of my despondency. Why should I, or any one, expect that a work so great is to be accomplished without a struggle? Nothing really important to mankind was ever achieved save at the expense both of trials and of toil. FROM THAT MOMENT I BECAME BLIND TO DIFFICULTIES, AND DEAF TO OPPOSITION."

Here we have one of the secrets of his success in this great and difficult enterprise. Resting on the Word and power of God, he went forward regardless of what any man might say or do. Having heard a divine voice bidding him go forward, he "FROM THAT MOMENT BECAME BLIND TO DIFFICULTIES, AND DEAF TO OPPOSITION." A life in accord with such a key-note could not but tell on others. Men became infected with the same enthusiasm. So much passion displayed by one who was usually so calm and judicial, and whose position and weight of character gave a peculiar force to everything he said, had something like a startling effect on the public mind. And there cannot be a moment's doubt that it was due in great measure to the circumstance that such a man moved in the enterprise, and moved with an almost terrible earnestness, that it took root so soon, and bore fruit so speedily.

It will not seem out of place if we add here that the children of Dr. Buchanan were quick to catch the spirit of their father. In the year 1852 he lost his son Hugh—who

died of yellow fever immediately after his arrival in the West Indies. With reference to this event we find him saying in a letter to Dr. Beith: "Accept my warmest thanks for your kind Christian sympathy under our late painful bereavement. It is the Lord. He hath done what seemed good in his sight; and good is the will of the Lord. We have concerning the dear youth all that precious consolation which springs from a well-grounded hope that he had been made through grace a partaker of the redemption that is in Jesus. For four years he had been, in all weathers and seasons, one of our most assiduous Sabbath-school teachers in the Wynds; and his whole conduct was such as never from his boyhood to have given us an hour's uneasiness."

The Glasgow Building Society addressed itself to its work with an energy which soon enabled it to speak of substantial results. In its very first annual report, dated January 10, 1853, it could tell of ground broken in three different districts—the Wynds, Anderston, and Gorbals; and two years later it was able to speak of three more stations opened—in St. John's parish, in Finnieston, and in a district in the neighbourhood of Free St. George's. But it concerns us more to follow the course of events in the *Wynds*; and what occurred there was remarkable enough to have more than rewarded Dr. Buchanan for all his anxiety and toil in connection with the planting of the tree from which such fruit was gathered.

As the congregation increased, it came to appear more and more desirable that it should be placed under the care of an ordained minister; and such a labourer as the field required seemed to present himself at the critical moment in the person of Mr. Maccoll. He had not, at the time when his services were required, fully completed his course as a divinity student, but he had laboured, along with Mr. Hogg and otherwise,

with singular acceptance in the Wynds, and Dr. Buchanan's heart turned towards him as the man whom God had sent. "What a noble appearance," he wrote to Mr. Brown, "Maccoll made last night! I have prayed much and earnestly that the Lord might show us the man for the Wynd Church. I more and more incline to the conclusion that he is doing so in giving us Mr. Maccoll. I am looking on and watching; but my impression is that it will be our duty to apply to next Assembly to exempt him from his last year at the Hall, and to allow him to be licensed and ordained to the Wynd Church."

What is here spoken of as desirable was actually done; and in 1854 the new Wynd Church was opened, and Mr. Maccoll ordained as its first minister.

At the end of the fourth year the church was filled, and the question was raised of whether with this result the congregation was to settle down content. The answer was immediate. That was not to be thought of. Mr. Maccoll cast a longing eye upon the *Bridgegate*—the very centre of the Popish population of Glasgow, and noted for its rioting. He scarcely hoped to be able to find a site there; or, having found one, to erect a church upon it. But with the generous aid of such men as Mr. James Burns, William Campbell, Richard Kidston, Hugh Tennant, Walter Gray, John Henderson, Nathaniel Stevenson, and George Martin, his difficulties were all cleared away; and in June 1860, a new place of worship, seated for 880 people, was opened in the unhopeful thoroughfare referred to, and he himself with the mass of the Wynd congregation hived off and took possession of the new premises. The Wynd Church, thus left vacant, was next occupied by the Rev. Robert Howie, under whose charge it again rapidly filled; and he, too, was transferred in 1864, with the bulk of the con-

gregation he had gathered, to a new and much larger place of worship, now known as *Trinity*. Mr. Howie was next succeeded in the Wynds by the Rev. James Wells, and a similar success followed his efforts. Yet again this wonderful tree threw out a fresh shoot, issuing in the formation, in 1867, of the *Barony Free Church*, over which Mr. Wells was placed. And still the process continued. The Wynd Church filled once more under the Rev. J. Riddell, and by him *Augustine Free Church* was founded in 1872. These three last-mentioned churches—Trinity, Barony, and Augustine—were each built to seat 1100 people.

On the 8th of March 1871, there were laid on the table of the Presbytery of Glasgow plans for the erection of the last-mentioned place of worship, and Dr. Buchanan took advantage of the opportunity thus offered to review the history of the remarkable movement which owed its commencement to his foresight :—

“The application,” said he, “now made by the session and congregation of the Wynd Church is one which I feel assured will be received by the Presbytery with cordial satisfaction. It is the first step towards another of those profoundly interesting movements which have made the name of the Wynd Church to be so widely and so honourably known. It is only sixteen years since that church rose out of the grave in which it had been buried for nearly half a century ; and after having already, within that period, given birth to three additional congregations, it is now preparing to give birth to a fourth. Such a history is, I believe, all but unparalleled. That a Wynd Church should have come into existence at all, was the first wonder. That it should have become, within so limited a time, the fruitful mother of so many other churches, larger far than itself, is a greater wonder still. That it should not only have survived the exhausting process of giving off so many hives, but should be again finding the place too strait for it, and making ready to hive once more, is the greatest wonder of all. I need hardly say that, interesting as such a history cannot fail to be to us all, it is especially so to me. For many years, as my brethren know, I toiled hard to get the foundations of the Wynd Church laid. I have spoken of its erection sixteen years ago as a sort of resurrection. It literally was so. The Wynd Church which stood on the same site from 1685 till 1809 was, at the latter date,



taken down and turned into a green-market. By that most unwise and most unseemly proceeding on the part of the Town Council and of the Church authorities of the time, a densely-peopled district of the city was robbed of its parish church and of all the wholesome Christian agencies and influences which had emanated from it. St. George's Church, which was built instead of it, could obviously in no degree supply the spiritual wants of the Wynds. It is true, indeed, that the Tron Parish Church remained at no very great distance from the Wynds, but the Tron Church was already fully occupied—and that with a congregation drawn from all parts of the city. I know at least how the case stood when I was myself minister of the Tron Parish Church. Out of a congregation of 1300 hearers, only 86 were people of the parish. The high seat-rents effectually excluded the local population, who, then as now, were generally poor. In point of fact, therefore, it was by the rebuilding of the Wynd Church,—and on the old site, which I was enabled to secure,—that the people of that densely-crowded district had the means of grace again established in the midst of them. When the church was opened in 1854, and placed under the ministry of my esteemed friend Mr. Maccoll, it began its career with 101 communicants,—the fruit of much mission labour previously expended in the district. And what has been its history since? I have already glanced at it,—but in connection with such a step as the Presbytery is now being asked to take, it is every way suitable and seasonable to rehearse the leading facts which the history of the Wynd Church presents. The Wynd Church, as the Presbytery knows, is a comparatively small church, containing only about 580 sittings. Mr. Maccoll continued in it till 1860. For a considerable period before, it had been filled to overflowing; and accordingly with great energy he had set himself to the erection of an additional church in the same neighbourhood. I allude, of course, to the Bridgegate Church, where he still ministers to a large and flourishing congregation, having nearly 750 members. Meanwhile, in the same year, 1860, his place in the Wynd Church was supplied by the settlement of Mr. Howie. In less than four years the Wynd Church, which at the date of Mr. Howie's ordination contained 110 members, was again as full as ever. Accordingly, in 1864, Mr. Howie, who had meanwhile obtained from Christian sympathizers in his work the means of building Trinity Church—a church twice as large as that of the Wynd—was transferred to Trinity Church, taking with him about 430 of the members of the Wynd Church. In Trinity Church he has now a membership of 1100. The same year, 1864, which saw Mr. Howie translated to Trinity Church, saw Mr. Wells ordained as his successor in the Wynd Church. Beginning with only 152 communicants, their number rapidly increased, and the church so rapidly filled that in two years the necessity had again arrived of making provision for the overflow. Another additional church, that of the Barony, was accordingly set on foot; and to that new, large, and handsome church at the Town-

head,—an immensely populous and most necessitous district,—Mr. Wells was removed in the month of November 1867. In that church Mr. Wells is now at the head of a congregation of about 700 communicants, and is carrying on, as we all know, most abundant and successful labours. But meanwhile the Wynd Church has found a new minister in the person of our friend and brother Mr. Riddell, who was settled in it in October 1868. Nor has Mr. Riddell been one whit less successful than any of his admirable predecessors. It is only two years and a half since his settlement, and already he is here to-day to tell us that the Wynd bees are beginning to hang out at the hive's mouth, and to give note, by their increasing *hum* and stir, that the old process will soon have to be repeated. The membership was 98 when he came. It is now 445; and by the time the new church shall have been completed, the time will have fully come for a fourth swarm from our marvellously prolific Wynd Church. This surely is something like the wonderful blessing of which Scripture tells, when it speaks of a little one becoming a thousand, and a small one a strong nation. Let me ask the Presbytery to look for a moment at what God has thus wrought: for to him be all the praise! Here we have, within sixteen years, four churches instead of one. The first, and the original church,—undiscouraged and unimpaired by all these frequent removals,—is as full of life and energy as when the first of these removals took place. With a faith and a courage altogether admirable, it has made no complaint of the changes to which it has been so often subjected. Though it has had to build itself up from the very foundation four several times, it has braced itself up to meet every fresh emergency with a cheerfulness and a heartiness which surely indicate very remarkably the presence in it of the Spirit of God. The rank and file of the congregation gladly allow themselves to be told off as volunteers to go forth with their minister to each new enterprise for the extension of Christ's kingdom in the city. But the staff of the regiment remains on the old ground, and addresses itself, with the skill and resoluteness of veteran Christian soldiers, to repair the breach and to build up the walls to their former height and strength. And I am thoroughly convinced that this is the grand secret of the success of the Wynd Mission,—a secret which reads a great lesson to all who have a similar work in hand. To set down a minister all alone by himself in some spiritually destitute and sunken locality of a large city, is to bury him alive. To send him forth, on the other hand, like one of these Wynd ministers, not only full of experience, but surrounded with a multitude of fellow-workers, as much interested in the success of the movement as himself, is to make success, under God, all but certain and inevitable.

“Now let me ask the Presbytery—and not the Presbytery only, but the members of the Free Church through the Presbytery—to look at these four churches. See what a power for good they have become in the city! Here is the Wynd Church, the parent of the three others, as robust

and vigorous as ever, with 445 communicants and the usual proportion of other hearers. It has 31 elders and deacons, of whom 29 have been ordained since 1868. It has 73 Sabbath-school teachers, with an average attendance at their classes of 513 children, and nearly 600 on the roll. It has, moreover, Bible classes for adults attended by 163. It has 138 district visitors. It has within its own district in the Wynd 16 kitchen meetings for prayer and the reading and exposition of Scripture, none of them attended by fewer than 8 or 10, and many of them by from 30 to 40 individuals. Besides these, it has other similar meetings beyond the district; and, in connection with the Foundry Boys' Religious Society, it has 77 workers conducting services attended by about 420 children. Is not this a kind of moral and spiritual force which, if it were only multiplied, and carried all over the city, might speedily make righteousness run down our streets as waters, and justice as a mighty river!

“But this is only one of the four churches. The Bridgegate, the second in order, is a congregation greatly larger, and as full of life and of aggressive Christianity. It has 34 office-bearers. It has 2 missionaries. It has a colporteur and a Bible-woman, and 200 workers in various departments of earnest Christian effort. And besides large and flourishing Sabbath schools, it has week day and evening schools in great efficiency, attended by about 700 scholars.

“Then next look at Trinity Church, recruited to a larger extent from the Sabbath wanderers in Glasgow Green. As already mentioned, it has 1100 communicants. It has 64 office-bearers, and upwards of 300 volunteer agents engaged in the various departments of congregational effort for the furtherance of Christ's cause and kingdom. The number of young people it has under spiritual instruction on Sabbath is not fewer than 1500. Is not that a work which may well move all who are in sympathy with it to thank God and to take courage, and not to despair of yet making Glasgow flourish by the preaching of the Word?

“But, once more, look at Barony Church, the most recent of this remarkable group; a church but of yesterday, and which already numbers 700 communicants, 31 office-bearers, 105 Sabbath-school teachers, with more than 800 scholars in actual attendance, and upwards of 1100 on the roll, and with 86 active district-visitors doing their best, like the pioneers of an army, to break into the dense thickets around them, and to open up lanes and avenues for the entrance of the gospel. Here, then, we have at this moment, in those four churches, about 3000 communicants, besides the very many who have passed from the membership of these churches into congregations elsewhere.

“Now, I am aware it has been sometimes imagined that this wonderful success is more apparent than real; that all these communicants, or nearly all, have been simply withdrawn, by the attractive force of the Wynd Church ministers, from other congregations; and that consequently it is

not so much an addition to the actual membership of the Church that has been realized, as rather a redistribution of the old membership. If this were true—if anything like it were true—it would greatly abate the high satisfaction with which it ought to be regarded. But the imagination I have described is an imagination only. It has no foundation—nothing at least deserving the name of foundation—in fact. To demonstrate the truth of what I have now said, let me ask the attention of the Presbytery to the following simple statement, taken from the Session records of the churches concerned. Taking the four ministers in the order in which they have followed one another, the case stands thus:—

Mr. Maccoll, during his ministry in the Wynd and Bridgegate Churches, has admitted to the communion for the first time, about.....	1700
Mr. Howie, in the Wynd and Trinity .....	1337
Mr. Wells, in the Wynd and Barony .....	593
Mr. Riddell, in the Wynd Church alone .....	251

In all, these four ministers have introduced into the Christian Church 3881 persons, who either never were members of the Christian Church before at all, or who had fallen away from that position and privilege, and lapsed into utter indifference about divine things, and estrangement from all the public ordinances of God. These facts—and they *are* facts, solid and unchallengeable—are surely more than sufficient to satisfy the most incredulous that the work of the Wynd Mission is indeed a great and blessed work, a work that well deserves all the encouragement and sympathy which this Presbytery or this Church can give it.

“ It will, of course, be readily understood that in this statement I have confined myself entirely to what is doing within the limits of these four congregations themselves. Were I to trace out the history of what some of these churches have done in the way of founding others, it would be easy to show how largely they have inherited from their common mother-church in the Wynd her wonderful spirit and capacity of propagation. We all know what the Bridgegate Church had to do in the origination of the churches at Campsie, and Bishopbriggs, and Busby; what Trinity Church had to do in the helping forward a church in Bridgeton, and what it is at this moment doing in founding a new Free church to be called Cunningham Church, which Mr. Howie has been enabled to purchase on the south side of the river, which is now the scene of a most hopeful territorial mission; and, finally, what Mr. Wells and his people are doing in a similar way at the Townhead. But I enter not into these details. It would occupy too much time, and is, besides, quite unnecessary for my present purpose.”

Since Dr. Buchanan made this statement, still further evidence has been given of the extraordinary vitality of the

shoot originally planted in the Wynds. The church there has not indeed filled up again so readily as formerly; for the district as a mission field has been so far exhausted, and its character, besides, has greatly altered. Mr. Campbell, the present minister, is a man of a like spirit with his predecessors, and in other circumstances his success would certainly have been as signal. Owing, however, to the formation of new railways, the extension of business premises, and the operations of the City Improvement Trust, the population in the Wynds is only a mere fraction of what it was ten years ago. Nearly all the dwelling-houses are in the course of demolition, and the Wynd Church will soon be removed to another mission district. But the other Wynd ministers have not only borne the fire with them into the new fields they entered, but they have carried on the work into regions beyond. Mr. Maccoll is in London, building new congregations there. Mr. Howie, after filling Trinity Church, has broken fresh ground in Govan. Mr. Riddell has left Augustine Church for Paisley Road; and Mr. Wells, after establishing a large and influential congregation in the Barony, has moved out to Pollokshields. And behind these men, who by their noble and self-sacrificing labours have shown an example to the ministry of all Churches, there have risen up a band of evangelists who have sustained the work at the level at which they found it, so that in all the country there are no churches in which there is more life and activity, or a more perfect organization, than in those which have sprung more or less remotely out of the movement in the Wynds.

Dr. Buchanan gave, in the address quoted above, some statistics applicable to the time at which he spoke. It may be interesting to add a few figures of a more recent date. During Mr. Maccoll's ministry in the Wynds and in the Bridge-

gate till 1872, there was added to the Church, as members, about 3100; of whom 1750 were for the first time. Under Mr. Howie, in the Wynds and Trinity, up till 1872, the date of his leaving, 2561 were added; of whom 1422 were admitted to the communion for the first time. In the Wynds, under Mr. Wells, and in the Barony, up till 1875, when he left it, there were added 1924; of whom 995 were for the first time. Under Mr. Riddell, in the Wynds and in Augustine Church, up till 1875, when he left it, 1449 were received into membership; 841 being for the first time. Thus in the Wynd Church and its four offshoots, during the pastorate of its first ministers, there have been added in all to the Church 9032; of whom 4958 were received, after examination, for the first time. But this is not all. Every one of these four offshoots from the Wynd Church has, in its turn, founded other Home Mission Churches, until now there are already, in addition to two or three stations, eighteen regularly sanctioned charges in the Free Presbytery of Glasgow, all of which owe their origin more or less directly to the aggressive efforts of the ministers or congregations connected with the Wynd Mission. We may also add, as evidence of the peculiarly intense life which has been developed in connection with this movement, that a very large number of the young men in these churches have devoted themselves to mission work at home and abroad; and that some of them are at this moment ministers of the gospel or students of divinity.

It ought to be mentioned here that God at an early period gave what was regarded as a signal token of his favour to the movement undertaken for the reclaiming of the waste places of Glasgow. *The Revival in the Wynds* is one of the most precious memories connected with the history of the movement. It commenced during the ministry of Mr. Maccoll.

Some drops fell even before the wave of the American awakening of 1857 broke on this country. But when the clouds had spread, and Ireland as well as America became in many parts stirred to its depths, the quickened life spread into Scotland as well, and swept through the lanes and closes of that very region in Glasgow regarding which, some years before, the question had been often despairingly asked—Can any good come out of it?

This baptism of the Spirit, which has continued to a greater or less extent to the present day in these churches, together with the peculiar nature of the kind of work that had to be done, appears to have given a character to the whole methods and agencies of the Wynd System, as we may call it. That system is intensely evangelical and aggressive. To such efforts as Mr. Moody's it is ever ready to give a prompt and whole-hearted sympathy. It is ingenious in finding out new ways and means of reaching the sunken classes. And by open-air preaching, and meetings in circuses, music-halls, and such like places, it has done an immense deal to break down the heathenism of the city and its neighbourhood, and to extend the influence of vital Christianity. The material resources for all these achievements have been provided solely by the voluntary liberality of what Chalmers called "the general population." How much has been expended in the work in all it would be impossible to tell; but some idea may be formed of the extent of the enterprise, when it is said that the property belonging to the Wynd Church and the other churches related to it cannot be less than £100,000.

Dr. Buchanan would have been the last man in the world to claim more than his share in the success of this remarkable undertaking. That success was due in a great measure, under God, to the singularly able and earnest band of workers who were secured providentially and in succession for the

field. But that he was the originator of the movement, that he launched it, that he ceaselessly watched over and superintended it, and that to him were due in a large degree the conditions of its success, is what cannot be doubted. And if he had never done anything else for his country than this, it would have been something worth writing over his grave, that he was the **FOUNDER OF THE MISSION IN THE WYND.**



## CHAPTER XIV.

### TRAVEL.

DR. BUCHANAN had, of course, his periodical "furloughs;" and, like most men nowadays, he spent some of these in foreign travel. These trips abroad were occasions of great enjoyment to him. He had a keen appreciation of the beauty of natural scenery. He had an observant eye for everything that was distinctive in the social life and manners of other nations. And wherever he went he was always on the watch for indications of the progress or otherwise of that kingdom of God in the world to the promotion of which his own life was devoted. Among his papers have been preserved very full journals of four of these visits to foreign countries,—one of a short run through France and Belgium in 1851; another of a longer tour through Holland, Germany, and Switzerland in 1855; a third of a great and to him ever memorable expedition to Egypt and the Holy Land in 1857; and a fourth of a yacht-voyage to Norway in 1869.

In giving a few extracts from these journals, our object, it need scarcely be said, is not to supply any fresh information about the countries referred to. Our purpose is purely a biographical one,—to show the character of Dr. Buchanan in other than ecclesiastical connections. He was no mere narrow Scottish Churchman, with his thoughts and anxieties limited to the little circle within which he personally moved. His

sympathies were wide and generous, his tastes cultivated and refined; and while he never allowed any one in intercourse with him to forget that he was an earnest Christian man, he was withal so genial in his manner, and so full of kindness and pleasantry, that as a "companion in travel" he was invaluable. One of his specialties was an aptitude for languages. Although so overwhelmed at home all his life through with ecclesiastical business, he contrived to maintain an acquaintance with several of the Continental tongues. French he could speak with considerable fluency. Of German and Italian he knew enough to be able to follow a discourse in them; and he picked up sufficient Norwegian even to allow of his addressing some words on the claims of religion to the natives.

He arrived in Paris along with Mrs. Buchanan on the 1st of September 1851. After spending about a week there, he went on to Brussels; and from thence, by Ghent and Bruges (which were both visited), to Ostend, and home. We select, almost at random, two bits from his journal of this tour:—

PALACE OF THE LUXEMBOURG.

*Friday, September 5, 1851.*—The palace of the Luxembourg is situated near to the southern extremity of the city. It is a large and handsome building, in the form of a square, with a large quadrangle in the centre. It was founded by Mary of Medicis, and was her own residence. At the late revolution it became for a time the seat of government, and was the headquarters of Louis Blanc and his friends during the brief period of their ascendancy. The lower part of the building at present is occupied as a casern for the troops,—for soldiers are literally everywhere in Paris.

We were first shown the apartments in the upper part of the building, which we should have thought rather nice had we not previously seen the Louvre and Versailles. Everything looks mean after these magnificent palaces. The picture in the Luxembourg which most interested me was one of the Chancellor l'Hôpital tendering his resignation to Charles IX., because he would not consent to be a party to the atrocious plot of the Bartholomew Massacre. The young king is seated on the throne—his infamous mother, Catherine de Medicis, behind him—others looking on—and the chancellor, a tall, dignified-looking personage, is handing him his

keys of office. The picture is a composition painted in the reign of Charles X. The figures are portraits.

In this part of the building is the Senate and the Throne room of Napoleon, where he held his receptions, and made a farce of consulting with a Senate that was the mere echo of his own imperial voice. Adjoining the Senate chamber is the noble chamber of the Peers, built by Louis Philippe in 1840. Around the recess in which the chair of the President is placed are noble statues of eminent French statesmen,—such as D'Angesseau, L'Hôpital, Portulis, &c. The tribune is in front of the President or Speaker's chair. The form of the apartment is that of the arc of a circle, the Speaker's chair being in the centre of the base line. The empty benches and deserted look of the chamber remind one that the peerage of France, once so proud and exclusive, is numbered among the things that were.

The other parts of the building contain picture galleries. The pictures are modern, most of them, and full of the extravagance of the modern French style. Many of them are so indelicate that no English gallery would admit them. Indeed, one of the characteristic features of France is immodesty. It appears everywhere,—in shop-windows, on signboards, in books, and in the habits of the people.

The gardens of the Luxembourg are spacious, for a town, and handsome. The greenest and richest bit of grass I have yet seen in France was in these gardens.

From the Luxembourg we went to the Pantheon, which is in the immediate neighbourhood. It is a huge and splendid structure, in the Greek style, with a noble Corinthian façade, and ornamented by a lofty dome. The height of the dome within is 209 feet; without, it is 260. It is a temple for hero-worship, after the fashion of the ancient heathen. The names of those who fell in the "three glorious days" of July 1830 are inscribed on huge boards put up on the walls. There are huge cartoons—copies, I suppose, of those of Raphael at Rome. The names of Popes Leo X. and Julius II. figure on them. Near the Pantheon is the Sorbonne, a time-worn edifice, which I regarded with much more interest than the Pantheon.

#### A SABBATH IN BRUSSELS.

*Sabbath, September 7, 1851.*—Having breakfasted, and spent the morning quietly in our own room, we went out to church. On our way to the Chapel-Royal we entered the magnificent Cathedral of Brussels. High mass was going on. The spacious cathedral was full of people. Here is one point of obvious difference as compared with France. There the churches are little frequented, especially by men; and hardly at all, so far as we could judge, by the upper classes. Here we saw multitudes of genteel people, as well as of the lower orders, in all the churches we entered. Another thing we noticed,—in Paris and Rouen we never saw a priest walking with any of the people. He was always either alone or with

another priest. Here we saw them frequently walking with family groups, sometimes leading children by the hand. It is evident the priests here are not so detached from the people as in France. The Belgians have a religion, though unhappily it is Popery; the French have no religion of any kind.

The "grande messe" was a magnificent piece of pantomime, accompanied by splendid music. The orchestra was full, the performers excellent; and when the host was elevated the burst of music was very grand. But to call this Christianity is a mockery. The interior of the cathedral is very fine, and the painted windows, especially in the Chapel of the Holy Saviour, are unrivalled. There is a carved pulpit in this chapel, of singular beauty. It is a perfect wonder. No sculpture can surpass it. It is one of the marvels of the city.

The Chapel-Royal is a small, plain, but neat place of worship, in which service is conducted in English, German, and French alternatively. The king attends the German service regularly at eleven A.M. We were not aware of this till afterwards. We attended first a French, and afterwards an English service. The French pastor spoke very low in his prayers; and in preaching his tone was still low, and greatly too rapid to be easily followed. His sermon seemed to be very good, chiefly occupied in urging upon his hearers the necessity of being out-and-out in religion. Coming to this little chapel from the gorgeous pantomime of the cathedral, it was impossible not to be struck with the inscription written up over the pulpit—"God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." We were told the king is very regular in his attendance at this chapel—"Toutes les dimanches, sans exception."

I made an effort to find out Mons. Panchaud's chapel at night, but did not succeed.

On the 23rd of June 1855, accompanied by Mrs. Buchanan and by two Misses Mathieson, Dr. Buchanan set out on a much more extended excursion. From Leith the party proceeded to Rotterdam, and spent some time in visiting the chief towns of Holland. They then went on to Cologne, and took the Rhine boat to Mayence. Their course after that was by Frankfort, Heidelberg, Baden, Strasbourg, on to Zurich. Having there reached Swiss territory, they planned to see as many as possible of the great sights of that country; and having accomplished that object, they proceeded to Geneva, and thence through France to England once more.

## AN EVENING IN AMSTERDAM.

We set out to dine with our new and estimable missionary, Mr. Smith, who obligingly went to Haarlem with us. There we met with a most kind welcome from his wife, a very pleasing person. Their house is small. Rents here are high, and space is scarce in this city, where everything is crowded together. In the evening Mr. and Mrs. da Costa joined us, and several other Dutch ladies, including Mrs. Schwartz, whose truly excellent and agreeable husband was with us at dinner. In the course of the evening we had much conversation about the Dutch Church, and the state of religion in Amsterdam and in this country generally.

The missionaries regard the prospects of religion here as very dark and discouraging. The small party of evangelical men in the Dutch Chamber is becoming smaller. M. Groen van Prinsterer of the Hague, their wise and sagacious leader, lost his seat at last election; though seven years ago, at the time of the Papal aggression, the aroused Protestant feeling of the country carried him into the House with a flood-tide. The old Orange Protestant feeling is the only remaining chord in the heart of Holland that can be made to thrill; and that but seldom, and only under the influence of some strong, exciting cause. It is like the Irish Orangeism,—more a political than a religious sentiment with the people generally. There is little real sympathy with true Bible Protestantism, after all. The National Church is very dead. Rationalism is prevalent. About one-third of the ministers are more or less evangelical, but they are timid—afraid, like the English evangelicals, of doing anything that will bring in a popular influence into the Church. Lately a minister was appointed in Amsterdam whose unsoundness in the faith was such as to excite strong opposition; but the ecclesiastical courts refused to sustain the objection. They admitted that his views were contrary to their Confession, but then the Confession was not to be set up above the Bible! The Confession itself says so; and the minister's doctrine was not contrary to the Bible! In other words, they condemned their Confession and acquitted the heretic. This is sad.

The preachers of the pure gospel are the favourites with the people; and this is the only hopeful symptom. But out of twenty-nine ministers in Amsterdam not more than five or six can be said to preach it faithfully. The Separatists are gaining ground amid this defection, though not rapidly. They number about thirty-five ministers and forty-five thousand people in all Holland. They seem to have some points of resemblance to our Voluntaries.

## ASCENT OF THE RIGI.

Ard, which was our immediate destination, is at the head of the lake of Zug, and at the very base of the Rigi, which rises up from the lake so abruptly, that, when on the summit of the mountain, one might suppose he could jump right down into the water.

Having obtained a comfortable repast at the quiet village-inn, we commenced the ascent of the Rigi about half-past two. The road leads up the valley between the Rigi and the Rossberg for a mile and a half, and past the ruins of the former village of Goldau, where, in 1806, the fall of immense masses of rock from the Rossberg buried the village, and killed upwards of four hundred and fifty persons. The huge scar along the face of the mountain sufficiently tells where the rent was made that inflicted this sudden and terrible calamity on the unhappy village and its people. A little beyond Goldau the road reaches the small lake of Lowertz, in the heart of the canton of Schwytz, regarded as the birthplace of Swiss freedom. Above this little lonely lake tower the Mythen or Mitres, two fantastic mitre-shaped peaks that rise up bare and wild into the upper air, to the height of six or seven thousand feet, and form a most remarkable feature in a most remarkable scene.

At Goldau the way to the Rigi Culm leaves the high-road, and turns away up to the right towards a gorge or pass in the mountain, richly wooded, and with magnificent rocks rising in successive tiers above them, and seeming, as one looks up, as if they touched the very skies.

As the path gets into the breast of the mountain, it becomes extremely steep; but still the zigzags are so well managed that one may safely keep the saddle, and ascend to the very summit of the Rigi without ever dismounting, except to refresh the horses at the *auberge* half-way up.

About two-thirds up the mountain there is a chapel to "Our Lady of the Snow," where two or three ill-looking Capuchins, with their hatless and apparently brainless heads, and rusty brown gowns girded with a rope round the waist, may be seen hanging about and wasting their meaningless and useless life.

There is also at the same place a sort of "Pension" for people in infirm health, who go up there to drink goat's milk and get the benefit of the mountain air.

At six o'clock we reached the summit, upon which there is a very tolerable hotel or caravanserai, where all sorts of people are found congregated, and in astonishing numbers. There were apparently not fewer than one hundred, the night we were there. There is, besides, another large hotel about one thousand feet lower down.

The evening was most favourable for a view; and our guide immediately began to name to us, over and over again, from right to left and from left to right, the grandees of the great Alpine chain,—beginning with the Sentis and the Voralberg on the extreme east, to the Jungfrau and Silberhorn on the north-west; and embracing between them the Glärnisch, the Wengern Alp, the Uri Rothhorn, the Winkel, the Wetterhorn, Faulhorn, Finsteraarhorn, Grand Eiger, Engelbergerhorn, &c.—truly a magnificent series. In comparison with these, the Mythen, Mont Pilate, &c., looked as if they sat merely at the feet of their more majestic compeers.

After the sun went down we witnessed a most magnificent thunder-storm. The sky was covered with dense clouds, and the whole scene was wrapped in darkness; but ever and anon the lightnings flashed up from behind Mont Pilate, throwing out its rugged outline in full relief, and flashing their brilliant glare upon the lakes that lay hidden far beneath, revealing in a moment the whole wild landscape around us. In the midst of the broad flash, frequently there shot up and down streams of liquid fire; at other times they darted to the right and left, with startling and dazzling brightness; and then came the tremendous roll of the thunder, reverberating among the mountains like the roar of heaven's artillery, and terribly recalling to mind the language of the 77th Psalm: "The voice of thy thunder was in the heaven: the lightnings lightened the world: the earth trembled and shook."

"Far along,  
From peak to peak, the rattling crags among,  
Leaps the live thunder! Not from one lone cloud,  
But every mountain now hath found a tongue;  
And Jura answers, through her misty shroud,  
Back to the frozen Alps, who call to her aloud."

As we stood under the lee of a huge pile of firewood that sheltered us from the blast, contemplating this elemental war, the excitement and fascination of the scene helped us to understand the poet when he gave utterance in these glowing lines to the feelings which a similar spectacle called forth:—

"And this is in the night! Most glorious night!  
Thou wert not sent for slumber: let me be  
A sharer in thy fierce delight,  
A portion of the tempest and of thee!  
How the lit lake shines, a phosphoric sea;  
And the big rain comes dancing down to the earth!  
And now again 'tis black! And now the glee  
Of the loud hills shakes with its mountainous mirth,  
As if they did rejoice o'er a young earthquake's birth"

It was late before we could persuade ourselves to retire. By midnight, all was still in the hotel. The Tyrolese minstrels, with their fanciful costumes, who had been holding a concert in the large room below, and discoursing most eloquent music to an admiring audience, had gone to bed; and, save the occasional roll of the now distant thunder, and the dash of the outside window-shutter of our little sleeping-apartment, as the gusts of wind threw it furiously against the casement, there was no sound to be heard.

About three o'clock in the morning of Tuesday the 10th, the reveille of a bugle-horn was heard in the long gallery into which the countless bedrooms opened, pouring out its cheerful notes, and rousing the sleepers, that, for once in their lives, they might see an Alpine sunrise. The toilette of the Rigi Culm hotel will match any in the world for the rapidity with which it is performed. Within five minutes after the first sound of the

horn, the peak of the mountain was all alive with as grotesque a company as could well be conceived,—some rushing out with their blankets for morning robes; others ordering their upper garments as they hurried forth from the hotel; others with one shoe on and the other, which had proved a little stiff and refractory, carried in their hand; gentlemen calling to ladies, and ladies to gentlemen, to make haste—as if the sun had been going to get up half an hour before his time, on purpose to cheat them out of a sight of his ruddy face as he came forth like a bridegroom out of his chamber, or as a strong man rejoicing to run a race.

The sun, however, took his own time, quite indifferent about the eager company that was gathering to have a look at him as he rose. Slowly and steadily he approached the horizon's verge, far away in the north-east, about the Lake of Constance, where four hundred years ago there was another and still more glorious light beginning to dawn,—the light of John Huss and Jerome of Prague, the Morning Stars of the Reformation,—a light which Imperial treachery and Popish persecution arrested for a time, but which at length burst forth with a power which neither popes nor princes could withstand.

As the daylight spread upwards along the eastern sky, the vast landscape came out every moment with increasing distinctness into view. The north was the only quarter of the heavens where clouds obscured the view. These clouds were the relics of the thunder-storm, which had now rolled away to the Black Forest of Germany, over which it was still flashing forth its lightnings when the sun arose. In every other direction the whole field of vision was fully exposed. No language can describe it, and no painting could convey any adequate conception of its extent and grandeur. Twelve or fourteen of the romantic lakes of Switzerland lay like mirrors amid the depths of the mountains; at our feet, away to the north, the long line of the Jura was seen stretching from the neighbourhood of the Lake of Geneva to the Black Forest of Germany; while, on the opposite side, the gigantic chain of the Alps towered up into the heavens, and their snowy peaks shone like gold in the rays of the morning sun. In surveying this scene, the eye could pass from June to January at a glance. There, down in the valleys, all Nature was rejoicing in the verdure and fragrance of Summer; yonder, up among those blue glaciers and spotless snows, eternal Winter reigned.

We remained upon the summit till about half-past five o'clock, by which time the whole landscape was bathed in sunshine. It is only from such an elevation as the Rigi that one receives any adequate impression of the height of the Alps. Seen from the ordinary level, they are in great measure concealed by the lower mountains; and as caught here and there peeping over the shoulders of some inferior ridge, the eye cannot gauge their dimensions. In such a position, one has no scale by which to measure them. It is otherwise when on such a vantage-ground as the



Rigi; there the eye can range, without interruption, from the margin of the lake right up to the summit of yon peak that seems almost to touch the heavens. Standing, as we then did, on a mountain more than one thousand feet higher than our Ben Nevis, we found that, after all, we had only scrambled up to the footstool of such giants as the Finsteraarhorn, or the Grand Eiger, or the Jungfrau.

By eight o'clock we had descended once more to earth,—I on foot, and the ladies on horseback. The morning was intensely hot, and we were all in good case to enjoy a hearty breakfast at the old-fashioned, clean, and comfortable inn of the village, and to congratulate ourselves on the rare good fortune of having had not only a cloudless sunset and sunrise on the mountain, but a magnificent thunder-storm to boot. Hundreds perform the same journey only to realize the experience recorded in the album of the Rigi Culm hotel, by one of many luckless travellers, in the following lines:—

“Nine weary uphill miles we sped,  
The setting sun to see;  
Sulky and grim he went to bed—  
Sulky and grim went we.  
Seven sleepless hours we tossed, and then,  
The rising sun to see,  
Sulky and grim we rose again—  
Sulky and grim rose he.”

#### THE VALLEY OF THE RHONE.

Just where the road leaves Martigny, and crosses the Drôme, one of the many feeders of the Rhône, it passes close under a steep rock surmounted by the ruins of the old castle of La Bûtie, one of the strongholds in other days of the Archbishop of Sion, whose hold upon the country does not seem to have been exclusively of a moral or spiritual kind. Though a so-called successor of the Apostles, he was evidently in the way of using other weapons in his wars than those which they employed. It is from this town of Martigny the monks of the not far distant hospice of the great Saint Bernard are detached, their headquarters being in a convent of Martigny. From this point, where it makes a sudden and violent bend to the north-west, the Rhône rushes down a narrow pass, overhung by the Dent de Moreles on the right bank, and by the Dent du Midi on the left. The peaks of these stupendous mountains are not visible from Martigny, being both further down the river and a good way back from it, and hidden at this point by the gigantic buttresses—or rather, huge jaw-bones—of these tremendous *teeth*. About two or three miles below Martigny, the road which is running down on the left bank of the stream passes under the *Pisse Vache*, or famous fall of the Sallenche, which, after finding its way unseen out of some upland corrie, and struggling down in its hidden and tortuous bed by a steep ravine, at length rushes out into the broad light of day, and leaps sheer over a perpendicular face of rock one hundred and twenty feet in height. It is a sheet of the purest foam, white as snow,

beautifully bounded across, when we saw it about half-way from the bottom, by a resplendent rainbow. At the little tumble-down village of St. Maurice, a place of about one thousand inhabitants, the mountains which overhang the Rhône come so close that the Rhône has enough to do to get through between them. Part of the town has the live rock for the back wall of the houses; and a bridge of a single arch, seventy feet in span, suffices to unite the Dent du Midi to the Dent de Morcles. The view at this point is very fine. Up the river all is wild, frowning, magnificent, with the snowy height of the St. Bernard bounding the view. Looking down, the valley opens, and the scene softens. Noble woods, beautifully cultivated fields, pleasant-looking villas and country-seats, smiling vineyards, bright and prosperous-looking villages, the river bending away to the left, clinging to the base of the lofty, tooth-like Dent du Midi, some nine or ten thousand feet in height; while on the opposite side the valley is bounded by gradually ascending hills, green and graceful, swelling away up to the Alpine heights, through which the famous pass of the Diablerets leads by a short cut to Sien. The bridge of St. Maurice transfers the traveller from the Canton du Valais to the Canton de Vaud. The middle ages are at one end, and the nineteenth century at the other. The filth, the ignorance, the dilapidated buildings, the beggars, the goitre, the wretched cultivation of the fields, speak emphatically to the character and influence of the Popery which reigns in the Valais. The cleanliness, the intelligence, the tidy cottages, the thriving farmhouses, the well-clad healthy-looking people, are not less significant of the beneficent spirit of Protestantism which has long been supreme in the Canton de Vaud.

#### FREE CHURCH OF VAUD.

LAUSANNE, *Sabbath, July 15, 1855.*

In the morning we had a heavy thunder-shower. It cleared up, however, by ten o'clock, and we descended the hill to the English Church, a handsome and commodious structure more than half-way down towards Ouchy. The Episcopal minister, a very worthy man, has been twenty-five years in Lausanne; and we enjoyed the service considerably. There was an attendance of sixty or eighty people.

Being anxious, if possible, to have an opportunity of worshipping in the Free Church of the Canton de Vaud, I sought out, after the English service was over, the house of M. Scholl, a Vaudois pastor, who visited Scotland at the time of their Disruption in 1845, and with whom I had then a good deal of intercourse.

I found that M. Scholl was in the country. His sister, however, kindly undertook to conduct us to their place of worship; which she did at three P.M. The Disruptionists have three regularly organized congregations, and two preaching-stations, in Lausanne. Their adherents in the town—avowed adherents—number about two thousand; and there are many more who

frequently attend their worship. The persecution that was so hot against them for a time has now completely subsided. The disposition may still exist to obstruct their movements, but the authorities dare not indulge it. Public opinion is against any interference. The only hindrance the Free Church people experience is in the erection of regular places of worship. Every sort of difficulty is interposed to hinder them from getting sites for churches in Lausanne. In the country they get on more easily, and have built several churches in the rural districts. They have about forty pastors settled in regular congregations in the country. In Lausanne itself the Government do all they can to keep the Free Church out of sight.

As yet, they meet only in halls or other places that have no ecclesiastical character or appearance. By-and-by they hope to get regular churches. Both prudence and economy seem to dictate a quiet and gradual course. The congregation to which Miss Scholl conducted us meets in a flat of a large building, the apartments of which have been thrown into one. Another flat of the same building is occupied as their Theological College. This place of meeting put us in mind of our own Disruption days. The long, comparatively low-roofed hall was filled with people, as were also several side-rooms that opened from it to the right and left. There must have been several hundred people present. Professor Chappin preached a most admirable and edifying discourse. It was in the form of an exposition of a pretty large portion of Scripture from the Acts of the Apostles,—a good deal in our Scotch style of lecture, and well fitted to make the people acquainted with their Bibles. The professor's elocution was so clear and deliberate, and his style so transparent, that there could be no excuse for not understanding him. I never heard the French language more pleasingly spoken. The psalm-singing and the whole service was exactly like our own. At the close of the service we had an interesting address from a young Waldensian pastor, M. Appia, who happened to be passing through Lausanne. He made an appeal in behalf of his poor countrymen. It seems it is a season of great scarcity in the Valleys, and many of the people are hard pressed for the means of living. The service was concluded by prayer offered up by M. Chappin's colleague,—M. Meunier, I think it was; and the prayer was truly touching, simple, scriptural, affectionate, confiding, and in some parts full of pathos. We were greatly refreshed.

At Miss Scholl's request I went to her house in the evening, where I met Professor Chappin, and two other members of their communion,—one of them the editor of their local and denominational religious publication.

They were much interested about our Scottish Free Church, and had a thousand questions to ask about its progress. They had heard of our recent discussions about College questions and the Sustentation Fund, and had been greatly alarmed lest we should be weakened by internal division. The enemies of their own Free Church movement had been at pains to turn

our Scottish difference to account, in the way of trying to weaken the hands of the Disruptionists in the Canton de Vaud. It was rather vexing to find from what quarters some of the weapons were taken that were thus turned against our Vaudois brethren. The *London* —, a renegade on our Free Church question, had been serving up in its columns extracts from a late pamphlet, which made the extravagant and unwarrantable statement that the yoke of the Free Church was heavier and more oppressive than that of the Court of Session had ever been in the Old Establishment! This outrageous allegation had greatly troubled the good men of the Free Church of Lausanne. They did not understand how such a thing could be. The Free Church of Scotland was under subjection to no power but that of its Divine Head and Lord; and its ordinances and institutions were administered by office-bearers chosen by the members of the Church themselves. How could there be a yoke and an oppression at variance with Christian liberty under such a state of things? But still, here was a Free Church minister publishing this statement, and a religious newspaper giving it circulation!

I was happy to have the opportunity of putting these excellent men in a position to estimate the value that was to be attached to the discreditable accusation, and to the —'s conduct in circulating it. They told me that they have followed our example in having a Sustentation Fund for the support of their ministry, and they assured me that without it their Church could not have existed at all. They had watched all our movements and controversies on the subject of the Sustentation Fund with the deepest interest, and were rejoiced to find we had determined to adhere to the principle of the equal dividend. It is their plan, and they see great danger in adopting any other.

On every side I was glad to learn what was doing in the Canton de Vaud in connection with their Church, and with the Lord's cause generally. Of the one hundred and forty or one hundred and fifty pastors who left the State Church at their Disruption, a certain number went back when they found the difficulties with which the Free Church had to struggle. "When tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the Word, by-and-by they are offended." It will always be so with those who have no root. Others had gone to France to labour in the ministry. Others still had become teachers of schools; and so on. They have still some fifty or sixty regular Free Church pastors, and their Church is steadily gaining ground. It is a highly encouraging and promising circumstance that they have about sixty students of divinity in their Theological Hall. The State Church, on the other hand, is at a loss for students and candidates for the ministry. They have many parishes vacant, for which they cannot procure pastors, the supply having failed.

As none of the Swiss brethren spoke English, I had to maintain this long conference entirely in French.

In the winter of 1856-57, the health of Dr. Buchanan was so seriously affected that a complete cessation from work, and a prolonged change of scene, was declared by his medical advisers to have become absolutely necessary. He resolved accordingly to go somewhere; but he found it difficult to make up his mind as to the direction in which he should move. While in this state of perplexity, he received a visit from his friend Mr. Tennent of Wellpark, who told him that his yacht *St. Ursula* was lying in Lamlash Bay ready to put to sea, and that it was at his disposal, to carry him whithersoever he wished. This generous offer was at once and gratefully accepted. Palestine was named as the terminus of the voyage. Dr. Buchanan, along with his wife and son Lawrence, then a boy of ten, became Mr. Tennent's guests on board the yacht; and before the party\* returned not only were the ports of Valetta, Alexandria, Joppa, and others in Italy and Sicily, visited, but pilgrimages across country were made to Cairo, to all the places of interest in the Holy Land, and to Damascus. When Dr. Buchanan came home again, he published in a goodly-sized volume an account of these travels,† and that volume is still accessible. But we shall not spoil the reading of it to any one by extracting two passages from the journal written on the spot:—

#### FIRST VIEW OF JERUSALEM.

At five P.M. we got our first view of Jerusalem. The west side, which comes then in view, is not imposing, though to see any part of a city so renowned, the type of the City of the living God, cannot be otherwise than deeply interesting. As it had been arranged, contrary to my wish, that we should encamp this night on the Mount of Olives, instead of entering the city, we passed the Jaffa Gate and the Damascus Gate, riding along the outside of the lofty Saracenic wall built by the famous Saladin; and round-

\* The party gathered as it proceeded, and was at last a pretty large one. It included Mrs. Henry Paul, Miss J. Lyon, Mr. Patrick Tennent, Rev. Grant Brown, Mr. Nathaniel Stevenson, and Mrs. Wodrow from Glasgow, and a young friend who accompanied her.

† "A Clerical Furlough." Glasgow: Blackie & Son.

ing the north-end corner of the city, we opened the Mount of Olives and the upper valley of the Kidron lying in the deep hollow between. We continued alongside of the city wall as far as St. Stephen's Gate, where Stephen was said to have been stoned to death,—which is on the east side of the city,—and there we descended into the bottom of the valley, crossed the dry bed of the brook Kidron, passed between the walled (Popish) Garden of Gethsemane and the so-called Tomb of the Virgin Mary, and ascended the steep sides of Olivet; the very path by which David went up barefoot and weeping when Absalom usurped the throne, and by which our Lord so often took his way from the turmoil of the godless city, to the quiet retreat he so much loved at Bethany. At a little after six we reached the Turkish mosque, built on the site of the Church of the Ascension; though we knew from Scripture itself that the Ascension did not take place there. We had intended to bivouac in our tents, but it now blew hard, and threatened moreover to rain, so that we were fain to take shelter in the house of the mosque. It was but a sorry place to pass the night in, but we had now no choice, as by this time the gates of the city were shut, or would be before we could reach the nearest of them. The old man of the mosque, an asthmatic old Mussulman, was very civil. The two apartments we got, on the roof of the building, were fitted up for us, in a sort of way, with some divans and a few chairs. The windows, unglazed, and with very rickety shutters, let in abundance of wind, which we tried to exclude by nailing up cloaks and railway wrappers over them. A little, low, round table was placed on the floor, and we crouched or reclined around it, and made the best we could of the mess of rice and mutton chops, and the dish of pigeons, that were set before us. Our own Marsala, biscuits, and hard-boiled eggs were fully the best part of the entertainment. The apartment of the ladies was a mere vault, with a window on one side, in which the storm made only too successful an attempt to get in. We had but a sorry night of it, and were very glad when the day dawned.

MOUNT OF OLIVES, *Saturday, April 25.*

Attached to the house in which we had passed the night is a minaret, the entrance to which was close to our apartments, and from which perhaps the finest view, both of Jerusalem on the one side, and of the country all around onwards to the Dead Sea and the far-off mountains of Moab on the other, is obtained. The sirocco had ceased. The wind had gone round to the north-west, but the haze of yesterday still hung heavily around the horizon. The Dead Sea gleamed brightly in the morning sun, but the vapour that lay over it concealed the mountains of Moab, all but the sky-line, which seemed to float among the clouds. The country between the Mount of Olives and the Dead Sea is ragged in the extreme, intersected by countless deep ravines and wild rocky hills, whose notched and barren ridges, especially in the direction of the Dead Sea and the Caves of Engedi, well enough explained

how well suited it must have been for a hiding-place to David in the times of Saul's persecution. This is understood to have been the wilderness of Judea, the scene of our Lord's temptation, and probably of much of John the Baptist's preaching. The Frank Mountain, seen in the distance southward—the mountain of Bether of Solomon's Song—was the site of the last stronghold held by the Crusaders. We could descry imperfectly, through the haze, the valley of the Jordan, through which the river glides into the Dead Sea, where it finally disappears. The mosque from which this noble prospect is obtained looks right across the valley of the Upper Kidron upon the city, and is immediately confronted by the Mosque of Omar, the temple of the False Prophet, that now covers and desecrates the site of the ancient Temple of the God of Israel.

## THE DEAD SEA.

The heat in passing over the plain was intense. It had hardly anything upon it deserving the name of vegetation. At length we reached its eastern extremity, and entered one of the rugged and narrow defiles which lead from it, down and down, to the plain of the Jordan. Some of the views which opened on us occasionally on the side of this defile were singularly striking, though the grand characteristic feature which pervaded them was that of utter desolation and savage barrenness. At length, on rounding one of the projecting shoulders of the range that forms the western boundary of the plain of Jordan and of the Dead Sea, the sea and the plain burst at the same moment on our view, with the long and lofty wall of the mountains of Moab confronting us on the further side. It seemed but a step, looking down, to the brink of the sea, but we found it took us a good hour and a half to reach. The plain, as it approaches the level, begins to exhibit traces of vegetable life, in the shape of various flourishing shrubs and reeds—chiefly in the beds of what are watercourses in the winter and early spring, but which we found utterly dry. These shrubs grew into close thickets as we neared the sea, and were resounding with the song of birds, very grateful to our ears, though very contrary to the fabulous ideas that used to be propagated about the Sea of the Plain—as fatal equally to animal and vegetable life.

Scarcely had we touched the beach, when the male portion of the party hastened to some distance to enjoy the luxury of a bath in these mysterious waters. The very pebbles were burning beneath our feet with the intense rays of the sun, the temperature aggravated by a stifling sirocco, which has blown since the day after we landed at Jaffa. The buoyancy of the waters, owing to their high specific gravity, is well known. I found it impossible to swim on my face—for the simple reason, that the fact of the arms and chest being beneath the water made it utterly impossible to keep the legs from rising into the air. The only way in which it was possible to swim was on one's back, which was easy and delightful. To float motionless on

the surface was as easy as to lie on a sofa. The water was very warm, especially near the side, and its saltness and acridness excessive. The taste is intensely disagreeable; and if there be the least excoriation in any part of the body, the pain caused by the water is so sharp as to be felt for an hour afterwards.

#### A STORM ON THE LAKE OF GALILEE.

On this lake, whose shores were once crowded by a numerous population, and whose waters, abounding in fish, had boats in hundreds incessantly at work, engaged in traffic or in pleasure, there is now but one solitary craft—a clumsy, crazy vessel, employed now and then in carrying some stray passenger, or a load of firewood, from the one side to the other. It was so employed this forenoon; but as soon as it returned to Tiberius we hired it to take us up the lake, and so enable us to inspect more closely some of the interesting scenes on its northern shores. At two P.M. we embarked. It was a dead calm; the lake was smooth as a mirror, and the heat excessive. The level of the lake being nearly 700 feet below that of the sea, the climate is Egyptian. The Arab boatmen are not disposed to overtask themselves, and our progress was very slow. By half-past four we had got up as far as Mejdél, the ancient Magdala, the town of Mary Magdalene. This place, of which some ruins remain, occupies a fertile nook, just where the range of hills that bound the lake on the west sinks down towards the plain of Gennesareth. We had scarcely come opposite this fine plain, which is formed by the opening out towards the lake of a great valley running away westward among the Galilean mountains, when we had occasion to realize the Scripture story of the great storm of wind coming down suddenly upon the lake. First there was a ripple seen dashing the surface of the waters, and the lateen-sail, which had been hanging idly from the yard, swelled out, and our heavy boat began to move a little more briskly. Within five minutes afterwards it was blowing a gale; the yard, unable to resist its force, broke, and the whole rigging threatened to go overboard. The Arab crew, five in number, shouted at the top of their voices, all speaking at the same time, and presenting, by their noise and confusion, a curious contrast to the quiet decision and easy management with which a boat's crew of our countrymen would have met a similar occurrence. In a quarter of an hour the waves were high, and we were running away before the wind towards the head of the lake as fast as so unwieldy a hulk could be made to move. About half-past five we dashed into the mouth of the Jordan, where it enters the lake, and, running up the stream, found shelter immediately from both wind and waves. The storm of wind against which the disciples found it so impossible to make head evidently came down through that same valley by which it burst forth upon us. We ran before it to the Jordan; but their course compelled them to face it, as they were going precisely the opposite way. It was at the north-eastern extremity of the lake, and beyond the Jordan, where our Saviour had been feeding the



multitude with the five loaves and the two small fishes, and from that place the Lord had sent his disciples away across the lake towards Capernaum, which was situated on the north side of the plain of Gennesaret. It was an interesting circumstance to find ourselves on the very part of the lake on which our Lord appeared, to calm the fears of his servants, and to rescue them from peril and toil by bringing them at once to land. The suddenness and the violence of the gale, and the fact of its blowing from the same quarter, helped us all the better to realize to our own minds the striking and beautiful incident which the Scripture narrative relates, and which so touchingly illustrates our Saviour's watchful care of his people.

Ten years later—on the 10th of June 1869—Dr. Buchanan set out on another yacht-voyage; this time in the *Blue Bell*, and as the guest of Mr. James Stevenson. The destination of the party (which included the Rev. Mr. Laughton of Greenock, Mr. George MacDonald the novelist, Mr. S. Cousin, and Rev. W. T. Ker of Deskford) was Norway; and as the time of some on board was limited, little was attempted in the way of excursions into the country. The scenery along the coast-line, however, and in the fiords which were ascended, was often exquisitely beautiful, and the journal of the voyage reveals at many points the greatness of the impression which was made by it. A few short extracts from the journal will not be unacceptable:—

#### SABBATH IN A NORWEGIAN VILLAGE.

SODNES BAY, VESFEN FIORD, *Sabbath, July 4, 1869.*

This little bay is, in breadth, about five times the ship's length, and about thrice as much from the entrance to the inner end. It is enough for one such vessel as ours, but two would inevitably get foul of one another. We had worship—a full service—with the ship's crew, in which I officiated. In the afternoon Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Ker, and I went ashore with a bundle of tracts in the Norwegian tongue, which we gave to the people of a little solitary hamlet of five or six houses overlooking the bay—the only houses on the same side of the fiord for very many miles. We called at every house, and did our best to speak to the people. The tracts were received with many thanks; and we got many hand-shakings in token of gratitude. One woman brought out an old china bowl, filled it with milk, and presented it to us, as her way of acknowledging the kindness shown to them. They could all read—both mothers and children. Most of the

men were away at the fishing. We sauntered up to the summit of a lofty hill, enjoying the healthful breeze and the far-ranging prospect of wild snowy mountains above, and of green sea-margins below. On this side of the sea, and in the entrance of the Leer Fiord, was the only church of the district. The low green land is there unusually extensive, and the population considerable. There also is the school.

#### COASTING SCENE.

*Friday, July 9.*—Sailed from Christiansand at eight A.M. for Bergen. Our plan is to keep outside till we pass the island of Statland,—at the angle of this coast, where the land begins to go right southward,—and then to take the inside channel, where the scenery becomes fine. We have a pilot on board to conduct us through the narrow and intricate sounds, through which our course will then lie. From Bergen we are to send him home, and then we shall make direct for the Forth, which we hope to reach in the course of next week.

It is uncommonly mild for a sunless day. There is at present a drowsy haze over the sea and the land, and we have next to no wind. It will probably rise, however, after noon.

As the day wore on the sky cleared, and the sun shone out brightly. By-and-by a breeze sprang up, right ahead,—and which speedily grew into a strong wind, and brought along with it a heavy sea. We had nothing for it but to beat down the coast in the wind's face. The sea was covered with coasters, running up before this—to them—favouring gale. For us, there was only the harder fate of fighting against it. As evening came on the wind and the sea incessantly rose. Over the many sunken rocks which lay all around us the waves were breaking, and roaring, and flashing up into the air in foam of dazzling whiteness, forty or fifty feet high. It was a beautiful sight to see how the waves, on striking the end of the sunken reef, flew up, up, up, half the height of our mast, and then rushed frantically along the line of the unseen rock,—and then, meeting the recoil of some other breaker, rushed as wildly back again: the whole sea above the reef thus dashing from side to side, like a boiling caldron,—tossing, and leaping, and heaving in flood-like billows, white as the driven snow,—without a moment's cessation. We were told by the Consul at Christiansand of a daring ship-captain, who was accustomed to navigate these seas, and to go round the North Cape, who said he had no fear of its sunken rocks except in a calm. In a gale, or any strong wind, they all betrayed themselves, and were easily avoided. We could quite understand this from our own experience.

The sun set in a round flaming orb, into the sea, unclouded and glorious, exactly at ten o'clock. It took eight minutes to disappear, after the rim of its disk first touched the horizon. The golden light which gilded the sky never left it,—not even at midnight, when we went to bed. At this time the sea was running very high, and tossing us like a feather on its breast.

## A WALK INTO THE COUNTRY.

*Saturday, July 10.*—Have been ashore from two till five o'clock, and have had a long walk into the country, and have examined the entire pretty little town itself. It has increased considerably of late, and has 2000 inhabitants. Many of the houses—even in the oldest part of the long street which runs along shore, from end to end of the town—are handsomely built, and evidently occupied by people of some substance; many of the houses, even in the main street, have nice gardens, full of flowers and flowering shrubs. The hawthorn, and laburnum, and lilac are at present in full flower; but so, also, are the rose and the fuchsia. The people are evidently very fond of flowers,—in Norway, wherever we have been, even in humble houses, and always in that of a better kind, there are flower-pots in all the windows. And these, with the nice vandyked white window-curtains, give an air of taste and tidiness to the plainest dwelling. The houses are all of wood; and most of them in Molde are painted white or stone colour. Some of them have neat facings of carved work under the eaves and around the doors and windows. The town, here and there, creeps up the slope of the hill, which rises gently behind it. Overlooking the town and the bay—and giving a commanding view of the immense fiord, with all its wood-covered islands, and backed in the distance with its grand Alpine, snow-clad mountain ranges—there is an upper terrace-like road, on which the church stands, and a handsome *prison* in ominous contiguity. The people here seem specially given—as in many Lutheran countries—to dress the graves in the churchyard with fresh flowers; and Saturday seems to be the day for doing so. We met a great number of women and young girls, with bunches of flowers in their hands, going to the graveyard—and many returning. Scarcely a grave was without its bunch of fresh flowers, —everlastings being the favourite kind. We also found roses and fuchsias planted and growing on one of the graves, and in full flower. On one of the grave-stones we found this epitaph, in Norwegian,—

*He lived to die, and  
He died to live.*

A noble testimony to his worth. The man's name was Möller. The chief proprietor of land around the town and in the islands opposite it is of that name, and probably of that family. He has a fine house, a mile from town. Vegetation here is wonderfully far advanced. We found, in the gardens, the potatoes nearly covering the drills; the *big* (coarse barley) shooting; and oats strong and rank, though the ear was not yet appearing.

## WORSHIP IN A LUTHERAN CHURCH.

*Sabbath, July 11.*—It has rained much during the night; and in the evening of yesterday, and during most of the night, it blew hard,—though

we were quite sheltered in the little bay of Molde. The glass, however, is this morning very high—thirty inches and nearly three-tenths, which is the highest point it has touched since we left home. We are therefore in great hopes of a north wind. At ten A.M. we went to church. The place of worship would hold about 350, and there were probably about 300 present. The flat roof, with its heavy beams and planks overhead,—all unplastered, but painted white, like the walls of the church,—gave the building a confined appearance, which would have been completely taken away had this flat ceiling been removed. It is probably to keep out the cold that this flat roof is intended. It is about two hundred years old. In the church, which is raised by two steps above the level of the nave and transept, there was an altar or table covered with a white cloth, on which were two large candles in large brass candlesticks, two small ones of the same sort, and in the centre one silver candlestick with two branches—a symbol perhaps of the perfect *light*—like seven golden candlesticks. Behind the altar was a large gilt cross, rising about five feet above it. In beginning the service, the minister—whose name is Boges, and who is the bishop of the place—was robed in a surplice, with a white quilled ruff or collar round his neck in the style of Vandyke's portraits. He was a broad, short stout man, with a fat round face, and not much hair on his head; apparently about fifty to fifty-five years of age. He had a kindly and rather homely expression. The hymn sung at the "in-going" being over, he intoned part of the service, standing with his back to the people, and leaning against the altar. Now and then he turned round and chanted something, and then again turned round. After this the congregation again sang; and a little fellow who sat beside me having his prayer-book, which contained the psalms and hymns,—as well as the collects and epistles to be read,—I was able to join in singing, and could follow, at least imperfectly, the general import of it—from its resemblance to German and Scotch, and from the aid of a little smattering learned on our voyage, and by talking with the people.

After the liturgical part of the service was over—and it was very short—he took off his surplice, in presence of the people. He had all the while a black gown under it, and in this black gown and the ruff he ascended the pulpit—a perfectly round box, painted white, and placed at the angle of the left side of the transept. After a short prayer, which began with a reference to the Saviour's promise that where two or three are met in his name he is in the midst of them, and which ended with the Lord's Prayer, and after another hymn, he read the lesson of the day. It was the passage giving an account of the Saviour feeding the four thousand with the five loaves and the two small fishes. Then followed another psalm; and then he preached, taking as his subject the passage he had read about the feeding of the multitude in the desert place. He preached extempore,—evidently in a simple, conversational style, in which he was at pains to show that Christ is the true Bread that giveth life unto the world.

After a short prayer, he named a Madame somebody who had recently died, and of whom he spoke warmly. She must have been a public benefactress, as some of the people listened with evident emotion. He then named another person—reading the names in both cases from a manuscript. This person was ill, and he prayed in this person's behalf. He ended with a second repetition of the Lord's Prayer. Then came the hymn or psalm for the "red-going." After which a young man, without gown or ruff, in plain black clothes, made some announcements, standing at the top of the steps leading up from the nave; and closed all with the Lord's Prayer and the benediction—when the congregation departed. The service occupied very nearly two hours; and the congregation seemed very attentive. They consisted of plain-looking people—the poorer females, young as well as old, wear a neat tidy handkerchief over their heads, and tied under their necks, for a bonnet. The girls of a better class had mostly round pork-pie straw hats; and the ladies—if they might be so called—had *make-believe* bonnets, like those worn with us at home, though certainly very much simpler and plainer. There was nothing like *show* in the style of dress of any of them.

I have omitted to mention that there was a baptism,—in front of the altar, and after the sermon. The father and mother were attended by two male and two female sponsors. The congregation, accompanied by an organ softly played, sung well and heartily, though not boisterously. The tunes were simple and pleasing. We suppose the Molde minister and his people to be favourable specimens of the Norwegian Church.

Afterwards we walked along the high terrace-like road on which the church stands, and sauntered away up through the woods till we had got high up the hill, where we sat down. Having tried to bless the Lord with his *saints*, we now sought to praise him with his mighty and glorious *works*, which lay in such magnificence before us. On the lonely hill-side, amid the pine woods, we found a little boy herding a solitary cow, and at the same time learning his catechism (Puntoppidmis). We gave him a Norwegian tract, which he gladly received, and then we returned to the yacht.

## A SUNSET VIEW.

We had a magnificent sight before us at sunset,—one of the most wonderfully beautiful, almost magical sights, I ever saw. We were about three miles off the coast. Looking across the shining surface of the sea that separated us from it, we had before us a far-stretching range of islands of the most picturesque and varied character,—some of them in deep shadow, dark and solemn; others, catching the sun's rays and glowing with the richest hues, seemed as if their rocky steeps and wild precipices had been turned into gold; while here and there some little spots along their base, and close to the sea-line, had their patches of brilliant verdure brought out with a vividness perfectly wonderful. Then away behind these islands, and towering up far above them, range after range of hills appeared,—

some in sunshine, some in shade,—belted in many places with straight lines of strangely tinted mist; while high above the mist soared up into the sky the purple peaks and snowy summits of the loftier mountains, which formed the far-off background of the scene. It stood out before us like some glorious vision presenting itself in a dream, such was its fairy-like and almost unearthly loveliness.

Such glimpses into character as these extracts give are not without their value. In some quarters the prevalent conception of an ecclesiastic—especially of a Calvinistic ecclesiastic—is that of a man living in an atmosphere of gloom, with none of the finer susceptibilities of humanity in him, and incapable of being touched by the beautiful in art or nature. How little this conception was realized in Dr. Buchanan, those who knew him best are well aware; but even those who were not personally acquainted with him may gather, from such off-hand notes of travel as have been given above, that his religion, while influential enough to move him to passionate pleading for the sunken classes of his own city, did not render him insensible to the manifestations of God in the works of his hands.

## CHAPTER XV.

### THREATENED RENEWAL OF THE CONFLICT.

FIFTEEN years after the Disruption, a case occurred in which the question seemed about to be tried, of whether the Free Church had really made all its sacrifices in vain. Mr. John M'Millan, minister of Cardross, was accused of certain moral offences, some of which were found proven by all the courts of the Church in succession. But there was one particular charge, regarding which there was serious doubt in some minds, and the procedure taken in connection with it was held in certain quarters to be peculiar, if not irregular. The Presbytery pronounced, with reference to it, a sentence of acquittal, and the sentence was not appealed against. A minority, however, in the immediately superior court, insisted that it was within the power of that court (the Synod) to look at the whole case, and to give a judgment upon all the counts, the particular count not appealed against included. The point of order thus raised by-and-by came before the Assembly; and, after discussion, the conclusion was deliberately come to there that the minority was in the right. The case, therefore, was gone into in all its breadth and length—all the charges without exception were spoken to from both sides of the bar—the whole evidence was placed in the hands of the judges—and the Assembly, having decided against Mr. M'Millan on the merits, suspended him from the ministry.

Here, it will be seen at once, was a question on which a difference of opinion might have very reasonably arisen. The decision did not practically affect Mr. M'Millan very much, for there was matter enough in the other charges to have ensured his condemnation independently; but he had undoubtedly some conceivable warrant for arguing that wrong was done to him, when a charge of which he had been acquitted in the court below was revived against him in the Courts of Appeal. Rightly or wrongly, this was the position which he actually took up; and, smarting under a sense of what he supposed to be injustice, he rushed into a course which brought himself in the end no comfort, but the adoption of which was hailed with visible satisfaction by not a few outside of the Free Church. *He applied to the Court of Session for an Interdict.*

Such a step was heard of by the Assembly with astonishment and indignation. The Lord Ordinary, indeed (Lord Kinloch), to whom the application was made, was too wise to fall into the snare. He refused the interdict. But the offence was the same. In a Church whose very fundamental principle it was that it must be left free from the interference of the secular authorities to exercise discipline on its own members, a minister had been found ready to throw that principle to the winds when he had a private end of his own to serve. Mr. M'Millan was forthwith summoned to the bar of the Assembly. He was asked there whether it was really the case that he had appealed in the circumstances to Cæsar; and on his confessing that the rumours regarding him were strictly true, he was dealt with as one who had been taken "red-handed," and *deposed on the spot.*

This summary justice, however, did not, as may well be supposed, tend to soothe the mind and temper of the delinquent. He was now, in a manner, outlawed, and consequently reckless; and the next thing that was heard of him was, that



he had raised in the Civil Court an action against the Assembly, naming certain persons as specially representing it, and concluding for "reduction" of the spiritual sentences, and for damages to a large amount.

Now, this much could be said for the case that had thus arisen, that it was as favourable a one as could well be conceived of for trying in the interest of Erastianism the question of the independent jurisdiction of a non-established Church. There were some of the most loyal friends of the Free Church who had serious doubts about the strict regularity of its procedure; and, at any rate, the summary deposition of a man for what they, of course, regarded as the very venial offence of appealing to themselves for protection, produced, at the very outset, an unfriendly impression on the minds of some of the judges. Things therefore looked, to begin with, exceedingly well for those who held, and rejoiced to hold, that all Churches are in bonds alike. And there was something like positive jubilation when certain of the judges gave, as in former times, utterance to sentiments which were shocking to the traditional religious feelings of Scotland, but which were not out of harmony with an age which shows a growing impatience of everything spiritual or supernatural. What was a Church? it was asked. It may call itself what it likes, and think itself to be what it pleases. But to us it is no more than a voluntary association, like a gas company, and we are bound to see that no member of it receives injustice through an improper and irregular administration of its constitution.

That such utterances gave pain to many, is very certain. That it was clearly enough seen that if sentiments like these were to be remorselessly applied the toleration of *Churches* would become impossible, is also admitted. But those who, like, for example, Dr. Donald Macleod, speak as if the Cardross Case had affected the claim of the Free Church to spiritual

independence, do not seem to realize that that case did not shake a single conviction or a single principle which the Free Church ever had professed.

“The Free Church,” says Dr. Macleod, “has failed to solve the difficulty she herself raised as to the relationship of Church and State. In the Cardross Case, her claim to spiritual independence within her own denomination was judicially denied. May it not therefore be questioned whether, after little more than thirty years’ existence, she does not really find herself without a logical position between Voluntaryism and the Establishment?”

With the sincerest desire to weigh respectfully any opinion expressed in such a quarter, we are obliged to acknowledge that we have the very vaguest conception of what these sentences mean or amount to. The last sentence, in particular, is altogether dark. It was the belief of those who “came out” at the Disruption, that every true Church has, by gift from its Divine Head, an inherent right of free self-government,—and that no Church, be it Established or Free, has any title to surrender that right. The Court of Session did not endorse that belief before 1843, and we do not know that any one was very much astonished to find that it was still as unenlightened in 1858. “The judicial denial of the spiritual independence of the Free Church” therefore—that is, the utterance by a judge on the Bench of Erastian principles—took nobody at all by surprise. But how this results in the “logical” conclusion that we must in consequence go either back into the Establishment or go forward to Voluntaryism, is what is so little plain to us, that we confess we do not even understand the meaning of the statement. To go on to Voluntaryism would not make us any better, so far as we can see—for it is always within the power of the judges, if they misinterpret the principles of justice, to follow

us anywhere into the wilderness; and as for going back, that could only be at the cost of *our giving a formal consent* to a principle of law which deliberately and avowedly places the Church in subordination to the State.

The position of the Free Church is a perfectly intelligible one. It is this,—that a true Church *has* spiritual independence, whether the State within whose territories it works recognizes the fact or not. When our Church was told that it could not be permitted to enjoy that spiritual independence *and the benefits of an Establishment also*, it made up its mind to the necessary sacrifice, and surrendered the benefits. That a pursuit was threatened, and that for a time it seemed as if the chariots of Pharaoh were again to make havoc among us, is true enough; but suppose that the case had been gone thoroughly through with, nothing would have occurred to convince us that we were wrong in our fundamental principles. The free circulation of the Scriptures is not tolerated by the Spanish Government, but that does not make it the less true that the Word of God ought to be allowed to have free course even in Spain. And if the Court of Session had finally come to the conclusion that it was within its competency to reduce spiritual sentences, even within disestablished Churches, and to do with men like Mr. M'Millan what it did for the Strathbogie ministers,—does any one imagine for a moment either that that would necessarily have demonstrated the rightness of the thing in itself, or that the members of any disestablished Church in the kingdom would have submitted to it? It would have often fared ill enough with the Church of Scotland if it had agreed to entrust its liberties to the safe-keeping and absolute control of civil judges. It has been glad when these judges have accorded to it their protection. It has never willingly provoked their opposition. But, after all, it has kept the treasure of its freedom in its own custody, and

has been prepared to contend or suffer for its preservation in any such ways as Providence might seem to require. If, therefore, the Cardross Case had really issued in a fresh invasion of the spiritual province, the simple result would have been a collision, between the Church and the State, of an infinitely more serious character than that which had occurred before the Disruption. *Then*, there was an out-gate. The Church could sever its connection with the State if it did not like its conditions,—and it did so; but in the other case there could have been no side-way of escape. One party or the other must have been obliged to give way; and it does not need much knowledge of the Scottish character to enable any man to predict which side would have finally gained the victory. The Covenanters are gone, but their spirit lingers among us still. That appeared when Candlish proceeded, in the face of Court of Session interdicts, to open the new church at Marnoch, in the old Strathbogie days. And it is no empty boast to say that the Presbytery of Dumbarton would have cheerfully submitted to imprisonment rather than acknowledge a deposed minister to be in full standing simply because the sentence passed upon him by the Church Courts had been “*reduced*” by the civil judges. When authority and conscience come into collision, the latter has often the worst of it for a time. But this has to be said for conscience, that it has amazing powers of endurance; and mighty as the Court of Session is, with its interdicts and other means of molestation, the history of its relations to the Church during the last forty years has not been such as to warrant any one to say that it would have earned any lasting honour for itself if it had really entered upon such a conflict with the disestablished Churches as seemed at one time to be threatened.

It is right, however, to explain in a sentence or two what the Free Church actually did in the matter. When Mr.

M'Millan's actions were raised against it, it pled (1) that they were *incompetent*, because implying a right on the part of the Civil Courts to review and reduce spiritual sentences; and (2) that, in regard to the charge made against the Assembly to the effect that it had not adhered to its own forms, neither was that charge one which it fell to the Court of Session to consider,—the General Assembly claiming to be the sole and competent judge of its own forms.

When the Civil Court required the Church to produce its sentences, that it might see them, the demand was resisted, the requisition being looked upon as involving in it the claim to a right of review; and in this opinion they were sustained by Lord Benholm. But when it was explained that all the defences were reserved the opposition gave way, and, on the principle that the Church had nothing to conceal, and that the State has a right, for its own guidance, to be informed of whatever affects the material interests of its subjects, every sort of information was freely tendered which could throw any light upon the case. By-and-by discussions ensued, followed by a judgment given by a majority of the Court, repelling our pleas of privilege, and asserting the right of the Court to set aside the sentences in so far as they stood in the way of damages being awarded if they should be found to be due. But every word that even remotely threatened the independence of the Church was protested against; and the conclusion was come to, not only, when the proper time arrived, to carry the case by appeal to the House of Lords, but, if the judgment of the Court below was confirmed there, to resist its application to the uttermost as persecution.

While the case was proceeding, the Free Church was compelled to listen to utterances from the Scottish Bench which grated on its ears as painfully as some others that were spoken long before, when the whole subject of the

relations of Church and State were supposed to be less perfectly understood. The Lord President of the Court of Session had startled men in 1838 by saying: "That our Saviour is the Head of the Our Kirk of Scotland in any temporal, or legislative, or judicial sense, is a position which I can dignify by no other name than absurdity; the Parliament is the temporal head of the Church, from whose Acts, and from whose Acts alone, it exists as the National Church, and from which alone it derives all its powers." By this dictum, spoken twenty years before, people in their simplicity had been shocked. They were accustomed to quote it in proof of the lamentable state of darkness into which an intelligent Scotchman had been reduced by Moderatism. But in 1859 the very same doctrine was reproduced by Lord Deas; and that in a harsher form than it had assumed even in the hands of the Lord President. "If anything," said his lordship, "be clear in this case, it is that the defenders [the Free Church] are invested with no jurisdiction whatever, ecclesiastical or civil. All jurisdiction flows from the supreme power of the State. The sanction of the same authority which enacted the laws is necessary to the erection of courts, and the appointment of judges and magistrates to administer the laws. The Established Church of Scotland had and has this sanction. *The statute law of the land conferred upon it ecclesiastical jurisdiction, to be exercised by Kirk-Sessions, Presbyteries, Provincial Synods, and General Assemblies.*\* But there is no such statute law applicable to the association called the Free Church. When the defenders separated from the Establishment, they left all jurisdiction behind them. No voluntary association can, by any agreement among its

\* The friends of the Established Church regard Lord Deas as a friend, and quote his utterances with triumph. We are surprised at the circumstance, for if he gives the true history of their jurisdiction, it is vain to pretend that the State has not destroyed their autonomy as a Church of Christ.

members, assume a jurisdiction which flows only from the legislative power and regal prerogative."

Listening to utterances like these—utterances which plainly indicated an utter absence of appreciation on the part of a leading judge of the idea (dear to every religious Scotelman) that a Church is an association *sui generis*, having jurisdiction from a much higher source than the royal prerogative—the Free Church came to regard it as not at all an improbable thing that the Court of Session might again be true to its traditions, and might once more interpose for the prevention of the free exercise of ecclesiastical discipline. But, because it saw this, it never flinched for a moment from its position. In anticipation of a possibly adverse decision, it retained English counsel of the highest name (among others, Sir Roundell Palmer, now Lord Selborne) to represent it in the House of Lords; and it is the simple fact that, even had it been affirmed in the highest Court (which was most unlikely) that it was competent to the Lord Ordinary to rescind the sentence of the General Assembly, and to "repose and restore Mr. M'Millan *in integrum*," such a decision would never have been acquiesced in. The result would simply have been to compel a Christian community, which had always been thoroughly loyal to the State, and which had done a good work for it in the country, to assume an attitude which to a governing power is always embarrassing,—that of a conscientious "*Non Possumus*."

As it happened, things were not driven to this extremity. As the process drew its slow length along, it became more and more plain that the judges were trying to lay stones across the ford to make it easier for the Church to follow them. Lord Deas' theory, indeed, was found not at all to serve his purpose. His object seemed to be to break down the prevalent superstition about "the Church," and so to reconcile

people to his proposal to ride rough-shod over its sentences. What is a Church? he asked. You talk of it as if it were something sacred. It is nothing of the sort. It is just as thoroughly a commonplace association as a railway company or a naval club. And as for its "*sentences*," as you call them, they are neither more nor less than the "*resolutions*" of the society. But the religious mind of Scotland, instead of being convinced by this reasoning, was simply irritated. Earnest-minded Established Churchmen were shocked to hear from so high an authority that their Church had no jurisdiction but what was given to it by the Queen; and members of the Free Church were led at the same time to two conclusions,—first, that they were well out of an Establishment that was judicially proclaimed to be so constituted; and, second, that if such sentiments were those which ruled in high quarters, there was not very much prospect of any sincere believers in the Confession of Faith seeking soon a union of the Church with the State again.

Other and less offensive attempts were made to smooth matters. The Free Church was assured again and again that the Court would not insist on so rescinding the sentence of the General Assembly as to compel the Presbytery of Dumbarton to receive Mr. McMillan back into their membership. It would merely displace it in so far as it stood in the way of his getting the *temporalia* of his cure. But the defenders refused to accept the distinction. They held that if the Civil Court reduced the sentence in any sense, and for any purpose, advantage might be taken to make other demands which would involve an intolerable interference with the exercise of discipline. The Church equally objected to a pure and simple action of damages. It admitted indeed, cheerfully, that it would be liable to prosecution if manifest *malice* were justly chargeable upon it; for it claimed for spiritual courts no privileged title



to slander. But it maintained that if a Church were to be subjected to civil penalties while engaged in an honest endeavour to deal faithfully with its own officers, one of the fundamental principles of the law of religious toleration would be set aside.

So things proceeded until 1863, when an extraordinary and significant event occurred. The case came into the Inner Court one day on some incidental issue. No judgment on the merits was asked or expected. But suddenly the Lord President broke silence, and gave forth his mind on the prospects of the whole process. He announced that he did not think it worth the while of the prosecutor to go further on the particular line he had been pursuing. The Assembly against which the action for damages was laid had ceased to exist, and no money could be looked for from it. And as it could be got to pay nothing, there was no use in reducing its sentences. If Mr. M'Millan really wanted anything, he must prove malice against certain individuals. Mr. M'Millan took the hint. He dropped the first process, and brought another of a totally different kind. But a general feeling of weariness had come over the Parliament House. Mr. M'Millan's supporters (of whom it is understood there were not a few who were prepared to pay liberally for the satisfaction of showing that legally a Free Church has no more freedom than an Establishment) ceased to supply the funds needed to carry on a process which, even if it were successful, would not touch the heart of the question they wanted to see settled against disestablished Churches. And suddenly, though by no means unexpectedly, the intimation was made that the case was finally withdrawn.

In illustration of the spirit prevailing in the Free Church in this connection, we may introduce here a brief but significant correspondence which took place in the spring of 1863:—

(*Rev. James Stark to Dr. Buchanan.*)

“GREENOCK, *March 3, 1863.*”

“MY DEAR SIR,—M<sup>c</sup>Millan of Cardross has sent me a letter, which I enclose, as it is really intended for you though addressed to me. I have simply acknowledged the receipt of it, stating at the same time my conviction that his proposals would not be listened to for a moment by any party in the Church.

“You are at liberty, of course, to make any use of his communication you may think fit.—Yours truly,  
JAMES STARK.”

(*Mr. John M<sup>c</sup>Millan to Mr. Stark.*)

“FREE CHURCH MANSE, CARDROSS,  
 “*February 28, 1863.*”

“REV. DEAR SIR,—It has been suggested to me that it were better to terminate the Cardross Case by my withdrawing my action from the Court of Session, and casting myself on the mercy of the Church, than by embarking again on a sea of litigation. I have at last brought myself to look upon matters in that light, expecting some provision to be made for me by the liberality of the members of the Church. I am at the same time doubtful whether my petition to be reponed would be favourably received after what has taken place, and its prayer granted, leaving the matter of suspension for after consideration. If it should not, I would become the laughing-stock of the whole world, losing both my chance by my civil action and any benefit from my petition. In these circumstances I am anxious, before committing myself to a definite course, to ascertain, if possible, whether my petition, or casting myself upon the mercy of the Church, would be favourably received, and whether leading men would countenance a subscription being got up for me, and thus terminate the Cardross Case. I take the liberty to write you on the subject, as I have learned with much gratification you are not prejudiced against me. Dr. Buchanan is the great leader of the West. Unfortunately, Professor Gibson and he are not so intimate as they at one time were. Mr. M<sup>c</sup>Nab is from home for the benefit of his health, and there is no other influential person in the West to break this subject with Buchanan that I can apply to but yourself. In these circumstances I take the liberty to ask you to do the service to a distressed brother, to the Church, and to the cause of religion, to call on Dr. Buchanan, and endeavour to ascertain from him whether, in the event of my withdrawing my action from the Court, and my casting myself upon the mercy of the Church, he would be disposed to support my petition to be reponed; and, further, whether in the event of a subscription being got up for me he would countenance and encourage it. In this arrangement I look upon myself as descending to the lowest step, and making probably a great money sacrifice. But I am tired—soul, spirit, and body—of the

Cardross Case. I go far to meet parties for the sake of peace; I trust I may be met in the same spirit, and so the unhappy contest that has been carried on for years take end. I know I am asking a great favour from you in my circumstances, but God will reward you, whether you succeed with Buchanan or not. Can nothing be done before the meeting of Commission on Wednesday?—I am, Rev. dear Sir, yours truly,

“JOHN M'MILLAN.”

(*Dr. Buchanan to Mr. Stark.*)

“GLASGOW, March 5, 1863.

“MY DEAR SIR,—I received last night, on my return from the Commission of Assembly, your letter of the 3rd inst., and also the letter addressed to you by Mr. M'Millan of the 28th ult.

“In reference to the extraordinary application which Mr. M'Millan's letter contains, I have simply and emphatically to express my entire concurrence in your own statement, ‘that his proposals would not be listened to for a moment by any party in the Church.’

“I cannot refrain from adding that the effrontery of the proposal is in perfect keeping with all Mr. M'Millan's previous proceedings in the Cardross Case.—I am, dear Sir, yours most truly,

“ROBERT BUCHANAN.

“I return the letter, of which, however, I have retained a copy, as also of this letter to you.—R. B.”

The termination of the case placed the Free Church in a difficulty. On the understanding that the whole process would go up by appeal to the House of Lords, it had waited in expectation of a final decision by the Court. Now, however, that the case had collapsed, it remained to be decided whether the Church should go on of itself with the appeals taken at earlier stages on minor points, or whether it should let these go for what they were worth, and return to its own more direct and congenial occupations. The conclusion come to was the one dictated by common sense. A favourable judgment from the House of Lords was not needed to satisfy her that the doctrine laid down by Lord Deas is one which in a religious country is unworkable. She rested her claim to spiritual independence on a higher than statute law. And as Mr. M'Millan had effected nothing, either in the way

of forcing himself again into office, or of getting by way of *solutium* one farthing of damages, there was no practical end to be served in pursuing the case any further. It is true that the determination to let the matter drop has left on the records of the Court of Session judicial statements which show that Erastianism is now at the very core of Scottish Church Law. But these statements are not left there unchallenged; and, apart from that, our whole experience in the case has only served to deepen the conviction that the liberties of the Church are safer in her own keeping than in the hands of civil lawyers, however dispassionate and however learned they may happen to be.

Dr. Buchanan naturally took the deepest interest in the Cardross Case. He was a member of the Committee appointed by the Assembly to conduct it. And on several occasions he delivered in the Church Courts speeches on the subject which produced a deep impression. One of these, in particular, was given at a special meeting of the Commission on the 18th of January 1860. This meeting was called soon after it had been agreed "to satisfy production,"—that is, to comply with the requirements of the civil judges to produce for the purposes already explained the sentences which the Assembly had pronounced. Such consent appeared to some to involve an undue concession to the civil authority, and it was judged desirable that the whole matter should be fully expounded to the Church. The two persons to whom this duty was intrusted were Mr. Dunlop and Dr. Buchanan. They had laboured together in the old days to secure freedom for the Church established, and they now stood shoulder to shoulder when the liberties were threatened of the Church in its disestablished condition.

Mr. Dunlop's appearance on this occasion was a very noble one. We retain a vivid recollection of it to this hour. His

voice, never strong, had become feebler with advancing years, but the intensity of feeling in his audience produced a stillness which allowed every word to tell; and as he went on, the conviction ever grew and deepened that we were listening not to a mere lawyer with an infinity of statutes at command, but to a statesman and Christian philosopher. One of his remarks still seems to linger on the ear:—

“One of the judges—Lord Deas—said, and so far truly, that toleration is just freedom; but he left out half the definition,—toleration is freedom of conscience. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) In regard to all religious associations—to all bodies of men associated together for the worship of God, and the exercise of discipline according to their views of the Word of God—or of men who, uniting together for religious worship, though not as a Christian communion at all—in regard to them all, I say that conscience is the foundation-stone, and liberty of conscience is essential to their existence; and it is on the ground of liberty of conscience that the Civil Courts cannot interfere with any of their proceedings in reference to status or membership.

“The essence of liberty of conscience and the liberty of discipline is this, that the religious body, and the religious body alone, should be the authority to determine who are to be their own members and their own office-bearers—(applause)—and any interference with their decision in regard to officeship or membership is a violation of conscience which cannot be allowed in accordance with the principles of toleration. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) Now, the Court, or some of the judges of the Court, seem to view it in this light; and they think that is all the freedom any reasonable man can ask. They say: ‘You are free to unite together under contract, and to lay down your own rules; and if you keep to your own rules as we interpret them, we will protect you, and we will enforce them just as in regard to any other contract on ordinary matters.’ And they hold also that the status and the rights of officeship or membership arising from that contract are matters cognizable by the Civil Courts, and under the sanction of the law. Our idea is that they are not matters cognizable by the Civil Courts at all—that they are not to be enforced by the civil authorities—that they are wholly under the sanction of conscience alone, and that in dealing with them the Church Courts are to be regulated by their responsibility to their Divine Head.” (Applause.)

Dr. Buchanan's address was equally remarkable—so remarkable, that it was customary to refer to this appearance of

his as parallel to that other which he made in the General Assembly of 1838, when he carried the motion on Spiritual Independence, and lifted up aloft again that old banner under which the Church of Scotland has so often been called to fight and suffer. In itself, the speech of 1860 is every way superior to that of 1838. The fire in both is the same; but the young and comparatively inexperienced Churchman had developed into a man of acknowledged weight and power, and his words on the latter occasion have an incisive force in them which we miss at the earlier date. In introducing his subject, he refers to what was implied in the raising of

AN OLD QUESTION.

“It is very trying, after all that was done and suffered in support and vindication of that sacred and fundamental principle in 1843, to find that we are already again reduced to the necessity of struggling for it even in our disestablished position. There are gross minds—minds, I mean, intellectually and spiritually gross—that can see in such a fact nothing but a proof of our folly in giving up the substantial comforts—the glebes, manses, and stipends—of the Establishment. In their haste to arrive at a much-wished-for conclusion, men of this class take for granted that the whole matter is already definitely settled against us; and speak, accordingly, in tones of much pity as concerning us, and of great complacency as concerning themselves. Let them have their little triumph, such as it is. (Loud cheers.) Even if it were so, that the Civil Courts had decided everything against us,—instead of having as yet decided nothing very material to the fundamental question at issue,—men of earnest and religious minds would have seen nothing whatever in that circumstance to alter, in the very least, their views of the Disruption controversy. (Hear, hear.)

“The four hundred ministers who forsook their benefices and their parish churches in the time of Charles II., rather than perform an act which involved the practical recognition of the royal supremacy in matters spiritual, gained nothing for themselves by doing so but penury and persecution. They had, moreover, in some sense, less spiritual liberty after making the sacrifice than before. But what then? Though they had not escaped from suffering, they had escaped from sinning. (Cheers.) They were still pursued and oppressed, it is true, in all their spiritual and ecclesiastical proceedings by the tyrannical Erastianism of the State, more fiercely than ever; but they were no longer chargeable with the guilt of complying with it. No doubt the temporizers of those days accounted

them very rash and foolish, and congratulated themselves on their own superior prudence and discretion. But the outed ministers were quite willing to be counted fools for Christ's sake ; and in the end their folly turned out to be the truest and noblest wisdom. (Hear, hear, and applause.) It gained for their Church and country whatever of religious liberty they have since enjoyed. (Loud cheers.)

“The spirit of those men still lives in Scotland—(renewed cheers)—as the events of 1843 not unequivocally proved. With us, as with them, the question, when we abandoned the status and the emoluments of the Established Church, was not, primarily and chiefly, what greater liberty we should gain by leaving it. The ruling question with us was, What is our duty!—(hear, hear)—what must we do to maintain a good conscience towards God, and true allegiance to Christ our King? To stay in the Establishment, after it had been decided by the courts of law, and confirmed by the supreme power of the State, that even her most spiritual sentences were liable to review and reversal by the civil tribunals—in other words, that not Christ but Cæsar must thenceforth be practically regarded as master in the house of God—was impossible, unless we had been prepared to renounce those very articles of our Church's faith for which we had been contending—namely, that ‘the Lord Jesus Christ, as King and Head of his Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hands of Church officers distinct from the civil magistrate;’ and that ‘to these officers the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed;’ and that ‘the civil magistrate may not assume to himself the administration of the word and sacraments, or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven.’ At that very time we saw well enough, and often said it, that on the footing of such views as the Civil Courts had laid down in the course of the pre-Disruption conflict, no such thing as spiritual independence or true liberty of conscience, in the conduct of ecclesiastical affairs, could be safe in any Church whatever, Established or Nonconformist.

“It is altogether a mistake, therefore, to suppose that there is anything in the tone or attitude assumed by the Court of Session in its recent handling of the Cardross Case that can really take an intelligent Free Churchman by surprise. (Hear, hear.) To give effect, indeed, to the doctrine, as I understand it, on the subject of their right of interference and control in matters spiritual, which has been recently propounded from the Bench, would no doubt be a decidedly stronger and more startling thing in the case of Dissenting Churches than in the case of the Establishment. It might be said, and with some show of reason, that in the case of an Established Church—an institution not only tolerated, but endowed and upheld by the State—the State's courts may be entitled to a kind and measure of interference with its proceedings, not called for, or allowable, in the case of Dissenting Churches.

“But let the doctrine be once admitted that the Civil Court is entitled

to review and to reverse any sentence of the Church, no matter how purely spiritual,—if only the sentence can be shown somehow to affect the temporal interests of the individual against whom it is pronounced,—and it must be at once apparent that such a doctrine cannot possibly, with any show of logic or consistency, be limited in its application to an Established Church. A man's character is the most precious of all his temporal interests. If the Church to which he belongs be a pure and faithful Church, his character cannot but be damaged, in the estimation of society, by the sentence which casts him out from its communion. There can be no Church whatever, therefore, in which the exercise of discipline may not afford to the civil tribunals this sort of pretext for interference. (Hear, hear.) And just because we saw that this principle lay at the bottom of that whole series of judgments which broke down and reduced to a nullity the spiritual independence of the Established Church, it needed no gift of second sight to suggest the possibility that this principle might some day be transferred into another and wider arena, and be made as destructive of spiritual liberty outside of the Established Church as it had been within its pale." (Hear, hear.)

The speaker then goes on to describe certain actions, to the raising of which the Church could not object as incompetent. Mr. M'Millan might have asked to have his right to the *temporalia* acknowledged, notwithstanding his deposition, or he might have demanded damages on the ground of malice.

"But," said Dr. Buchanan, "this Cardross Case does not belong to either of these classes of cases. It is a case altogether distinct and different from both of these,—a case, as previously mentioned, that stands absolutely unparalleled and alone in the history of the Nonconformist Churches of Scotland, and I believe I may safely say of the British Isles, at least since Nonconformity ceased to be a crime. It is not an action as to a question of right and title to some piece of ecclesiastical property. It is not an action of damages for defamation of character. If it were such an action as either of these, it would create with us no conscientious or constitutional difficulty whatever in meeting it, or in recognizing the competency of the Civil Courts to deal with it. We make no such preposterous claim as that of deciding questions of property by the sentences of our Church Courts. We make no such arrogant claim as that of being allowed with impunity to slander and defame whom we please. But this we do claim, that our Church Courts shall not be coerced by civil law in exercising the spiritual discipline of our Church upon her own office-bearers and members. (Hear, hear.) This is what we claim, and this is all that we claim; and it is because the action



raised by Mr. M'Millan is utterly subversive of that claim, that we contemplate the entertaining it at all by the Court of Session with the most profound alarm. (Hear, hear.) In that action, as already explained, the pursuer comes before the courts of law, not asking them to settle any question of right or title to a church or manse, glebe or stipend,—not asking them to give him damages against certain individuals for wilfully and maliciously slandering and defaming his character. But in that action the pursuer comes before the courts of law asking them to reduce the spiritual sentences of suspension and deposition from the office of the holy ministry, pronounced against him by the supreme Court of the Church, under whose spiritual authority he had voluntarily placed himself, and to which, by that fact, he had bound himself to be subject. He alleges no malice against the Assembly in pronouncing the sentence, or in trying the cause which led to it. He alleges malice, indeed, against three individual members of the Assembly,—namely, the mover and seconder of the sentence, and the Moderator, who pronounced it. And though this allegation, on the very face of it, is absurd, and though not one solitary fact is adduced by him from beginning to end of the record in support of the allegation, the three individuals concerned will, notwithstanding, meet him to his heart's content on every point and particular of the action so far as they are concerned. (Applause.) But I repeat the statement, that as regards the chief party against whom the action is directed—namely, the General Assembly itself, in its corporate character considered—there is not a word about malice or any sinister design whatever. He simply and nakedly asserts that the spiritual sentence pronounced against him was a wrong sentence,—wrong because, as he alleges, the Church Courts did not adhere in some certain particulars to their own forms of procedure; and having made this allegation, he asks the Civil Courts to deny to the supreme Court of the Church the right to determine, for its own guidance, what its own forms are. He asks the Civil Courts to determine that question for the Church, and against the Church's judgment—to set the solemn spiritual sentences of suspension and deposition, pronounced in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, aside—and by civil authority 'to repon him against the same, *in integrum*.'

“Let this action be sustained—let its conclusions be granted—and I repeat unhesitatingly the words which I addressed to this Commission five months ago, that ‘such a decision would be a fatal blow struck at the spiritual liberty of every Church in Scotland; nay, a blow struck at the purity of religion, for the purity of religion and the scriptural integrity of Church discipline must stand or fall together.’” (Hear, and applause.)

Referring to what has been already spoken of,—the desire manifested by some of the judges to make it appear to the

Church that the Court did not contemplate proceeding to the extremity of absolutely rescinding the sentences,—Dr. Buchanan said :—

PERSECUTION.

“I add only a single remark before leaving these recent judicial speeches,—that obviously we can take no comfort from the hint thrown out by the Lord President, that the Court does not mean to restore Mr. M'Millan to the office of the ministry, or to replace him in his pastoral charge at Cardross. I suppose no man in his senses ever imagined the Court would attempt anything of the kind, and for the very simple and obvious reason that it is utterly beyond their power. As I took the liberty of saying at the Commission in August, they could just as easily make Mr. M'Millan king of Great Britain. But to what does that other course amount at which his lordship points? I say unhesitatingly, it amounts to simple persecution. (Loud and general cries of Hear, hear.) To give damages against the General Assembly, acting in its judicial capacity, and within its own province, as an Ecclesiastical Court, would be to commit as great an outrage on the first principles of justice as would be committed by subjecting to similar treatment the judges and juries of the land. (Hear, hear.) The independence of the Bench and of the Jury-box is the safeguard of British justice. When judges were removable at the pleasure of the Crown, history tells us what enormous crimes were committed under the forms of law. Let those whom it concerns beware how they attempt to expose to a like contamination the integrity and independence of that authority which is exercised in the government of the house of God. (Hear, hear.) The purity of discipline in the Churches of Christ in these kingdoms is not one of the least important safeguards of public morals and of domestic virtue. (Loud applause.) God knows that in all religious communions discipline is already lax enough. The danger, indeed, is always on the side of laxity, and not by any means on that of too great strictness and severity. But let it once be ruled that no Church Court, in any of our Christian Churches, can excommunicate an offending member, or suspend or depose an offending minister, without the hazard—on the mere allegation of the offenders, that some error or irregularity in the forms of Church procedure has been committed in his trial—of being dragged before the civil tribunals, subjected to ruinous expenses, and exposed to still more ruinous fines in the shape of damages;—I say, let this fatal doctrine be once ruled as law, and the discipline of the Churches will be destroyed, and with it the purity, the moral influence, the spiritual power of the Churches themselves. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) The salt will have lost its savour; and society, unseasoned by its conserving principle, will hasten to corruption and dissolution. (Renewed cheers.) It is nothing less than that most ruinous result to which the success of the pursuer in the Cardross Case must lead.

What we shall have to do in such an event is a question of a very grave and momentous kind. The state of things to which it would give rise in this country it is painful, nay, it is alarming, to contemplate. I firmly believe that it would convulse every religious communion in this country. (Hear, hear.) It is not to be imagined that they will sit down tamely under a decision that would virtually rob them, as Christian Churches, of that liberty of conscience which is with them all a matter of life and death." (Hear, hear.)

In concluding, Dr. Buchanan dwelt on the annoyance to which the Church was subjected of having to engage in a fresh conflict; but he pointed out that in having to work out the problem anew, it might be of service to others as well as to itself.

#### COMPENSATIONS.

"In common, I am sure, with all my brethren, I feel it to be a grievous hardship and trial that our Church should be dragged into this new controversy, and that our ordinary and more congenial work, to which we desired entirely to devote ourselves, should be interrupted, or at least commingled, with the discussions and excitement of a fresh conflict for our religious liberties. But my consolation is this,—that the Divine Head of the Church best knows how his own cause and kingdom are to be advanced in this fallen world. His ways are not our ways, neither are his thoughts our thoughts. We regarded the rise of the Disruption contest as a great calamity, but he has turned it into a great and manifest blessing. It may be that he has designs not less gracious in connection with the contest to which he is summoning us now. Let us be true to him, and he will be true to us. Our banner in this new battle is the same under which we fought before; and if now we must bear it over a wider field, we shall have new and faithful allies who are ready to rally around it with us. (Loud cheers.)

"The question of the right relation to each other of the civil and the spiritual jurisdictions, and of their mutual independence, is one which, as yet, is comparatively little understood. The confusion of these jurisdictions in England has left its National Church without a government, and is giving birth, in connection with that Church, to evils and dangers of the most formidable kind. It is the same confusion of these jurisdictions—though proceeding from an opposite extreme—which in the Church of Rome is at this moment disturbing the peace of Europe. It is agitating Hungary, and threatening to involve the Austrian Empire in civil war. In France, and Switzerland, and Germany, and even in Sweden, it is becoming more and more the question of the day in the Protestant

Churches. If this Cardross Case goes on, we shall have the same controversy spreading broad and wide throughout our own land. And surely it is well that a country which has been and is the light of the nations as to civil liberties, should also be their guide in what concerns the liberties of the Church of Christ. Let us not grudge any toil or trial which God may assign to us in connection with the settlement of so great a question, and with the advancement of so glorious a cause."

Towards the end of 1860, when the aggressive spirit of the Court of Session had manifested itself still more decidedly, Dr. Buchanan preached to his own congregation a sermon, which was afterwards published, entitled "*Christ and Caesar; or, The Cardross Case viewed in the Light of God's Word.*" The civil judges had just put forward their claim to be entitled to set aside the sentences of spiritual courts generally, and to take all cases of discipline into their own hands. Even after that conclusion had been come to, the special rights of the Free Church to be exempted from concussion remained to be considered. It had laws of its own, making it a condition of membership that no appeal should be made to Civil Courts in ecclesiastical matters. And it is quite possible that Mr. M'Millan would have gained little ultimately, even from Lord Deas, if the original action had been proceeded with. But Dr. Buchanan was not content to take his stand on the ground of the Free Church *constitution*. He took up the point as involving an attack on the liberties of all Churches, and showed that through it the old and sacred struggle of centuries was revived.

"Let it be observed," said he, "and distinctly noted, that the principle which has been laid down in the recent decision is shortly and simply this,—that 'spiritual acts done by a Christian Church, in the ordinary course of discipline, may be reduced;' that is, may be reversed and set aside by the courts of civil law. Let it be further observed, that the doctrine thus propounded, and in the form of a legal judgment, has no reference to any one particular case. It is broad and general. It applies to all spiritual acts whatsoever—to every possible act which belongs to the

spiritual government and discipline of a Christian Church. For example: we read in the fifth chapter of 1st Corinthians, of a member of the Church at Corinth who had been living in gross and heinous sin, and that Paul, speaking by inspiration of God, commanded his excommunication. ‘In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ,’ said he to the spiritual rulers of that Church, ‘when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.’ Now, in regard to any such sentence, pronounced by any Christian Church in this kingdom, the recent decision declares that it is competent for a court of civil law to reduce it, to declare it illegal, and to undo it. That is to say, the courts of civil law, to which Christ has given no authority in spiritual things, and no right to rule in the house of God, hold themselves entitled, notwithstanding, to review and reverse the spiritual sentences of the Christian Church. The Church deposes a minister for immorality, or excludes a member, for similar reasons, from the Lord’s table. The Civil Court claims to itself the right and power to declare these sentences to be illegal, and to draw its pen through them.

“It is quite true that the Civil Court evidently hesitates as to the way and manner in which it would venture to give practical effect to this tremendous doctrine; and no wonder. But this does not and can not affect the nature and import of the doctrine itself. The doctrine claims for the Civil Court full competency and right to reverse sentences in matters spiritual, pronounced by the Church in the ordinary exercise of her discipline, upon her own office-bearers or members, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. It claims the right to do this, even where there is no allegation that the Church Court has been actuated by malice or sinister design. It claims the right to do it, on the bare and naked plea that some civil injury is alleged, and that in its judgment there was no sufficient warrant for the spiritual censure out of which that alleged civil injury indirectly arose. In other words, it holds itself entitled to take out of the hands of Christ’s Church the ultimate settlement of the question as to what those circumstances are in which the members or office-bearers of the Church ought to be either received into it or excluded from it. And further, that in the event of its judgment differing from that of the Church on such a point, it holds itself entitled thereupon to decree that either the Church must undo the spiritual sentence she has pronounced, or, at the very least, be coerced by pains and penalties for refusing to do so. In one word, it holds itself entitled to require that in a matter in which the conscience of the Church binds her to obey God, she shall do violence to that conscience, and consent to obey man.

“And what, it may be asked, is the principle on the strength of which this right to control the discipline of Christian Churches is claimed by the civil tribunals? It is simply the old principle upon which our Lord him-

self was condemned and crucified—the principle that to recognize the right of the Church to exercise an independent jurisdiction, even in matters the most purely spiritual, is to speak against Cæsar. To say, in defence of this principle, that the spiritual sentence of the Church draws after it some civil consequence, or affects some temporal interest, is simply to adduce, in a much feebler form, the argument which was used for the same purpose by the civil tribunals of Jerusalem, when they assumed authority to stop the preaching of the gospel. The preaching of the apostles was bringing into question, the civil rulers of Judea said, the justice of the sentence by which the Saviour had been put to death. It was agitating society as to the conduct of the civil rulers themselves in that momentous proceeding. It was thus tending to damage their influence with the people. Here was a great civil interest most powerfully affected by the purely spiritual acts of the servants of Christ. But did that fact justify the civil authorities of Judea in taking it upon them to say that Christ's authority and command **must** be set aside, and that the preaching of the gospel must cease? It is essentially the same question with which we are dealing at this hour. To depose a man from the ministry, or to exclude him from the Lord's table, is undoubtedly to affect his civil interests. In the case of the minister, it may involve the loss of his living. In the case of the member of the Church, it may involve the loss of his reputation, and thereby, perhaps, may lead indirectly to his losing some worldly advantage which he previously enjoyed. And if, therefore, *this* be enough to entitle the civil tribunal to reverse and set aside the spiritual sentence the Church had in such cases pronounced, it simply and obviously follows that the Church's right of discipline is taken utterly away. If exercised at all on such a footing, it is exercised in subordination to Cæsar, and not to Christ. The Church, if she submit to such a state of things, becomes of necessity the mere servant of men. If she refuse to submit to it, she passes at once into the fires of persecution."

The cloud, as we have seen, passed away; and nothing now remains but the addition of one more to the number of those legal decisions which demonstrate the wisdom of those who fought the battles of the Disruption. Then, as now, it was allowed that the Church has a province of its own, and perhaps an additional something which might be figuratively called "jurisdiction." But it was always asserted, at the same time, that in the case of any dispute arising about the boundaries of the province or the limits of the jurisdiction, it belongs to the Court of Session to settle the dispute and

pronounce a supreme decision. The Evangelicals objected to that arrangement. They held that the theory was not a right one in itself, and that, as a practical scheme, it was not one that could be trusted to give satisfaction. How far those may now be satisfied who elected to remain within the Establishment on the distinct understanding that this arrangement was one of the conditions, we are unable to guess. But in any case our experience in the Cardross process has not contributed anything to reconciling us to the principle. The Judges of a country which recognizes the *Confession of Faith* as part of the law of the land, are unable to admit that a *Church* is anything essentially different from a gas company; and while the doctrine rules on the Bench that the ecclesiastical jurisdiction exercised by the Kirk-Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies of the Establishment has been conferred, not by Christ, the Head of the Church, but by Statute Law, we are content to wait till worthier conceptions of spiritual things prevail, and in the meantime to trust our liberties as we may to our own safe keeping. We may add that, from the peculiar complacency with which the action of the Court of Session in the Cardross Case has been regarded by eminent ministers of the Established Church, it is clear what their views are; and the tendency exhibited in that case to apply Erastian principles to non-established Churches, indicates too clearly that an Erastian Establishment is a constant menace to the liberties of Free Churches.

## CHAPTER XVI.

### HONOURS.

WHILE Dr. Buchanan was pleading for the extension of the Church in the waste places of Glasgow, a thought suggested itself almost simultaneously to two of his brethren,—that his own special gifts might be used in the interest of the movement which he had commenced. He had many qualifications which fitted him for work even in the poorest localities ; but he had also other qualifications, not possessed by all, which peculiarly adapted him for labour among the educated and cultivated classes. It occurred, therefore, to Dr. Candlish and Mr. Andrew Gray of Perth, in the end of 1853, that it would be a wise thing to transfer the minister of the Tron himself, from the East End charge which he had so long filled, to a new church in the West End, where his personal influence might be felt in drawing to the house of God some who, though they were higher in social position than the people of the Wynds, were just as much exposed as they were to lose sight of the paramount claims of religion.

“ Buchanan,” wrote Dr. Candlish to Dr. Anderson Kirkwood, “ never stood so high in public esteem as he does at this moment. In the highest and purest sense, he has won golden opinions from all sorts of men. Not members of the Free Church alone, but people of all degrees and denominations join in the general feeling of admiration and grateful respect



with which he is regarded. Let advantage be taken of this. Let it be resolved that a mark of the value attached to his services, and the affection cherished for him personally, be forthwith got up. And let this be the shape of it: a new place of worship to be erected in the West End of Glasgow. It must, of course, be handsome; but it need not be costly. I preached for Dr. Beith in Stirling on Saturday, and examined his church outside and in. There is nothing like it in Scotland. Let a similar one be set down in a right locality in Glasgow. Let the larger portion of the needful sum be raised as a fund for a testimonial to Dr. Buchanan,—of course, the congregation that would follow him might fairly make up a part. It should be a new charge, with a new name; and Buchanan should be asked to occupy it as a new charge, leaving the Free Tron to be filled up by a new minister. Were a scheme of this sort rightly gone about and promptly carried through, it would be a suitable compliment to the man and an immense boon to the cause.

“You will at once see that this is a scheme which should not be mooted, even in a whisper, unless it is to be at once executed. I am fully persuaded, however, that there are not a few both within and without our pale who would welcome it and promote it. The sum need not be a large one. Hay of Liverpool, the architect of Beith’s church, would give a better one for £5000. And if £4000 of that were secured for the sum to be presented, the congregation who are to worship in it might do the rest. I have a notion that a large number of people would like to have a stone or two in ‘*Buchanan’s Church.*’”

This suggestion bore fruit, though not immediately. In 1855, a munificent offer of £30,000 was made by Dr. Clark of Wester Moffat for the institution of a Free Church College in Glasgow. This offer was accepted; large addi-

tional sums were raised by subscription; and when the buildings were completed in the winter of 1857-58, they included a church, constructed mainly at the cost of those who desired to enjoy there the ministry of Dr. Buchanan. The Free College Church, to which he was then translated, was opened on the last Sabbath of 1857.

It is interesting to notice in the letters which he received about this time how highly his services were appreciated by his brethren. We may add just one other testimony here to that of Dr. Candlish. Dr. Fraser, now of the Free Middle Church, Paisley, who had been, before his ordination, connected professionally with the Glasgow Normal School, wrote as follows to Dr. Buchanan in reply to a request for assistance on a Fast-Day. The Eastern tour was on the eve of being commenced, and the occasion for it had become known:—

“It is with extreme regret I have been hearing of the necessity that is withdrawing you from home. I thought of writing to you, but resolved not to do it, as you must have little time for such letters, and might think it presumption. I am glad of the opportunity your note gives me to offer you my sincere sympathy and best wishes. It is long since my connection with the Normal Seminary, and seeing your interest in its progress, led me to cherish for you sincere respect and esteem; but since I became a minister, and have seen your labours on behalf of the Sustentation Fund, and of the neglected masses in Glasgow, and have marked the wisdom and power of your counsels in the hour of our Church’s danger in some of her late Assemblies, I have learned to have something higher than the highest respect and esteem. Be assured of this, there are numbers whose silent yet deepest sympathies are with you in your present illness. The marvel is that your strength has been so long equal to such incessant and arduous toil.

“You will be greatly missed at next Assembly. May the spirit of wisdom and love prevail. The prayers of many follow you. May you come back restored in health, for many years’ service in the cause of our Redeemer.”

The highest distinction which it is possible for a Presbyterian Church to confer on any of its ministers is to elect him to the Presidency of its Supreme Court. In the Established Church, the custom had been to leave the nomination of the Moderator of the succeeding year to those who had been themselves Moderators on former occasions. But in the Free Church another arrangement was followed. The Commission of Assembly, meeting in November, is now invited to name a man for the chair; and although it is always open to the General Assembly, when it has been constituted, to choose its own President, there has not been, so far as we are aware, one instance of any nomination of the Commission having been challenged by a vote.

Principal Cunningham had been Moderator of the Assembly in 1859, and after him there was no one who was so generally recognized as entitled to the honour as Dr. Buchanan; and his name was brought before the November Commission accordingly.

“I had supposed Dr. Candlish would have written to you,” says Mr. George Dalziel in a letter of date 19th November 1859, “to tell you how *VERY cordially* your name was received and approved for the Moderatorship next year. Dr. Beith proposed and Dr. Julius Wood seconded your nomination in a few very appropriate sentences. Dr. Cunningham, who was in the chair, rose and said that it would give him great pleasure indeed to move your appointment when the General Assembly met. Whereupon marked applause followed. Mr. Murray Dunlop had left the Hall, but he called on me

the following day, when he told me he was delighted with your appointment, and that much good would result from it.”

The Assembly of 1860, which met at Edinburgh on the 17th May, is specially memorable on two accounts. First of all, there took place in connection with it a great demonstration in commemoration of the Reformation. Three hundred years before, Scotland had definitely thrown off the yoke of the Church of Rome ; and a great gathering was held to mark the Tercentenary of the event. Dr. Buchanan, as Moderator, delivered the opening address, and was followed by Principal Cunningham, Dr. Hetherington, and Dr. Begg of the Free Church ; Professor Gibson of the Irish Presbyterian Church ; Professor Lorimer of the English Presbyterian Church ; Dr. Leyburn and Mr. George H. Stuart from the United States ; and Dr. Robert Burns from Toronto in Canada. The other feature of the Assembly of 1860 may be gathered from the description given of it in the Moderator's closing address. He spoke of it there as having been called "*The Revival Assembly.*" The religious awakening which for a year or more previously had been overspreading all the land, was the passing event most present to the minds of the members. A whole day was devoted to the hearing of reports regarding its progress, and to the consideration of the means whereby it might be most effectually promoted. Dr. Buchanan then and afterwards was in heartiest accord with such movements. The atmosphere of the Assembly over which he presided proved in this way delightful to him. And, as will be seen from one of the extracts which we give below, it came to be his belief that there had been no such Assembly—none in which the tide of Christian love flowed higher or more purely—since those which were held in 1843.

It fell, of course, to the past Moderator to propose his successor, and thus we have an opportunity of hearing

## DR. CUNNINGHAM ON DR. BUCHANAN.

“I have very great pleasure in proposing for my successor one who is thoroughly well known to this Church,—whose claims to this honour, and to any honour the Church can confer upon him, are of the highest order, and are generally recognized and appreciated. Dr. Buchanan of Glasgow—(loud applause)—has for more than a quarter of a century occupied a very prominent and honourable place among those public benefactors who, in addition to the faithful and conscientious discharge of the duties of their own immediate situations, have been able and willing, have received from Providence both the capacity and the opportunity of rendering important public services, and of doing much for the advancement of Christianity and the general welfare of the community. Occupying an influential position in a very important community, Dr. Buchanan was able, during the whole period of the Ten Years’ Conflict, to render very important public services, both in connection with Church extension and Church defence, in carrying out measures for providing means of grace for the population, and in expounding, defending, and applying the principles for which the Church was called upon to contend. And when that conflict came to a close, it was with the cordial concurrence of those who had been most closely associated with him that he undertook to write its history—(applause)—the history of transactions in many of which he himself held an influential and honourable place. I need not tell you what a success that history was. It is enough to say here, that it was worthy of the subject and worthy of the occasion—(applause)—and to remind you that, in its literary qualities, it obtained the high commendation of the most eminent critic of the age.\* The preparation of such a history of such a subject, by one standing in such relation to the transactions recorded, was a very great public service,—a very great boon conferred on the Free Church,—and a very great advantage to the principles for which we have been called upon to contend. It will be a permanent service, and a most important permanent boon. (Applause.) You all know that since the Disruption Dr. Buchanan has done a great deal for the Free Church in connection with all its councils and all its actings; that he has devoted much time and high talents, the results of great experience, unwearied zeal, and indefatigable activity, to the service of the Free Church; and that by doing so he has established for himself the strongest claims upon our respect and gratitude. I need not dwell upon his extraordinary and long-continued services in connection with the great Sustentation Fund. These have all along, and ever must be, strongly and vividly present to your minds. There have been some questions connected with this subject on which we did not, and do not yet, all see eye to eye; but I am satisfied that there exists no difference of opinion amongst us on these points,—that

\* Referring to Lord Jeffrey.

Dr. Buchanan has given much time and strength, and rare talents for business, to the service of the Church in this matter; that he has rendered most important services to the Sustentation Fund in several important respects, where there was not, and could not be, any difference of opinion; and that that great Fund is in no inconsiderable measure indebted, under God, to him for the measure of prosperity it has enjoyed. (Applause.) I need not dwell further on Dr. Buchanan's services, talents, and qualifications; you all know them as well, and appreciate them as highly, as I do.

"I would only further say one thing in conclusion. Whereas it has sometimes happened that the Church has been pleased to place in this chair men whom, for some reason or other, on some ground or other, she wished to honour,—to whom she thought it proper to pay some mark of respect, without having much regard to their fitness for the special duties of the office of Moderator,—I am sure you will agree with me in thinking that you will have in Dr. Buchanan,—if it is your pleasure to appoint him to his office,—not only a man who on many grounds is well worthy of any honour the Church can confer upon him, but one who will also discharge the duties of the office with admirable propriety—(applause)—who in all respects will be a model Moderator. I beg to propose that Dr. Robert Buchanan be elected Moderator." (Loud applause.)

The closing sentences of Dr. Buchanan's address at the Tercentenary meeting are well worth reproducing here, for more reasons than one. They deal with the vexed question of the relations between

#### CHURCH AND STATE.

"Let us give God thanks for the completeness of the Scottish Reformation. It were great blindness not to perceive in it, and deep ingratitude not to acknowledge, his gracious overruling hand and power. Nor let it be said or thought that these matters of government and discipline, to which the divine light of the Reformation was so closely and searchingly applied, are not worthy of the pains that were bestowed on them, or of the struggles which it has cost our Church and country to uphold them. Speaking on this subject of the relative importance of the inward faith and the outward organization of the Church, Ullmann, who will not be suspected of being carried away by our Scottish ideas, expresses himself thus: 'The objective foundation of the Church—namely, that which is out of ourselves—is Jesus Christ, the Son of man and the Son of God, Reconciler and Redeemer. The subjective foundation—namely, that which ought to be found within ourselves—is the living faith in Christ by which grace is applied to us,—the union with Christ in the spirit,—that union from which proceeds a new life consecrated to God. It is only upon this double foundation, which in reality forms but one, that the Church can be built. The

essential always is, that Christ the Redeemer is the source of the new life; and without this purer basis all external improvements were but vanity and nothingness. Nevertheless, it is not an indifferent matter to ascertain what form and what constitution an ecclesiastical society ought to have. There must be for the spirit a corresponding body; the tendency towards what is internal ought not to lead us into a morbid spiritualism. The spirit begets the form, but the form preserves the spirit; faith constitutes the Church, but the Church nourishes faith.' Going on to apply these views to the question of the expediency or lawfulness of allowing the State to intrude into the domain of the Church, and to take the regulation or control of these matters of external organization and discipline into its own hands, he adds these words: 'We do not desire a radical separation of Church and State; but yet it is evident that there are here two very different spheres. The State cannot administer the powers of redemption and sanctification, and it must allow the Church the right of freely developing herself. If the State—if a prince—claims to act in the Church, this can only infinitely augment the agitation and confusion. And even supposing that the State does all that the Church would have done, the result, nevertheless, would be entirely different. The whole duty of a prince is to leave a fair field to the Church; for the safety of the Church can come only from the Church and through the Church.' These views, which as yet are only dawning upon Germany, are three hundred years old in Scotland. We doubt not, however, that, derived as they are from the Word of God, they are destined, in conjunction with Presbyterianism, to go through the world. If we have this firm confidence in the enduring vitality and ultimately universal diffusion of those Church principles which Scotland received at the Reformation, that confidence is not derived from any arrogant assumption of superior light and learning as belonging to this little country of ours, but from the fact that perhaps no other people have been so exercised upon these questions as the people of this ancient kingdom. Scotland has been the battlefield of these questions at different memorable periods, ever since they were laid down in the Books of Discipline framed by our first Reformers. Both argument and brute force have often been put in array against them; but if, on any occasion, they seemed for a moment to be overthrown, it was only that, Antæus-like, they should rebound from the fall, and spring up stronger and more immovable than before. He who has in this respect been assigning to Scotland's Presbyterian Church and people so remarkable a history, has doubtless had a design in it all. One at least of the great problems which, by that history, Scotland seems to have been set to solve,—the problem of the right relation of Church and State, of the spiritual and the secular,—is undeniably one which hitherto has been little studied in most of the nations of Christendom, and concerning which they have much to learn. And it is surely a sufficient reason, even if it stood alone, why we should this day look back with gladness and gratitude to the glorious era

of the Scottish Reformation, that, in addition to the countless and varied benefits it has conferred upon our country, it has made familiar as household words to this Church of ours questions of great moment, and towards which the Churches of so many other lands are even yet only groping their way. It has thus placed us in a position to be the pioneers of that onward movement by which all the Churches of the Reformation are destined to advance to the conscious recognition and to the practical assertion of their true place and prerogative as kingdoms not of this world—as kingdoms in which the Lord Jesus Christ has instituted a government distinct from the Civil Magistrate—as kingdoms which can rise to the dignity of their great commission only when they shake themselves from the dust, and loose the bands of their neck, and stand in the glorious liberty wherewith Christ has made them free.” (The Moderator, whose address was received with great applause throughout, sat down amidst loud and prolonged cheering.)

Several things may be quoted from his concluding remarks on the last day of the Assembly. Here is a

#### REMINISCENCE OF THE ASSEMBLY OF 1841.

“My fathers and brethren will perhaps pardon me for recalling to their recollection one of the many memorable incidents by which the Disruption was preceded. It occurred during the sitting of the Assembly of 1841. The Church was then about to make a fresh application to the Legislature to close the yawning breach in the Church, and to avert the impending Disruption, by lending its sanction to a measure which was at that time before the House of Lords, and the object of which was to give civil effect to the Church's Veto Law. That alone which, humanly speaking, was needed to secure the consent of the Legislature to the passing of that bill, was the petition of an unanimous Assembly. For the purpose of trying to obtain this indispensable unanimity, an appeal on the part of the majority was made by one\* whose absence from the present Assembly has been matter of profound regret to us all; an appeal unsurpassed, for either force of reasoning or touching and persuasive eloquence, by almost anything that ever fell before or since even from his gifted tongue. It shook the House like a rushing mighty wind, and for a brief interval it did seem as if it had swept away all opposition before it. Should there have been anything to wonder at had it actually done this? It asked only that—to save the integrity of the Established Church as a great religious and national institution, and to render unnecessary the trying and painful step to which hundreds of the Church's ministers must otherwise be driven, by what they felt to be the imperative demands of conscience and of the Word of God—the minority of the Assembly should consent to concur in an application for the restora-

\* Dr. Candlish.



tion of a law under which they had themselves acted for five or six previous years, and under which, admittedly, they could have acted again without any scruple of conscience whatever. History will surely say that where interests so momentous, not to individuals merely, but to the Church and to the country at large, were at stake, this was no very extravagant request to make. It was, however, made in vain. The party to whom the appeal was addressed responded to it, not by conceding, but by resisting what was sought; thereby virtually declaring, in that crisis of the Church's affairs, that rather than have the Veto Law they would have the Disruption. Such a course of proceeding might be justifiable, but at least it involved a tremendous responsibility. Whether the survivors and representatives of those who adopted it continue to regard it with satisfaction, themselves alone can tell. To us, at any rate, it cannot fail to appear a singular and somewhat instructive commentary which Providence is now writing on the incident in question. Dr. Chalmers used long ago, with his characteristic pith and prescience, to say that the day would come when those to whom I have now referred would be only too glad to get back, if they could, his 'dead and dishonoured Veto.' We have lived to see that prophecy at least in course of being fulfilled. We have lived to see the famous Act of Lord Aberdeen, that was to save the Establishment, and to be more than a compensation for all it had lost by the Disruption, denounced within the Courts of the Established Church itself as an intolerable nuisance, alike to presentees, Presbyteries, and people; and to hear the Veto Law earnestly pleaded for as all but indispensable to preserve that Church from ruin! Providence has its own way of putting things in their proper places, and of setting them in their true historic light, and it takes its own time to do it; but, in the long run, it seldom fails so to order events as effectually to bring it about. That this process is steadily proceeding, as regards both the facts and the principles of the Disruption, there are many things besides the significant incident now alluded to that very clearly show. It will be found out at last, even by those who are slowest to understand such things, that if Non-Intrusion—if the right, that is, of the Christian people to be consulted at all, and to any practical effect whatever, in the choice of their ministers—be a good thing, it does not now belong to the Established Church. When that day comes, it will certainly not be for us to complain that those whom it chiefly concerns should go to Parliament to ask as a precious boon what they formerly repudiated as the greatest possible calamity. But when they do so, candid onlookers, and not improbably Parliament itself, will surely with reason expect that in the petition for legislative aid there shall be confession as well as supplication; and that, at last, the acknowledgment will be made that the protesters of 1843 were cruelly and grievously wronged. Meanwhile, strong in conscious integrity, and in the goodness and greatness of our cause, let us be comforted by the words of the inspired Psalmist: 'Trust in the Lord, and do good; so shalt thou dwell in the land,

and verily thou shalt be fed. Delight thyself also in the Lord ; and he shall give thee the desires of thine heart. Commit thy way unto the Lord ; trust also in him ; and he shall bring it to pass. And he shall bring forth thy righteousness as the light, and thy judgment as the noonday.' Already, indeed, he has abundantly made good to us all these promises."

He then notices the place given in the Assembly to the

#### WORK OF GRACE.

" How often has it happened to us before, when in previous Assemblies days were set apart for the solemn and prayerful consideration of the state and progress of religion in the midst of us, that we had little else to hear but sad confessions of prevailing coldness and deadness,—hardly a solitary father or brother had aught of an encouraging nature to tell ! How marvellous the change ! In this Assembly time absolutely failed for the recounting of the Lord's wonderful doings in almost every part of the land. We had thought, many of us, that through the ordinary channels of public information the whole extent of the present religious awakening was already generally known. But how striking and how delightful was it to find that the half had not been told ! In the course of that long and most refreshing day that was occupied with this blessed subject, as one brother after another rose to address the House, the fact became increasingly manifest that in countless districts, of which no public mention had ever previously been made at all, the Spirit from on high had been dropping as the rain and distilling as the dew to refresh God's weary heritage, and to revive his work in the midst of the years. From East Lothian to the Outer Hebrides, from the shores of the Moray Firth to those of the Solway, and all through the great central mining and manufacturing districts of the kingdom, we heard of scenes which carried us back to the days of the Lord's wonderful doings at Shotts, Stewarton, and Cambuslang. Unless we greatly deceive ourselves, no former revival of religion which our Church and country have witnessed has ever spread over so wide a field, or stirred more powerfully the hearts and minds of those among whom it appeared ; and, just as if on very purpose to shame us out of that sinful distrust of God's promise and power to which we have so often been tempted to give way, when looking abroad over those large classes of our population who had fallen away from all attendance on the ordinances of the gospel, and from all concern about divine things, it has been in the midst of these very classes, and among the most hopeless sections of them, that God has been most signally displaying the triumphs of his grace."

Last of all comes a general review of the character of what he believed to deserve the name of

## THE REVIVAL ASSEMBLY.

“ It has been my fortune to be present at many Assemblies, but, with the exception of the ever-memorable 1843, I know not if I have ever witnessed one that left at its close less to regret or more for which to praise and magnify the Lord. So far as I can remember,—and, with the exception of this forenoon, I think I have presided at every sitting of the House,—I have not heard one word spoken that was fitted to cause offence or to give pain. Brotherly love has continued uninterrupted and unbroken, without the slightest restraint on the freedom and fulness of manly discussion. God has enabled the brethren to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. Not one, I am sure, will leave it with a mind ruffled or wounded. Many—may we not hope all?—will leave it refreshed, edified, comforted, saying from their inmost heart, ‘ It is good for us to have been here.’ As for myself, and as the occupant of this chair in which your kindness placed me, I have had in it an easy task. In the course of my life I have seen enough of the sea to know how little skill or effort it requires to steer a ship when the tempest is hushed, and when none but favouring breezes are abroad. Even a landsman in such circumstances may be safely trusted with the helm; and the merest novice might, with equal absence of risk or harm to the Assembly, have presided over it. If in your present Moderator there be any latent ecclesiastical seamanship that might in less auspicious times have been helping in weathering the storm, let me assure you no one is happier than he that no opportunity has arisen of putting it to the test. It is surely in beautiful harmony with an occasion which will henceforth, I feel assured, be known and remembered among us as *The Revival Assembly*, that there should have been seen among us so much of what the apostle expressly calls the fruit of the Spirit—‘ love, joy, peace.’ In the Acts of the Apostles there is a passage that strikingly brings out and exemplifies the connection between the outpouring of the Spirit and the exercise of such a loving, brotherly, self-sacrificing spirit on the part of those upon whom His grace descends. The primitive disciples had met together to commend themselves and their cause to God. ‘ And when they had prayed, the place was shaken where they were assembled together; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they spake the word of God with boldness. And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul: neither said any of them that ought of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common. And with great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus: and great grace was upon them all.’ May the Lord grant that there may be such evidence, when we return to our several fields of labour, to prove that the Spirit of God has been here, and that this Assembly has been truly a time of refreshing from the Lord’s presence to us all.”

“Most heartily,” writes Dr. Candlish, who was then at Wiesbaden, “do I congratulate you on this most noble Assembly. I have now studied carefully all the proceedings down to your closing address,—which, by the way, always excepting one foolish sentence, was a very great success. I see that at the close you slyly bid for a second Moderatorship, that the experienced seaman’s hand may be tried in a storm. By all means ; and may I be there to see ! Seriously, I know not that we have ever had an Assembly so evidently marked by the presence of our Church’s Head, and so full of promise for the Church’s prosperity and usefulness. It must have a most blessed effect on our congregations and on the whole country. May the Lord keep us humble and faithful, waiting upon him. Tuesday’s revival work was singularly excellent and refreshing. Nixon was evidently much helped. Thursday also I liked, so far as your address and part of Begg’s went. All the other things have been admirably arranged. Again I rejoice with you, and give thanks on your behalf, for, I may say, an unprecedented and unrivalled success in the occupancy of the chair.”

A year or two after this the feeling grew and deepened that a more substantial recognition behoved to be made of the eminent public services rendered by Dr. Buchanan ; and by-and-by this feeling found expression in the following “Memorandum,” which was circulated privately among the wealthier members of the Church :—

“The ‘Ten Years’ Conflict’ is the graphic history of a great struggle, in which many who are gone, and a very few who remain, took, throughout, a prominent part.

“Amongst the latter, no one did more effective service than the Rev. Dr. Robert Buchanan of Glasgow.

“Indeed, those only who had access to the inner history

of the Church, from the passing of the Veto Act till the day of the Disruption, can fully estimate the value of Dr. Buchanan's labours in the Church's cause during that eventful period.

“For he brought to the consideration of the difficult and delicate questions that successively arose a steadiness of principle, a clearness of intellect, and a maturity of judgment, which rendered him invaluable alike in counsel and in action.

“And none prized these qualities more than the remarkable men who fought side by side along with him.

“But Dr. Buchanan's services to the Church in her years of rest and peace have been equal to those he rendered her in more troublous times.

“For no sooner was the weary battle over than he earnestly addressed himself to the task of helping to build up and consolidate the disestablished Church.

“And ever since the Disruption he has devoted his best talents to the promotion of all her interests, and his best energies to the advancement of her leading schemes—more particularly the Sustentation Fund, which is the sheet-anchor of the whole.

“Considerations like these suggest the propriety of now raising for Dr. Buchanan a testimonial similar to those so justly and considerately presented in 1859 and 1862 to his fellow standard-bearers, the late and the present Principals of the New College. It was felt at the time, and is felt still, that the Church's obligations to Cunningham, Candlish, and Buchanan will be imperfectly fulfilled if the two former only are thus gratefully remembered.

“To the wealthy members of the Church at large this brief statement will, it is hoped, be a sufficient recommendation of the object in view. To those in the west country no such recommendation is necessary.”

The result was, that within about two months a sum was collected sufficient to allow of the presentation to Dr. Buchanan of *four thousand guineas*; together with a silver epergne and appendages, intended for Mrs. Buchanan, on which it was inscribed that the whole was given “as a tribute to his private worth and to his public labours as a clergyman and citizen of Glasgow, and as an acknowledgment of his eminent services in maintaining the independence of the Church of Christ, in organizing the Free Church of Scotland, and in administering her more important schemes.”

A meeting of the subscribers was held in the Queen’s Hotel, Glasgow, on the 8th August 1864, when the presentation was formally made by the Lord Provost of the city, Mr. John S. Blackie.

Dr. Buchanan, in replying, referred in touching terms to the unexpectedness on his part of such a recognition. And he ended thus:—

“I can truly say, in now looking back on these proceedings, after the lapse of more than twenty years, that I feel it to be honour and reward enough for all the anxieties and toils of the great conflict of those days, to have been permitted and privileged to share in them, believing, as I firmly do, that they were endured in a just and noble cause, and that they have been blessed of God to give a great and lasting impulse to true religion and vital godliness, not in Scotland only, but in the world at large. If what I have written on the subject of that conflict shall be the means of helping to keep alive among our children, and our children’s children, an intelligent attachment to the great Scripture principles on which the conflict turned, my heart’s fondest desire in that matter will have been fully attained. As regards any poor service I may have been enabled to render to our Church since her disestablishment in 1843, it has been all along acknowledged far more than it deserves, by the uniform kindness which I have received at the hands of my brethren. In saying these things, it will not for a moment be supposed that I am indifferent to the honour that is done me this day. I cannot, indeed, persuade myself that I have at all merited so signal and generous a token of your esteem; but it has affected me deeply—it has gone to my inmost heart, and has awakened within me feelings and emotions which I have no words to utter. To the pecuniary value

of such a gift nothing but silliness or insincerity could affect to be insensible. I fully and thankfully appreciate its importance in that point of view, both to my family and to myself. And yet I can truly say with the apostle, 'Not that I desire a gift,'—it were a shame to me if I did. From the very outset of my ministry, even until now, God has supplied all my need. My congregation has ever acted most liberally towards me, so that I may well say, with Paul, and with more reason, 'I have all, and abound.' There is another aspect, however, in which it is especially grateful to me to contemplate this Testimonial. It assures me that I have been so happy as to gain the confidence and approval of those to whom I am best known, and whose affection and esteem I have no higher earthly ambition than to retain and to enjoy. I need not say how much it deepens my gratitude to your lordship, and to all the generous friends for whom you are now acting, to find that my dear wife shares with me in this kind expression of your regard. I suppose she could hardly trust herself, on an occasion like this, to say what she thinks and feels, and that she looks to me to say it, however imperfectly, for her. She thanks you, I know, from the bottom of her heart. We passed through the excitement and the anxieties of the Disruption together—we were of one heart and of one soul in facing that event when its issues were all future and unknown. It has been our happiness to be spared long enough to see the many dark fears regarding its results, which were then prevalent, entirely disappointed, and the fond hopes on the same subject that were cherished by the few more than realized. From the first we shared much more in the hopes than in the fears; but that such honours were in store for us as we have this day received, never entered even into our dreams. May that generous God, whose hand we desire to see in your munificent kindness, abundantly reward you for it; and may he, by his grace and blessing, dispose and enable us to devote ourselves more humbly and heartily to his holy service. For, after all, it is not he who commendeth himself, nor he whom his fellow-men commend, who is really approved, but only he 'whom the Lord commendeth.'"

How well-merited this distinction was, was acknowledged on all hands. Without lingering over proofs of that, we may give two characteristic extracts from notes which happen to lie beside us as we write. The first note is from Dr. Norman Macleod.

"When I met you on the street," he says, "on Monday, I was ignorant of the noble and generous gift which had been presented to you, or I would certainly have expressed my sympathy with you on such an occasion. No man deserves

better of your Church than you. The old Establishment made you, and some others of a like stamp ; *and it will bother either Free or U. P. to produce anything better !*"

The other note is from Dr. Candlish ; and in it he says :—

“ Most heartily do I congratulate you. Of course I knew of the movement, and was partly in the confidence of the promoters. But I was not asked to take any active part ; and I did not. I feel with you that such a thing is humbling as well as gratifying. In your case I rejoice in it as an act of honourable justice on the part of the donors. And it is peculiarly pleasing to me ; for I always felt that I had been unduly favoured, and that something was first due to you.”

It will perhaps not be out of place in this chapter to add that by this time Dr. Buchanan's fame as a financier had gone far beyond the bounds of his own Church. Applications were made to him from many quarters for advice in connection with the question of the support of the Christian ministry. Nor were the members of other Churches content to hear from him only. Earnest entreaties were addressed to him to visit England, Ireland, and America, in the interest of the new schemes which, in imitation of that of the Free Church, were being everywhere set agoing ; and if circumstances prevented his proceeding in person to all those countries, there can be no doubt that, by his written communications and otherwise, he greatly helped to give a sensible impulse and direction to every movement in the English-speaking world which has issued in the elevation of the standard of clerical remuneration.



## CHAPTER XVII.

### BEGINNING OF THE UNION MOVEMENT.

IF a body of men put off to a more convenient season the performance of any duty to which they may seem to be providentially called, either because the duty itself threatens to be troublesome, or because they have other and more congenial occupations to attend to, the probabilities are great that, when they come at their leisure to *wish* to take up the work, they will find themselves confronted with difficulties which would never have presented themselves at all at an earlier period. This law of life appears to be illustrated in the history of the efforts begun in 1863 with a view to the effecting of a Union among the non-established Presbyterian Churches of Scotland.

The desirableness of that object, and its feasibility, were both emphatically recognized in the very earliest Free Church General Assemblies.

Dr. Chalmers, referring at Glasgow, in 1843, to the numerous congratulatory addresses which, as Moderator, he had received, in connection with the Disruption, from other denominations, said: "I think that every man whose heart is in its right place will be delighted with such movements. They are movements quite in my own favourite direction, because one and all of them are movements of convergency; or, in other words, movements which point in the first

instance to union ; and, as soon as is possible and prudent, I trust their landing-place will be incorporation."

"My friends will bear me witness," said Dr. Candlish on the same occasion, "that I am the very last person who would stand on the rigid assertion of the mere theory of Establishments for the purpose of keeping up division or schism in the Church. So far from that, it appears to me that the distinct refusal of the States and Kingdoms of this world to recognize the only principle on which we can consent to have the Church established, leaves to us a very great degree of practical liberty, and a large measure of practical discretion, as to the terms on which we should stand with other Churches. IS THE DIVISION AND SCHISM OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH TO BE KEPT UP BY A QUESTION AS TO THE DUTY OF ANOTHER PARTY OVER WHOM WE HAVE NO CONTROL?"

Such sentiments as these were cheered to the echo. It was felt by the Disruptionists that they had bidden a long good-bye to a State Establishment. On the outside they saw scattered companies of men who in former days had suffered like themselves, and who had for generations been maintaining a faithful testimony to the two great principles of the Ten Years' Conflict—Non-Intrusion and Spiritual Independence. It was natural that they should draw to them. It was natural that, in spite of the recollections of the Voluntary controversy, they should welcome with enthusiasm their congratulatory Deputations. It was inevitable that the thought should have been suggested at once, that it would be good for the interests of Evangelical Presbyterianism, and good for Scotland, that the broken detachments of the ancient Church should as speedily as possible be gathered into one. And that this business was not set about at once—that it was postponed *sine die*—that nothing definite was done to put things even

in train for ultimate consummation, was, we believe, one of the few things concerning which we are warranted, with the light of subsequent experience on our side, to say, that an error in policy was committed.

The healing of ecclesiastical breaches is one of the most difficult of processes. It is like the crossing of a bar, which ships of any burden can overcome only when the tide is at its highest. And there has been no period in the history of the Free Church when the wave of feeling was fuller or could better have sustained a great union movement than just that period which immediately succeeded the Disruption. At that time there were no longing, lingering looks cast back upon the goodly land that had been forsaken. Dr. Cunningham came home from America, and told the Assembly of 1844 that "he had seen enough there to confirm him in the belief that there is nothing to which the energies of the Church of Christ, when animated by the Spirit of Christ, are not fully adequate." The same high authority—the man to whose opinion, after that of Chalmers, the Church of that day attached the greatest weight—said on the same occasion, referring still to his Transatlantic experiences: "The great body of those you meet are rather anxious to express their abhorrence of any union between the Church and the State. But I find at the same time a very general admission of *the great Scriptural principle for which alone we contend*, that, in virtue of the principles embodied in God's Word, the obligation is laid upon nations and rulers to have regard to the moral government of God as supreme, and to the welfare of the Church of Christ. *The general admission of this doctrine is all that we care about.*" And with regard to the soreness which some may suppose to have been still remaining as a memorial of the Voluntary Controversy, one is surprised and interested to find how much of brotherly love appears to have

existed under all the superficial bitterness. Years after, men who had fought in the front throughout that whole war, acknowledged that all the while they were conscious of a deeper affection for the men against whom they were contending than for many of those who battled by their side. The former were Evangelicals, the latter were Moderates; and the difference in life and doctrine cut deeper than the difference about Establishments. It was not, therefore, so difficult as might have been anticipated to welcome into the Free Church Assembly the Heughs, and the Browns, and the Marshalls, when they came with their swords beaten into ploughshares. In short, the conditions generally were favourable to the inauguration of a Union movement; and although we can very easily account for the Free Church coming to the conclusion that it was its first and exclusive duty to attend to the reconstruction of its own shattered walls, we cannot help thinking that it was a mistake to delay making any formal preparation with a view to the amalgamation of the scattered Churches, which, like so many guerilla bands, were each left fighting for their own hands, and always threatening to cross each other's paths.

Twenty years elapsed before this postponed duty was taken up in earnest. Much had been said on the subject before that, but it was in consequence of the supposed ripeness of the public sentiment that formal negotiations were opened in 1863 between the Free Church and the United Presbyterian Church. The matter was discussed first in the United Presbyterian Synod, which happened to have its sittings earlier in the month. But within a few days the response came from the Free Church Assembly; so that the step forward was, as it were, taken simultaneously.

Dr. Buchanan took the lead in his Church. On the 28th of May he moved that the General Assembly should express

its approval of the proposed movement towards Union, and its sense of the duty of aiming at its accomplishment; and should appoint a committee to confer with the representatives of such of the disestablished Churches as desired to see the ranks of Presbyterianism drawn together more closely.

“I look upon the question which these overtures have raised,” said he, “as the most important—(applause)—with which we have had to deal since the great event of the Disruption itself. It is a question which cannot have taken any of us by surprise. It has been coming across our minds every now and then, ever since we were called to take up our present position as a disestablished Church. From the very first it was manifest to all thoughtful men that two such bodies as the United Presbyterians and ourselves could not long resist the necessity of carefully considering the relation in which we were to stand with one another.

“Here we are,” he went on to say, “two separate Churches; both of us essentially Scottish; both of us decidedly Calvinistic in doctrine, and decidedly Presbyterian in government; both of us zealous upholders of spiritual independence and non-intrusion—upholders, that is, of the crown rights of Christ as Zion's only King and Lord, and of the blood-bought liberties of his people; both of us unconnected with the State, and exclusively dependent for the temporal support of our missions and of our ministry on the voluntary offerings of our people; and, finally, both of us all the while occupying the same territory, and rubbing shoulders on the same soil, in almost every town and village of our common country, while doing the very same work. Now, in circumstances like these, it is obviously all but inevitable that great inconveniences and misunderstandings must, in the long run, be produced. We cannot fail to come in each other's way. In some cases poor and spiritually-destitute localities will be neglected,

because neither Church may have, by itself alone, the means of overtaking them. While in other cases the spirit of denominational rivalry, or even the legitimate and honourable desire of each Church to supply the religious wants of its own adherents, may lead to the planting, in many a small village or limited rural population, of two churches and two ministers, where in reality there is room only for one. (Hear, hear.) The waste of money and of men resulting from such a state of things were evil enough, even if that were all. But that is not all. A far worse consequence will be found in those miserable jealousies, and heartburnings, and alienations of feeling, which are sure to spring up between ministers and congregations so unfortunately situated. Where two such congregations are both struggling for existence, and where each, by every success it gains, is aggravating the difficulties of the other, what reasonable hope can there be for either ministers or people of dwelling together in unity? It were hard to tell how many a worthy minister's life has in this way been embittered and practically thrown away, and what loss and damage has been sustained by religion itself. (Hear, hear.) It seems to me, therefore, obvious and undeniable that not only would the cause of Christian charity and Christian brotherhood gain much by our union, but that we should be thereby enabled, by God's blessing, to turn to far better account our means and resources for carrying the gospel all over the length and breadth of the land." (Applause.)

But there were notorious difficulties in the way. And, said Dr. Buchanan, "I am the last man in this House that would be for making light of them, or for refusing to look them fully and deliberately in the face. Unless we do this, no satisfactory or stable union can ever be formed. All that I contend for is, that these difficulties be not permitted to put

this great question aside, or allowed to hinder us from entertaining it in a fair and friendly spirit." (Applause.)

"My own opinion is," he proceeded, "so far as I understand the real amount of our disagreement, that there is not enough of difference to form permanently a separate and scriptural standing-ground for two such Churches as ours. I have no intention of going into an argument on this subject at present. It were premature to do so. This only let me say, by way of indicating the grounds of the conviction I have now expressed, that the public profession of the two Churches, as embodied in their standards, and in the questions put to their ministers and office-bearers at ordination, is, as I read these documents, substantially one and the same. The Westminster Confession of Faith contains their creed, as it contains ours; and they receive it with substantially the same explanation that we do ourselves. Their Formula proclaims, quite as explicitly as our own, the doctrine of the Headship of Christ, and of the independent jurisdiction of his Church; and it proclaims, almost in the very same words as our own, that Presbyterian Church government is founded on and agreeable to the Word of God. *In short, so far as I know and believe, there is but one point on which they and we differ; namely, this—not as to the Headship of Christ over the nations, and not as to the obligation binding on civil rulers to own his authority, and to regulate their official as well as their personal acts by his revealed will, but solely as to the lawfulness of setting up a Church Establishment, and endowing it out of the public funds.* To them it appears that, in doing so, the Civil Magistrate brings the power of the sword into the spiritual kingdom of Christ, and uses force in support of an institution which can be legitimately upheld, as they think, only by the voluntary offerings of its own members. *I believe that, when closely and candidly ex-*

*amined, this will be found to be the length and breadth of the entire difference between us.* (Applause.) In barring out the Civil Magistrate from the field of Church support, they do not bar him out from owning and protecting the sanctity of the Lord's Day, or from doing any of those other acts by which a nation may be called to avow its responsibility to God and to his Christ. This, at least, is my belief; and I am thoroughly convinced that close and careful inquiry will show it to be correct. Now, Moderator, *if this be all, and if, at the same time, even this that I have now stated be no part of their Church's public profession—*(hear, hear)—*if it be a mere opinion which probably the great majority of their ministers and members at present hold, but of which they make no term of communion—*(loud applause)—*and which they impose as a dogma or article of faith on no one—if this be so, as notoriously it is, though I differ from them on this point, I cannot see in it any insuperable obstacle to the union of their Church and ours.* (Continued applause.) We hold the union of Church to State to be lawful, but we do not hold it to be indispensable. We believe not only that the Church can and does exist without it, but that it is only in certain peculiar circumstances, and on certain special conditions, that the Church can warrantably enter into such a union at all. And if we were asked the question, Is there at this moment any National Church—I do not say in this kingdom, but in the world—whose union with the State rests on a scriptural basis? we should with one voice answer, No; not so much as one! Nay, more; I believe we should be equally unanimous in expressing our conviction that, constituted as States and Nations now are, the prospect of any such change as would warrant the alliance is indefinitely remote. When the change does take place—when kings really do become, in the true Scriptural sense of the term, nursing fathers, and



their queens nursing mothers, to the Church of Christ—I have no doubt that, in the light of so glorious an event, we shall all, on this one question of difference, be made to see eye to eye.” (Applause.)

The motion made by Dr. Buchanan was seconded by Dr. Charles Brown, in a speech which Mr. Nixon of Montrose, in the course of the debate which followed, characterized as one “which it was worth a man’s while to live to make, and which would exercise as great an influence over the Assembly and the Church as did the no less memorable statement which he made at the Convocation of 1842.”

Dr. Brown began by mentioning that he had happened recently, at an English watering-place, to see a great deal of one of his old antagonists in the Voluntary Controversy—Dr. King, formerly of Glasgow. Among the subjects talked over between them were the differences between their respective Churches; and the conclusion to which these discussions led Dr. Brown was this—that, except on the one point of the lawfulness and expediency of the State endowing the Christian Church, Dr. King and himself were substantially at one. Assuming, therefore, that Dr. King fairly represented his Church in the views he held about the Headship of Christ over the nations, and the duty of the civil power generally respecting religion, Dr. Brown could not believe that there were good reasons why the two Churches should continue to remain in a state of separation.

He then went on to say:—“Moderator, I have used the words Voluntary and Voluntaryism; and I am very anxious to utter a sentence or two respecting these words. I say the words, because, as to the things, I believe no man can tell precisely what these are—(laughter)—so many and different meanings do the words admit of, and so various are the

meanings they have been made to bear. In one sense of them *we* are of course Voluntaries; and I think our friends will admit that, in that sense, we have been Voluntaries to some purpose. (Laughter and applause.) In another sense we are very strongly opposed to Voluntaryism. Ay, Moderator, and in that sense—the sense in which we used to understand Voluntaryism during the controversy on the subject thirty years ago—my belief is that the brethren of the United Presbyterian Church are not Voluntaries at this hour. We used to affirm—I will speak very frankly, and I do not think I shall offend any of my brethren of the other Church who are present—we used to affirm respecting our friends of the United Secession and Relief Churches of those old days, that principles nothing short of impious were involved, at least by just and necessary consequence, in what they often maintained in connection with that word. Moderator, after all the dust and smoke of those years of strife have passed away, I confess I am strongly inclined to think that even then, at bottom, it was the endowment of the Church by the State at which alone our Voluntary friends designed to strike. But, unfortunately, they used certain very unhappy expressions about the Civil Magistrate having nothing to do with religion—about the Civil Magistrate, in his official capacity, having nothing to do with religion—which, if taken, as we perhaps were entitled to take them—(laughter)—in their plain and literal sense, were of a very erroneous and dangerous character. Moderator, I thought then, and I think still, that they used expressions which looked very like the casting of all State affairs, and all administration of them, over into a region of pure secularity—as if the State and religion, the Civil Magistrate as such, and the God of the Bible, were necessarily at antipodes to each other, and could have no possible common actings about any religious matter whatever.

“ But, sir, before I go further, I wish to ask, Did we, on the other side, use no language at that time—(hear, hear)—which was fitted to give just cause of offence to our brethren, and to wound their consciences? (Hear, hear, and applause.) I, for one, happened just thirty years ago, in the middle of that controversy, to write and publish a small volume—now, I believe, nearly forgotten—(applause)—entitled ‘ Church Establishments Defended, with Special Reference to the Church of Scotland ’—the name ‘ Free Church of Scotland ’ existed then only in God’s decrees. I am thankful for the opportunity I have to-day of declaring publicly in this House, that while I have not changed my mind since then in respect to any of the leading principles respecting the relations of Church and State which I endeavoured to make good in that volume, I am ashamed before the Lord—and have long been so in secret—of a good many things which I wrote in that little volume. I do not speak of mere juvenilities. It were not worth your while to be troubled with any reference to these. But I speak partly of certain bitternesses of language, which, if I know myself, I would rather put my hand in the fire than write again. (Applause.) I hope the Lord has forgiven them. But, further, in the second part of the volume, which was occupied with the expediency of State Endowments of the Church (even as I thought, and still humbly think, that in the first part I had made good their lawfulness), I am now satisfied that in that second part I put the whole matter of the expediency much too strongly, unaware then of the immense power of voluntary liberality—(hear, hear)—especially in a great commercial age and country, and in a state of society such as we now live in. In fact, I put the case as if the Church of Christ could scarce exist in any tolerable measure of prosperity without endowments from the State. This, I am now persuaded—and no

thanks to me, after the Free Church financial history of the last twenty years—was a great and serious mistake. (Loud applause.)

“ But to return: I have said I am much inclined now to think that it was the endowment of the Church alone which all along at bottom our brethren had really in their eye. But they used certain very incautious and indefensible expressions, which seemed to go, and if followed out to their consequences behoved to go, a great deal further. And if any one is disposed to ask, How comes it that you are now disposed to put so mild a construction even on the former sentiments of those brethren? I answer, that if he prefer greatly to have it this way, that our brethren of the United Presbyterian Church have altered their opinions very materially during these late years, I will not stay to dispute that with him. I rather incline to think—I speak humbly—but I am inclined to think, that all along they and we were not so far asunder, except as to endowments—(hear, hear)—as *we* were disposed to believe. But, at all events—and this is the important point now—*this has during these late years become more and more evident to my mind, that, saving and excepting in the one matter of the lawfulness and expediency of the State endowing the Church, our brethren and we hold substantially together, with respect to the duty of the Civil Magistrate, and of nations as such, about religion.*

“ I will just add this one thing, Moderator, with respect to the strong objections which they take to all endowments of the Church by the State. If I still believed that those objections of theirs sprung out of the root, the deeper root, of objection to the magistrate’s having anything to do with religion, anything to do with the God of the Bible, or the Bible of that God—they will pardon me for even putting the case—I should hold that to be a fatal bar to union, and

would not agree to the appointing even of a Committee of Conference. But I believe no such thing. (Applause.) Why, Moderator, our brethren, even in their allegation about the New Testament prohibiting the State from endowing the Church, must necessarily assume the duty of the State to learn at least that prohibition from the New Testament, and act on it accordingly. (Cheers.) I am persuaded that their hostility to the endowment of the Church by the State springs out of no such bitter, fatal root as that, but springs out of a fallacy—as we of the Free Church regard it—or rather a double fallacy; namely, their opinion that the New Testament absolutely restricts and confines the support of the Christian ministry, its lawful support, to the free-will offerings of the people—as to which I cannot at this day concur with them any more than I could thirty years ago; and, second, their opinion that the endowment of the Church by the State is, under all circumstances, necessarily hurtful to the freedom and welfare of the Christian Church; as to which last opinion, I must acknowledge that they can make out a more plausible case—though here too I must humbly still differ from them, at least regarding the universality and absoluteness of their thesis. (Applause.)

“ Now, if I am right thus far as respects the difference between the two Churches—the nature and extent of the difference—*then the question at once arises, Does this difference respecting the lawfulness of the endowment of the Church by the State form a sufficient ground for the Churches remaining in a state of separation?* (Hear, hear.) *I answer without hesitation, No.* (Loud applause.) For, first, there is nothing about endowments in our Confession of Faith, or in our Formula, even as there is nothing *against* endowments in the Formula of our brethren—(hear, hear)—the difference here simply being this, that most of their ministers—I believe

not the whole, but the great majority of them—hold the opinion that State endowments of the Church are unlawful, while we differ from that opinion. (Applause.) Second, we do not hold State endowments to be anything more than simply lawful, and, in certain circumstances, not inexpedient. As to the spiritual freedom of the Church, on the other hand, and her independence of the State, we, along with our esteemed brethren, hold that to be a sacred principle never to be abandoned or compromised. (Applause.) *Endowments are not a principle* (it is perhaps a pity we ever used to speak of the ‘Establishment principle’); *they are but one particular application of a principle*—(hear, hear, and applause)—*that of Christ’s Headship over the nations, which application of the principle we of the Free Church judge to be in certain circumstances lawful, and not inexpedient; while our brethren, holding along with us the more general principle, differ as to that application of it.* (Applause.) But then, thirdly, we have now no State endowments. We do not expect any. (Cheers.) We don’t desire any. (Hear, hear, and renewed cheers.) I know that men given to deal in theories and bare logic will insist on putting this case, that our Claim of Right were by-and-by to commend itself to the approval of the British Legislature, and our endowments to be offered back to us on terms of perfect spiritual freedom. And they will insist on our declaring, yea or nay, whether in that event we should not be in conscience shut up to accept them, and become again the Established Church of the country. Moderator, I might perhaps decline to trouble myself and you with a question referring to a case so purely hypothetical, and in the last degree, as I think they themselves must admit, unlikely to be realized. But I am quite ready to meet it. I do not think that our principles shut us up, even in the supposed case, to accept those offers. (Hear,

hear.) It would remain for the Church, in her now greatly altered condition,—prosperous and flourishing without the aid of the State, her lot cast in a commercial age, and in a country of great wealth, circumstanced so differently every way from the Scotland of John Knox's day,—to consider and determine whether, on the whole, it were not better and safer for her, and so more in accordance with the will of her Divine Head, to remain on simply friendly terms with so wonderfully pious a Legislature as our questioners insist on imagining, but preferring withal not to accept the offered gifts. (Applause.) Why, Moderator, if I mistake not, it was but a poor £10,000 a year that even Dr. Chalmers, in the days of Church extension, ventured to ask and expect of the State. We now raise without difficulty more than ten times that sum in a year without the State at all. (Applause.) But suppose the emphatically unlikely case, both that those offers were made to us, and that, the two Churches having been united, we, holding the lawfulness of State endowments, should see it our duty to accept them, and carried the acceptance by a majority. Well, Moderator, for my part I see nothing very fearful—even supposing such an event, and if things come to the worst—about our Anti-State-Church brethren and us, if still unable to see together on this vexed question, just voluntarily separating again as we had voluntarily united. (Applause.) I dare say, however, I owe an apology for arguing at all on a case so utopian and visionary. Moderator, I leave it to others more competent than I am to touch on the financial difficulties, or any others of a more immediately practical and business character, which may have to be got over in order to a union between the two Churches. I do not question that these will be found very considerable; but I have a confident persuasion that, supposing the way open to the Union on the score of principle, all these practical difficul-

ties would be gradually surmounted, according to the analogies of that blessed word of Abraham's servant in the 24th of Genesis—"I being in the way, the Lord led me."

We have quoted at so much length from the speeches delivered by Dr. Buchanan and Dr. Brown on this early occasion for this reason, *that it shows how clearly and distinctly the issue raised was understood from the very first.* Unhappily there came a period when some talked as if they had been led into the negotiations by false representations; as if, in consenting to open up conferences with the United Presbyterians, the prospect had been held out that Voluntaryism in any shape would be found to have become extinct. The real truth is this, that the mover and seconder of the first Union motion made no secret whatever of their belief that the brethren whose alliance they were about to seek were still as much convinced as ever that it is not one of the functions of a State to establish and endow the Church. And when the Assembly after all proceeded to appoint a committee, it went forward with its eyes open—with the distinct assumption that it might be proper to seek incorporation NOTWITHSTANDING this known and outstanding difference between the Churches.

Ultimately Dr. Buchanan's motion was carried unanimously; but there was, to begin with, a show of opposition. Professor Gibson of Glasgow unexpectedly gave notice that he would propose an addendum to it, to the effect "that, in dealing with any proposals for Union among Presbyterians in Scotland, the committee have due regard to the maintenance, in their integrity, of the principles of the authorized Standards of this Church, and especially to those distinctive principles for which this Church has been honoured to contend and suffer." This announcement took Dr. Buchanan somewhat by surprise. He had assumed that if the Free Church agreed to name its



leading men of all classes to confer with another Church about Union, the committee they constituted might very well be trusted to conclude that they were not intended to betray their own principles; and he looked upon Dr. Gibson's motion as in itself superfluous. But his main objection to it was that it suggested discord at the very outset. The proposals on the United Presbyterian side had been unanimous and hearty, and it was felt that if the negotiations were to commence with anything like hopefulness, it was indispensable that the opening of them should not be agreed to only after a division in the Assembly. The moment, therefore, the note of disharmony had been struck, Dr. Buchanan wrote the following note to Dr. Candlish:—

“ ASSEMBLY HALL, *Saturday*.

“ DEAR CANDLISH,—Gibson has given notice to-day of an addition to be made to my motion on Union, in the shape of a categorical and somewhat peremptory instruction regarding our distinctive principles, &c., &c.

“ Now, it is extremely important that our motion should be so framed as to make it impossible to divide against it.

“ I have spoken with Begg, who is entirely of this mind. In order to accomplish this object, I suggested to Begg that the right way to put the motion would be to introduce into the preamble a reference to the overtures which bring the subject before the Assembly; and to do this in such terms as will bring out, incidentally, the fact that it *is* in harmony with the views of the overtures we appoint the committee. Begg cordially approves of this.

“ Will you kindly look at the overtures with the above view, and apply your dexterous hand at the framing of the motion?

“ It is of the last consequence, for the moral effect of our proceedings in this delicate affair, and for keeping our people together about it, that we should avoid as much as possible even the appearance of disagreeing among ourselves.

“ You will have leisure in present circumstances, more than I can command, between this and Monday, to put the thing in shape.—Ever, dear Candlish, yours affectionately,

ROBERT BUCHANAN.

“ As my motion was not given in *terms*, it is of course quite open to frame it in the way above proposed.

R. B.”

The result was that the motion actually made contained the clause that the Union was to be aimed at “by all suitable

means consistent with a due regard to the principles of this Church;" and Dr. Gibson, after delivering a long speech, in which, among other things, he stated that he had never regarded endowments as of the essence of the Establishment principle, cordially withdrew his rider as no longer necessary. The Assembly then adopted the motion by acclamation, and the Church thus entered on the work of reconciliation with apparently one mind and one heart.

The time came when Dr. Gibson's proposal, and the clause to which it gave birth, were disinterred, and efforts made to show that the instructions given by the Assembly of 1863 were disregarded. We have read anew very carefully the speeches delivered on that occasion, and we candidly confess that the chief feeling which that exercise has produced on our mind is one of surprise that at so early a stage so many men appear to have realized with such completeness the significance of the step they were invited to take. Some may have entered on the Union negotiations merely under the influence of a generous impulse. But such men as Dr. Buchanan, Dr. Candlish, Dr. Begg, Dr. Charles Brown, Mr. Nixon, Dr. Guthrie, Mr. Dunlop, and Sir Henry Moncreiff, not only thoroughly understood what they were about, but deliberately and in express terms indicated that they were prepared to approve of incorporation with a Church, even although it should be found that that Church reckoned endowments unlawful.

It is scarcely worth while now to go far into this matter. The bitterness of the controversy is in a great measure past, and new issues and combinations are clearing the ground in a way which will make the position of those who moved on this line so plain that no one will be able to misrepresent it. But one cannot forget the hard words which were sometimes spoken of the author of the "Ten Years' Conflict," when he came to

insist that the union of Evangelical Presbyterians was, viewed in the light of the evangelization of the world, a higher interest than the maintenance of Establishments; and it is only just to him to say that, in accepting in 1863 the Conventionship of the Union Committee, he proclaimed to all the world the principles on which he proposed to proceed, and was sustained in the position he defined by a unanimous Assembly.

The great question which was debated, in one form or another, all through the ten years' contentings as to Union, was whether a difference of belief on the subject of the lawfulness of a union between Church and State was sufficient to form a justifiable ground of separation between two bodies which were in all other respects practically at one? Many seem to suppose that that question only arose after the conferences had commenced,—that, in fact, it was forced on the Free Church Committee by the unexpected discovery that the United Presbyterians still held Voluntary opinions! But the men who adopted the first Union motion did not delude themselves in that way. They never for a moment imagined that, in the interval between 1843 and 1863, Dr. Harper and Dr. Cairns and their friends had somehow or another come to accept the Establishment principle as Dr. Gibson understood it, and would be found standing, not on their own historical position, but on that of the Free Church. They openly and unreservedly proclaimed that they expected to find the United Presbyterians exactly where they had been for years before, and *yet they proposed Union with them notwithstanding.*

For example, here is what Mr. Dunlop said at the Assembly of 1863, not only without challenge, but with a running chorus of cheers and applause:—

“My excellent friend, Mr. Brown, in that wonderful and noble speech—so distinguished by high feeling and intel-

lectual acuteness—pointed out the erroneous application of terms employed in our old controversy, and explained the false inferences drawn from, and the different meanings involved in, the term ‘Voluntaryism.’ I wish much he would do the same service in regard to the term ‘Establishment principle.’ (Cheers.) That term in no way described the principles for which this Church contended. It was a result, in certain circumstances, which they thought lawful, that the State should endow the Church; but as to considering their principles as in any degree necessarily connected with the establishment of the Church, nothing could be further from their view, and nothing could give a more false notion of their principles than by so representing them. So far was this from being the case, that, for instance, *being then equally as now opposed to the Irish Church Establishment, I maintained that it was the duty of the State not only not to endow it, but, on the Establishment principle, to pull it down—because, viewing the duty of the Civil Magistrate to promote truth, and that Establishment being an obstruction to truth, I held it to be the magistrate’s duty to overthrow that Establishment.* (Applause.) *So far as mere endowments are concerned, I sit perfectly loose to them. The moment I found that our friends of the United Presbyterian Church were likely to adopt the general principle, that the Civil Magistrate, when he enters upon his office, should take with him the Word of God to regulate himself as a magistrate, as well as an individual, by that Word,—having got that principle settled, any further difference of opinion as to the application of that principle in particular cases was comparatively of no importance.* (Applause.) In the declaration which I signed six years ago, that principle was brought out quite sufficiently to satisfy me and the others who signed it. It was signed by leading men of the United

Presbyterian body, and was referred to the other day in the Synod as setting forth their principles. *I might be supposed to stand more rigidly upon the specific documents setting forth the distinctive principles of our Church than others, seeing I had the honour of preparing the draft of the Church's Claim of Right and the Protest.* (Applause.) *I feel satisfied, however, we and our friends are substantially agreed."*

Dr. Begg went forward as evidently realizing what was being done.

"For my part," said he, "I am most willing to admit, on the one side, to those who are strong in reference to the inexpediency, or, if you will, unlawfulness, although I never can hold that view myself, of the State upholding the Church by endowments,—I think we may readily admit that we have come to the very threshold of the time, if the time has not actually arrived, when, instead of accepting endowments from the State, we shall be bound in self-defence, and as a duty to the Government, to proclaim that it is their duty, rather than support Baal with one hand, and pretend to support Christ with the other—(loud applause)—and in that way to serve themselves heirs to the sin of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin,—I say the time seems to me to have almost, if not entirely arrived, when we may join with the most earnest Voluntaries, though on different grounds, in proclaiming to the State that it is both sinful and fitted to bring down the judgments of God to be thus tampering with truth and falsehood alike. (Continued applause.) A thousand times rather abolish and sweep away all endowments together. It is teaching the people to treat with indifference the great realities of eternity—(applause)—and to treat them as unholy things, which is one of the greatest sins of which a nation can be guilty."

The above extract is followed by about a page of the Report, in which Dr. Begg shows that, "in the very discharge of this duty [namely, of making said proclamation against indiscriminate endowments to the State], it seems to me essential that we should hold our principles:" but this showing ends with a sentence from which it appears that Dr. Begg did not regard "endowments" as of the essence, but of simply the accidents, of "our principles."

"If," said he, "we in the slightest degree compromise—I do not mean the circumstantials, but the vitals, and those great principles for which we have struggled and suffered so much—the lights would go out, as it were, in the world. It seems to me in these circumstances all-important that we should understand what Mr. Brown so powerfully expounded to-day, that whatever you do with *the question of endowments, and with any other of those mere circumstantial and unimportant questions*, the vital principle must be held."

It is, of course, competent to any one to assert that in no Church in the world ought the question of the lawfulness of Establishments to be left open. But that was certainly not the opinion of the leading men of the Free Church in 1863, or of the General Assembly which then cheered them on; and if any change of position subsequently appeared, we must attribute it to an alteration in other minds than in that of Dr. Buchanan.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

### OVERCASTING OF THE SKY.

IN less than a month after the seal of the Assembly had been put upon the Union proposals, the Committees appointed by the two Churches met and formally entered on the business of negotiation. An excellent spirit pervaded the proceedings. The first meeting (over which Dr. Harper of the United Presbyterian Church presided) was devoted almost exclusively to prayer; and in all the subsequent conferences which took place during the year, so much brotherly love prevailed that, in the Assembly of 1864, it seemed difficult for the Free Church members to find terms strong enough to express their admiration and regard for their new associates. This feeling of satisfaction was even specially noted in the official Report:—“The Committee cannot conclude this Report,” say they, “without giving earnest expression to the high sense they unanimously entertain of the Christian courtesy and candour and cordial affection which have been uniformly exhibited towards them by all the members of the large and influential Committee of the United Presbyterian Church. The intercourse which the Free Church Committee have been privileged to hold with these honoured brethren has been hallowed by many prayers, and sweetened by much fraternal communion. Whatever may be the final issue of the great movement on which the two Churches have entered, your Committee can

never cease to rejoice that it has brought them into such close personal contact with men whose high talents and great acquirements, and whose many Christian graces and gifts, render them so truly worthy of esteem and love."

When the Assembly of 1864 arrived, a great amount of work was shown to have been done. The first subject grappled with had been that of the relation of the Civil Magistrate to the Church; and the result reached was an elaborate Statement, in which the views of the two bodies were set forth. The Statement brought out very distinctly three things:—(1.) that a prevalent belief existed among United Presbyterians to the effect that State aid for the support of Christ's ordinances is excluded by the higher law that these ordinances have in Scripture been made dependent on the free-will offerings of the Christian people; (2.) that this theory—the theory of Voluntaryism—had never been made a term of communion in the Church; and (3.) that upon almost all other points connected with the functions of the Civil Magistrate, the two Churches were substantially at one.

Perhaps it may be as well to give the Statement entire here. It has been said about it, by those most competent to express an opinion upon such a subject, that in no Reformed *Confession* is there to be found anything on the same subject at all equal to it. The question of the relations of Church and State was notoriously not looked at from all possible standpoints by the Reformers. Since their day the world has had suggestive experiences of which they knew nothing. And in regard to the fathers of our own Church, we are absolutely confident of this, that if they had lived to see the Scotland of the nineteenth century, they would have expressed themselves in a way that would not have rendered it necessary for almost every Presbyterian Church in the world to



guard itself, while accepting their Confession of Faith, against being supposed to approve of persecution or intolerance. The Union Committee did a great and lasting service to the Church in drawing up the following important PAPER :—

I.—PRINCIPLES HELD BY THE TWO CHURCHES IN COMMON.

I. That Civil Government is an ordinance of God for his own glory and the public good; that to the Lord Jesus Christ is given all power in heaven and on earth; and that Magistrates, as well as other men, are under obligation to submit themselves to him, and to regulate their conduct, in their several places and relations, by his Word.

II. That the Civil Magistrate ought to further the interests of the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ among his subjects, in every way consistent with its spirit and enactments; and to be ruled by it in the making of laws, the administration of justice, the swearing of oaths, and other matters of civil jurisdiction.

III. That, while it is the duty of the Civil Magistrate to embrace and profess the Christian religion, it is not his province to impose a creed or a form of worship upon his subjects, or to interfere with that government which the Lord Jesus Christ has appointed in his Church, in the hands of Church Officers—it being the exclusive prerogative of the Lord Jesus to rule in matters of faith and worship; and that the Civil Magistrate is not to further the interests of religion by means inconsistent with its spirit and enactments, which disclaim and prohibit all persecution.

IV. That Marriage, the Sabbath, and the appointment of Days of National Humiliation and Thanksgiving, are practical instances to which these principles apply. (1.) In regard to Marriage, the Civil Magistrate may and ought to frame his marriage laws according to the rule of the Divine Word. (2.) In regard to the Sabbath, the Civil Magistrate recognizing its perpetual obligation according to the rule of the Divine Word, especially as contained in the original institution of the Sabbath, in the Fourth Commandment, and in the teaching and example of our Lord and his apostles, and its inestimable value in many ways to human society, may and ought, in his administration, to respect its sacred character, to legislate in the matter of its outward observance, and to protect the people in the enjoyment of the privilege of resting from their week-day occupations, and devoting the whole day, as they may see fit, to the public and private exercises of Divine Worship. (3.) The Civil Magistrate may, and on suitable occasions ought, to appoint days on which his subjects shall be invited to engage in Acts of Humiliation or of Thanksgiving; but without authoritatively prescribing or enforcing any special form of religious service, or otherwise interposing his authority beyond securing to them the opportunity of exercising their free discretion for these purposes.

V. That the Church and the State being ordinances of God distinct from each other, they are capable of existing without either of them intruding into the proper province of the other, and ought not so to intrude. Erastian supremacy of the State over the Church, and Antichristian domination of the Church over the State, ought to be condemned; and all schemes of connection involving or tending to either are, therefore, to be avoided. The Church has a spiritual authority over such of the subjects and rulers of earthly kingdoms as are in her communion, and the Civil Powers have the same secular authority over the members and office-bearers of the Church as over the rest of their subjects. But the Church has no power over earthly kingdoms in their collective and civil capacity, nor have they any power over her as a Church.

VI. That, though thus distinct, the Church and State owe mutual duties to each other, and, acting according to their respective spheres, may be signally subservient to each other's welfare.

## II.—VIEWS ABOUT WHICH THE TWO CHURCHES DIFFER.

### *Statements of Free Church Committee.*

I. That while the Civil Magistrate must not so sustain himself a public judge of true or false religion as to dictate to his subjects in matters of faith, and has no authority in spiritual things, yet, owning obligation to Christ, he may lawfully acknowledge, as being in accordance with the Word of God, the creed and jurisdiction of the Church.

As a further act of homage to Christ, it is his duty, when necessary or expedient, to employ the national resources in aid of the Church, provided always that in doing so, while reserving to himself full control over the temporalities, which are his own gift, he abstain from all authoritative interference in the internal government of the Church. And while the Church must ever maintain the essential and perpetual obligation which Christ has laid on all his people to support and extend his Church by free-will offerings; yet, in entire consistency with said obligation, the Church may lawfully accept aid from the Civil Magistrate when her spiritual independence is preserved entire. But it must always be a question to be judged of according to times and circumstances, whether or not such aid ought to be given by the Civil Magistrate, as well as whether or not it ought to be accepted by

### *Statements of United Presbyterian Committee.*

I. That inasmuch as the Civil Magistrate has no authority in spiritual things, and as the employment of force in such matters is opposed to the spirit and precepts of Christianity, it is not within his province to legislate as to what is true in religion; to prescribe a creed or form of worship to his subjects, or to endow the Church from national resources; that Jesus Christ, as sole King and Head of his Church, has enjoined upon his people to provide for maintaining and extending it by free-will offerings; that this being Christ's ordinance, it excludes State aid for these purposes; and that adherence to it is the true safeguard of the Church's independence.

II. That the United Presbyterian Church, without requiring from her members any approval of the steps of procedure by their fathers, or interfering with the rights of private judgment in reference to them, are united in regarding as still valid the reasons on which they have hitherto maintained their state of secession and separation from the judicatories of the Established Church, as expressed in the authorized documents of the respective bodies of which the United Presbyterian Church is formed—and in

the Church. And the question must, in every instance, be decided by each of the two parties judging for itself, on its own responsibility.

II. It follows from the preceding Articles, that any branch of the Christian Church consenting to be in alliance with the State, and to accept its aid, upon the condition of being subject to the authoritative control of the State or its Courts in spiritual matters,—or continuing in such connection with the State as involves such subjection,—must be held to be so far unfaithful to the Lord Jesus Christ as King and Head of his Church. And upon this ground, in accordance with the history and the constitutional principles of the Church of Scotland, a protest is to be maintained against the present Establishment in Scotland.

maintaining the lawfulness and obligation of separation from ecclesiastical bodies in which dangerous error is tolerated, or the discipline of the Church, or the rights of her ministry or members are disregarded.

Moreover, though uniformity of opinion with respect to Civil Establishments of religion is not a term of communion in the United Presbyterian Church, yet the views on this subject held, and universally acted on, are opposed to these institutions; and the statements set forth in these Distinctive Articles are regarded by that Church as a protest against the Church Establishment in Scotland.

To Dr. Buchanan, as Convener of the Union Committee, the duty fell of laying this Statement on the table of the Assembly; and in referring to the history of the negotiations he dwelt afresh on the harmony which had hitherto prevailed. “It will be seen,” said he, “from the Report, that the Committee have at least bestowed no small amount both of time and pains on the duty assigned them. Their meetings, by themselves separately and in conjunction with the Union Committee of the United Presbyterian Church, have been numerous and prolonged. They have been conducted with the earnestness and prayerfulness to be expected of Christian men handling questions at once so difficult and so sacred. The utmost freedom in discussion has been not merely allowed, but in every case invited and encouraged. (Applause.) Nothing has been done in any one instance by votes or by majorities. Not one solitary dissent exists in the minutes of either Committee—all, as yet, has been decided with unbroken unanimity. This more I can say, and say with equal confidence and pleasure, that the close and frequent inter-

course with the Committee of the United Presbyterian Synod into which the members of the Committee of this Assembly have been brought, has been to every one of them a source of unmingled gratification. (Loud applause.) The candour, the courtesy, the patience, the brotherly kindness, and not less the eminent ability, the great intelligence, and the Christian wisdom which the members of the United Presbyterian Committee have uniformly displayed, are such as have drawn out to our honoured brethren who compose that Committee our highest esteem and most affectionate regard." (Cheers.)

Already, however, the minds of some had become disturbed by the doubt of whether the re-establishment of the Free Church at some future time was really too improbable to be worth calculating on in a question of immediate action. Dr. Buchanan was, of course, very well aware of the existence of that doubt, and he endeavoured to meet it in his speech. In his judgment, the political and religious condition of Great Britain was such as to hold out no prospect whatever of any satisfactory State alliance, and he earnestly urged upon the Presbyterian Churches not to allow their theoretical views of what the Civil Magistrate ought in barely conceivable circumstances to do to hinder their drawing closer to one another, and so helping forward in an effective way the cause of evangelical religion in the land.

"Those among us," said he, "who are old enough to have taken part in the great reforming and evangelistic work on which our Church was so energetically and successfully setting out thirty years ago, do not need to be told how much we were then bent on gathering up and binding into one the entire Presbyterianism of our native land. Not only was there then every reason to hope that the smaller sections of those who had seceded from the Established Church might be induced to return within her pale, but the desire at least was

sincere and strong among us, that even the greater branches of the Secession might at length be so conciliated by the measures then taken to assert and vindicate both the Church's independent spiritual jurisdiction, and the rights and liberties of her members in the choice and settlement of their ministers, as to feel themselves at liberty to consider the question of abandoning their old protest against her, and even to entertain the proposal for again joining her communion. I can quite well understand, indeed, how difficult it may have been in their circumstances, and from their point of view, to see things in the same light in which they appeared to us. But I know that I am speaking only the simple truth when I say that it was the fondest wish of our hearts that the course we were then pursuing might become in the hand of an overruling Providence the means of once more giving to Scotland a great, united, and true National Presbyterian Church. There was nothing in the world that we less wished and intended or anticipated than disunion. Our grand aim was to undo the wrong and injury which the iniquitous and oppressive Patronage Law on the one hand, and the deadening and tyrannical ascendancy of Moderatism on the other, had entailed on our Church and country; and thereby to remove those causes of offence to which almost every breach which time had made in the noble Church of our reforming forefathers is directly to be traced. (Applause.) But this high aim, as followed out at that time, and by these means, God was pleased, in his own all-wise and wonder-working way, entirely to defeat. In spite of our every effort to the contrary, not only did we ultimately fail in strengthening the stakes and lengthening the cords of the Establishment, but we were constrained by the resistless pressure of conscience and Christian duty ourselves to abandon it. And I know this well, that among the many things that were trying

and painful in the event which then occurred, none grieved us more than the prospect of those religious divisions and alienations which it carried inevitably in its train. For these, indeed, we of course held ourselves in no degree to blame. We felt then, and we still feel, ourselves entitled to lay them all at the door of the Civil Power, which not merely refused to sanction our claims, but declined even to inquire into the grounds on which we undertook to show that they were part and parcel of the Church's legally ratified constitutions. According to the views we then held upon that subject, and which we still hold as firmly as ever, the State, by refusing our claims and sanctioning the encroachments of the courts of law, took upon itself the responsibility of rending asunder the Established Church rather than concede to it, or recognize as belonging to it, that right of self-government, in sole subjection to the Lord Jesus Christ, which he has conferred upon it, and which it cannot surrender or compromise without disloyalty to him, and without trampling on the privileges and liberties of the Church's members. (Loud applause.) In so acting, the State committed, as we honestly and solemnly believe, not only a great error, but a great sin; and gave, at the same time, the deadliest blow to national establishments of religion which their worst enemies could have inflicted upon them. (Applause.) And wherefore was all this? Why was it that God thus crossed us in the great object we had in view? The question is to be asked only with the deepest reverence; and any answer that may be given to it should be offered with diffidence and caution. *But may not the true answer be this, That the time is not yet come when such a union of Church and State as our forefathers struggled for, and as we thought had in substance been secured, can be realized. Such a union manifestly implies and requires, as a fundamental condition of its existence, not only a thoroughly*

*scriptural Church, but a thoroughly Christian State,—a State Christian not in form merely, but in fact—a State at one with the Church in its faith, and representing a community substantially of one mind in its views of ecclesiastical polity and religious truth.* (Cheers.) Two cannot walk together except they be agreed. And is it not the glaring and conspicuous fact that the condition now spoken of as indispensable to a truly scriptural Church and State alliance nowhere exists?.....And if we come nearer home, and look at our own Scotland, what do we see here? We see this: In the one country in the world where the grand problem of the right scriptural relation between Church and State has ever been earnestly studied,—in the one country in which anything like an honest and earnest attempt has ever been made to realize the ideal which Scripture appears to present of a Church and State union,—we see in that country the State peremptorily refusing and disallowing to the Church her inherent and, as she thought, legally ratified rights and liberties; and, by so doing, reducing the Church Establishment to the dimensions of a mere sect, the wreck and fragment only of a national institution, upheld at the expense of being robbed of its birthright liberty, and, in consequence, dissociated from the sympathies and the confidence of the majority of the Scottish people. This, I repeat, is what we see as regards the union of Church and State where, after all, the State is certainly more entitled to be called Christian than in any other kingdom in the world. *To what conclusion, then, do these things lead? Surely to this,—that if Christ's Church would maintain her freedom, and do her work, and occupy her place as the pillar and ground of the truth, she must, at least until some great change come over the political world, be contented to lean for temporal support on her own people alone. I firmly believe this to have been the great*

*lesson which God was teaching us by those aggressions of the Civil Power which brought on the Disruption of 1843."*

During 1863-64 the negotiations had been carried on only between the Free and United Presbyterian Churches; but by the time the speech was delivered from which the above is an extract, two other Churches had sought admission to the Conferences,—the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and the English Presbyterian Church. The accession of the former of these bodies to the Union Councils was hailed by Dr. Buchanan with peculiar pleasure. "The ministers and members of that Church," said he, "are the oldest of our Scottish Presbyterian Nonconformists. (Hear, hear, and loud applause.) For nearly two centuries they have maintained their own separate standing-ground, and have upheld with remarkable constancy and fidelity the pure Calvinistic creed, the sturdy Presbyterian principles, and the earnest piety of our godly forefathers. (Applause.) But on them too the spirit of Union has breathed; and no wonder, for it is the very spirit of their old Solemn League and Covenant,—a grand object of which undoubtedly was to bring the Churches to a nearer uniformity, and to a closer agreement. (Applause.) For such a Presbyterian Church—a Church united, evangelical, and free—our fathers longed, and laboured, and prayed, but never were permitted, in its integrity, to behold."

"Surely," he went on to say, "it is a wonderful thing to have lived to see the Nonconformists of 1689, the Seceders of 1735 and of 1760, and the Disruptionists of 1843,—to see, in a word, the ecclesiastical representatives of Richard Cameron, of Ebenezer Erskine, of Thomas Gillespie, and, last and greatest of all, of Thomas Chalmers—(loud applause)—approaching each other; not to cross, as in other days, the swords of angry controversy, but to confer affectionately and prayerfully on the subject of incorporating union. (Applause.) Is not this



a sight to send a thrill of deep and grateful emotion through every pious and patriotic Scottish heart? (Applause.) Who can tell how wide the sweep and range of this movement may yet prove to be? and whether it may not prove in the long run to be God's way of at length bringing about, at least for Scotland, that uniformity of doctrine, worship, and government which our godly forefathers so earnestly sought and strove to realize? (Applause.) If the time be drawing on, as many things appear not indistinctly to indicate, when, either by the operation of mutually repellent forces within the Established Church, or by the action of political causes from without, that body shall be still further dismembered, or, as a State Establishment, be altogether broken up, who can doubt that all in it who love and cherish the old evangelical faith and the old Presbyterian Church principles of the Scottish Reformation will then find their ultimate and only legitimate resting-place alongside of ourselves in the Free and United Church of Scotland? (Loud applause.) Yes; and who can tell whether it may not be in this way that God will teach to our rulers the duty they owe to the Church of Christ?"

In laying his report on the table of the Assembly, Dr. Buchanan did not ask any opinion to be expressed as to whether the Churches could unite on the basis of agreeing to differ upon the points specified. The statement submitted was simply for the information of the House, and all that was expected was the reappointment of the Committee for further consultation. Nevertheless, another debate ensued; raised on this occasion not by Dr. Gibson, who went with the majority, but by Dr. J. Julius Wood. He had already come to the conclusion that an incorporating union was impossible, and he proposed, accordingly, that the prosecution of that object should be abandoned. But he was not prepared to recommend the dissolution of the Committee. He wished it to be still con-

tinued—in order that it might stimulate *co-operation*. This suggestion, however, was felt to be essentially illogical; and in the end the Assembly became once more unanimous. Nothing in the judgment of the representatives of the Free Church of Scotland had yet emerged to make a Union seem inconsistent with that Church's principles.

But here, unfortunately, we open a new and much less attractive page in the history of the movement. The opposition to the Union which had appeared at the very outset, became gradually more intense. By means which we do not now care to think of or remember, attempts were made to excite prejudices which at first had no existence. And in the course of a year or two, the excitement on the subject grew so great that the question was pressed by the other negotiating bodies on the Free Church, of whether, in view of the spirit displayed, it was worth their while to continue the conferences any longer? Dr. Buchanan, and those who sympathized with him, felt keenly the naturalness of the appeal; and they resolved, accordingly, to ask the Assembly of 1867 to say if the measure of agreement already ascertained was in their opinion such as to hold out any reasonable hope of ultimate incorporation,—if, in short, it would serve any good purpose to go further. By a majority of 346 to 120 the Assembly gave an affirmative answer to the question, and the Union Committee was directed to proceed as before with its work. But the decision brought on a crisis within the Committee itself. Several members of it at once resigned; and thereafter began a war outside, which, like all civil, and especially like all religious wars, was far more bitter than those which take place between alien nations.

One common method of offence employed in those days was to exhibit proofs of what was called the inconsistency of the leaders of the new movement. These men, it was custom-

ary to say, had in their time been themselves within an Establishment, and had defended it devotedly against Voluntaryism. And now, it was triumphantly argued, they were turning their backs upon their own principles, and going over shamelessly to the enemy. The author of "The Ten Years' Conflict" appeared, of course, to be a peculiarly fair target for such small criticism. Had he not, of old, published lectures in favour of Establishments? Had he not gone to London to plead with successive Governments for State endowments? How, then, could such a man hold up his face before the community, and propose to join with a body which differed from him so much as to have conscientious objections to the acceptance of State aid at all?

Dr. Buchanan, like his friend Dr. Candlish, was not usually careful to answer such charges. He never pretended to have been so far-seeing in his youth as to have needed no further light in his riper years; and he never, accordingly, made an idol of consistency. But in the Assembly of 1867 he made reference to what was sometimes said about himself, in a statement which we quote, not so much because of its bearing on the Union Controversy, but because it is of some intrinsic historical interest. The lecture of which he speaks has been referred to in an earlier chapter of this volume, and it is curious to hear his comments on it after an interval of four-and-twenty years.

"There is a certain publication," said he, "which some unknown benefactor most generously hands in at my door every month—(laughter)—in the April number of which there is an article headed, in conspicuous type, 'Dr. Buchanan on the Establishment Principle.' (Renewed laughter.) It consists all but entirely of extracts from a lecture of mine, written and published in Glasgow in 1835, amid the heats of an exciting controversy. I have no doubt the extracts were quite

correctly made, though no copy of the invaluable original is now in my possession. These extracts have, I suppose, been raised up from the obscurity into which they had so undeservedly fallen—(renewed laughter)—and reproduced at this particular time as presenting, in contrast with some of my more recent utterances, one of those truly lamentable examples of human inconsistency and instability which are so common in these evil times in which it is our lot to live. (Loud laughter.) The article in question is, in short, a very perfect specimen of the *argumentum ad invidiam*—a very frequent and favourite style of argument with the periodical in which it occurs—(continued laughter and cheers)—a style of argument which, however much it may embitter a discussion, never really serves the interests of truth. (Cries of Hear, hear, and cheers.)

“In this particular case, the argument is a simple and glaring absurdity. Let me ask the Assembly to look at it for a moment. It really deserves attention; not in the least, indeed, for its own sake, but for the sake of the light it indirectly throws on the true source and occasion of much of that prejudice and misapprehension with which, in many minds, the present Union movement has had, and still has, to contend. In 1835, when my lecture was delivered, Voluntaryism was understood to mean what I then most strenuously opposed, and what I would oppose just as strenuously to-day. What that Voluntaryism was, the following extract from my lecture will sufficiently show. It contains the sum and essence of my whole argument against the views with which, on one side of the controversy, Voluntaryism was then identified. The extract runs thus:—

““In a word, if the Church Establishment doctrine were rejected, and the doctrine of Voluntaryism adopted in its stead, no bond could be formed between a nation and Him who is

the God of nations. It is in this view of the Voluntary system that its atheistical spirit and tendency unequivocally appear. For if God's authority and truth are not to be recognized by the king upon his throne, by legislators in the senate, by judges on the bench, by the statute-book in its laws,—is it not manifest that the nation, in that case, is placed in the position of practically disowning God? Civil government is expressly declared in Scripture to be God's own ordinance, and rulers are there pronounced to be his ministers for good unto the people; and yet, according to the Voluntary theory, the civil government must disown the very Being from whom its own authority is derived; rulers must disclaim all subordination to that King of kings and Lord of lords whose servants they themselves are. In a word, according to the Voluntary system, God must be virtually excluded from the government of his own world.'

“Now, Moderator, I am not able, at this distance of time, to say where we got our materials for drawing such a picture of Voluntaryism as that; but that undoubtedly was what we then supposed Voluntaryism to be. *And I have not the least hesitation in saying, that if such were the Voluntaryism of the present United Presbyterian Church, there could be no union between them and us.* (Hear, hear, and cheers.) Did any such gulf yawn between us, that Church and ours could not possibly come together. In the face of a difference so great and so vital, negotiations about union would never have been entered on at all. *But what more has any man of candour and common sense to do than to lay the extract I have read alongside of the Articles of Agreement which are now on the table of the Assembly, and which have been so nobly vindicated and so heartily accepted by the United Presbyterian\* Synod, in order to see that, in the extract in question, I condemned nothing which the United Presbyterian*

*Church does not in these Articles condemn with equal clearness and force.* (Prolonged applause.)

“How the fact is to be accounted for, that the Voluntaryism of the present day is so unlike and opposite to the Voluntaryism which my lecture described, I hardly know, nor does it much concern me to find it out. If, like Frankenstein’s monster, it was conjured into existence by incantations of our own; if it was the mere spectre of our nightmare-dream—the raw head and bloody bones of an imagination distempered by the heats of an angry controversy—it was nevertheless a reality to us at the time. We fought with it as vehemently as if it had been veritable flesh and blood. (A laugh.) The truth is, I dare say, that, for thinking so ill as we did of each other’s position and principles in that memorable warfare, both we and our opponents were not a little to blame. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

“If the Voluntaries of those days used sometimes—as I am pretty sure they did—language which seemed, at least logically, to lead to the sort of conclusions we were accustomed to impute to them, I am just as sure that we, on our side, laid ourselves quite as open to misconstruction too. I am sure that we were by no means so careful as the subsequent Disruption controversy taught us to be, in defining the place and power we conceded to the Civil Magistrate in relation to religion and the Christian Church; and most especially am I sure that, in speaking of Church establishments and State endowments, we assigned to them a position of importance and indispensableness which we are very far from assigning to them now. (Cheers.) We were in the habit of talking about the State’s duty to endow the Church in terms which could hardly fail to convey the idea that we believed it to be exclusively the State’s duty—a duty with which the members of the Church had little or nothing to do.

Nay, more—and I cannot, without a feeling of shame, recall the fact, which must be fresh in the memory of many now hearing me—we were accustomed to ridicule the language of our opponents, the Voluntaries, when they spoke of it as a privilege that the people should be called on to give of their own money to uphold the ordinances of God. Yes; many a foolish and heartless sneer upon that subject was uttered in those days, which not even the most extreme anti-Voluntary would allow himself to utter now. It is not for either party, therefore, to be throwing stones at the other. Each party, I believe, looked at its own position by far too exclusively from one side; and the result was, that the differences between us appeared to be far more and greater than they really were.

“Time and the course of events have, happily, allowed the blinding dust raised by that fierce controversy to fall, and have placed both parties in a much more favourable position for calmly and candidly reconsidering the whole question in dispute. And the consequence is, that, to the genuine surprise of many, and to the great joy of all, we now find that our agreement is immensely greater and our difference inconceivably less than we once imagined them to be.”

Still, with all this, he admitted frankly that there did exist in this connection a difference between the Free and United Presbyterian Churches. The Free Church could not say that it would never, under any circumstances, enter into an alliance with the State, or receive State assistance. *But with reference to the practical importance of the differences thus implied, he again insisted that it was not such as to justify two bodies that were agreed in all other respects to continue in a state of separation.* And he enforced his own conclusions on the matter by a remarkable utterance of Principal Cunningham. Dr. Cunningham had come to be so thoroughly convinced that a good understanding between the

non-established Churches of Scotland was indispensable, that he was inclined to attach more value to a friendly alliance with them than even to the most satisfactory arrangement that could now be entered into with the State.

“ ‘Even,’ said he, ‘if the State were to make to us proposals which, viewed in themselves, involved nothing that was, in our apprehension, inconsistent with the full recognition of all our rights and liberties as a Church of Christ, *we would attach very great weight, in deciding upon them, to the consideration of the way and manner in which our acceptance or refusal would bear upon our relation to the other Churches of Christ—(cheers)—as there is good reason to believe that the maintenance of a strict relation between the Churches of Christ in a community would have a far more important bearing upon the interests of religion and the welfare of Christ’s people than anything the civil power could do.*’

“ ‘*The question of National Establishments,*’ Dr. Cunningham had also said, ‘*is, with the views and in the circumstances of the Free Church, a purely theoretical one; and of this I feel confident, that before the period come, if it ever come, when the rulers of Great Britain shall make to the Free Church proposals which she could for a moment entertain, the Churches of Christ in that country will have attained to such a unity of sentiment, and such a cordiality of affection for each other, as to secure united and harmonious action in regard to all important matters that may bear upon the welfare of each and all of them.*’

“What,” Dr. Buchanan asked, “is this but to say, what must be self-evident to every thoughtful mind, that if the all but unimaginable contingency spoken of should really come to pass,—if so marvellous a change should be wrought, within any period about which we need to concern ourselves, upon the people and parliament of this kingdom, as that they should



be of one heart and one soul as to the true doctrine, worship, discipline, and government of the Church of Christ,—that marvellous work of grace upon the State must be contemporaneous with, or rather the fruit of, such an outpouring of the Spirit of God upon the Churches of Christ themselves, that the path of duty to all of them could not be otherwise than so plain as to make disagreement and disunion impossible. (Applause.)

“Such, Moderator, are the views upon the question which, in one form or another, we shall have this day to dispose of, that were pronounced by that eminent man by anticipation, so to speak, two-and-twenty years ago. Without knowing, or, at any rate, without at all remembering, that Dr. Cunningham had written the statements I have now quoted, I had myself, after a careful and earnest consideration of the whole subject, arrived at the very conclusions these statements set forth. When, therefore, my attention was recently called to them, I need hardly say that it afforded me a satisfaction of the liveliest kind—a satisfaction in which I cannot doubt that the overwhelming majority of this Assembly will be found to share.” (Applause.)

A large majority of the Assembly did indeed endorse these views. But from this date (1867) a blow was given to the speedy prospects of Union, and a fresh impetus given to a controversy which makes by far the saddest chapter in the history of the Free Church.

## CHAPTER XIX.

### THE CONTROVERSY.

IT is too soon to attempt to give, in a dispassionate way, a minute account of the outward history of the Union Controversy. It is a story which will by-and-by be well worth telling, as a suggestive episode in the Church History of Scotland. But, in the meantime, many of the men who took a prominent part in it are still living; and the wounds it left are too fresh to make it wise to risk exposing them needlessly. All, therefore, that we propose to do in this chapter is, to say a word or two by way of giving the *rationale* of the violent opposition which was offered to the movement, and to show, by some extracts from his correspondence and otherwise, how Dr. Buchanan bore himself in connection with the controversy.

We may very well assume that posterity will feel puzzled by the events of the period through which we have recently passed. The theory advanced by some of those who resisted the Union was, that the majority of the members of the Free Church had, in twenty years, fallen away from their principles. But that is not at all likely to find acceptance; for two reasons,—*first*, because almost all the men that had taken the lead in the exodus were still surviving; and, *second*, because the very ideas which formed the basis of the negotiations begun in 1863 had been expressed with approval in 1843. Had the Union movement been inaugurated by a younger

race, after all the men were dead who had fought through the Ten Years' Conflict, there might have been some pertinence in the assumption that the step taken was beyond what the fathers would have sanctioned. But the significant circumstance is this, that, with the exception of Chalmers, Gordon, Cunningham, and Gray, there were still surviving, in 1863, all the men who had very specially signalized themselves either by their eminent services as leaders in the struggle for independence, or by their marked personal devotion to the interests of the Free Church. What Chalmers, Gordon, and Gray would have said, had they lived to look at things in the light of 1863, is a question which no one is competent to answer dogmatically. In regard to Cunningham, however, this is a fact which can never be gainsaid, that it was an utterance of his which contributed immediately and effectively with other things to the actual commencement of the Union negotiations. The utterance to which we refer occurred in his famous speech in 1861 on the question of the amalgamation of the Presbyterian Churches in Australia. "There is nothing," said he on that occasion, "in the Formula of the United Presbyterian Church to which I have any objection. I could sign it myself. It does not contain an assertion of Voluntaryism; and they receive the Confession of Faith just with the very same qualification and explanation which we have now introduced into our Formula, and which is just the very same as that embodied in the Second Article of the basis of the United Church of Victoria." The speaking of these words was regarded by many United Presbyterians as the holding out of the olive branch. When such a man as Dr. Cunningham was able and willing to say publicly that, so far as the question of principle was concerned, he could himself become a minister of their Church, how was it possible for them to come to any other conclusion

than that the time for Union must be drawing near? And, as a matter of fact, it was this declaration which actually set the movement agoing within that particular denomination.

As to other men, there were surviving, the ecclesiastical statesman of the period, Alexander Dunlop; the historian of the Conflict, Robert Buchanan; the greatest preacher and orator of the time, after Chalmers, Robert S. Candlish; the pioneer-missionary of the Church of Scotland, Alexander Duff; the loyal and patriotic advocate of the Church's claims in Parliament, Fox Maule; the most scholarly Scottish theologian of the day, Patrick Fairbairn; and, not to speak of many others, the two men whom we naturally associate with Chalmers and Buchanan as the greatest material benefactors of the Free Church—Thomas Guthrie, to whom it owed its manses, and Robert Macdonald, to whom it was indebted for its schools. These were all living when the proposal was made to draw together the non-established Churches of Scotland, so as to form them into one Evangelical Presbyterian Communion. And the future historian who notices the fact that all these men were heart and soul in favour of the proposal which was made, will, we may be quite sure, hesitate about accepting the incredible theory that the movement they represented was one of unfaithfulness to the principles for whose sake they had made so many sacrifices.

Another and very different explanation can be given of the outbreaking of the controversy, and it may be worth while to state it in as distinct a way as possible:—

1. The roots of the differences which appeared during the Union contendings can be traced far further back than 1863. The truth is, that, as in all bodies with any life in them, there very soon appeared in the Free Church two marked drifts—one ecclesiastico-traditional, the other generously evangelical. On all points of doctrine and ordinary Church

work, the two parties into which in course of time the General Assembly became visibly shaded off were heartily and earnestly at one. But almost from the first some men showed a disposition to look at things from standpoints other than those occupied by their brethren; and more and more it came to be expected that, for example, Dr. Gibson should disagree in matters of policy with Dr. Buchanan. The very first instance of divergence appeared in connection with the Evangelical Alliance, when Dr. Buchanan, Dr. Cunningham, and men of their stamp, were on one side, and Dr. Gibson and others of a like mind were on the other. But in course of time there emerged another occasion of difference, by a reference to which the nature of the two drifts may be explained. At the Disruption, several of the Professors in the Universities joined the Free Church. The presence of Episcopalians there had been for many years winked at. But in the then state of feeling it seemed out of the question to allow Free Churchmen to remain within the walls of any national institution, and efforts were made by the Establishment to accomplish their expulsion. The result was an agitation for the abolition of University Tests, in connection with which the Liberal and the Conservative parties in the Free Church took opposite sides, and in doing so showed that they were respectively influenced by considerations and regulated by principles which would necessarily separate them during the discussion of almost all practical questions. Dr. Gibson was a dogmatist. He made up his mind in his youth as to what it would be absolutely and finally best to see realized, and he refused to entertain any proposal to admit new light or to adjust old formulas to meet new facts. Hence he opposed the abolition of University Tests, although their maintenance inevitably implied the indefinite continuance of a system under which the members of his own

Church were shut out of our seats of learning; and he did so for reasons which, if they had been applied all round, would soon have left the Free Church alone in the midst of the earth. To take what was *possible*, as an instalment for what was ideally best, was a plan which had no attraction for him. He cut out beforehand his scheme, and having settled that, he put his foot down, and would listen to no such reasoning as that we live in an impracticable world, and must be content sometimes to do with things as things will do with us. Dr. Gibson, in course of time, became the recognized leader of a party; and it is easy to see how a party so led must have come to tell as a disturbing force in the Union movement. The promoters of that movement were far-seeing, practical Christian men. What they proposed involved no sacrifice of principle, but it was undoubtedly a step forward taken in a large-hearted way in the interest of the evangelization of the country. And one can feel no surprise that against a drift so distinctly Liberal the instincts of a hard ecclesiastical Conservatism rebelled.

2. This is true also, that as the negotiations proceeded, and the combatants came to realize more perfectly what opinions they actually held, there did emerge differences of view, which were, to say the least of them, previously latent. For example: Dr. Candlish, in the speech which he delivered in 1864, spoke of a misunderstanding which had been cleared up during the year's negotiations. The misunderstanding was this. "The Voluntaries," he said, "thought that our Establishment principle carried us so far as almost to identify Church and State; or at least so far as to make civil government, as such, rest upon Christianity, upon grace." It afterwards turned out that this misunderstanding was not then thoroughly cleared up. In course of time it became plain that some in the Free Church did hold a doctrine about Establishments which

did virtually make the Civil Magistrate a Church officer and so identified Church and State; and among those who accepted such teaching, Union was, of course, out of the question.

But there was another point about which Free Churchmen came to be conscious of the pressure of a far-reaching difference. It was in the interpretation to be put upon the permanent significance of the Claim of Right. Some understood that document not merely to mean that the Church of Scotland had been illegally deprived of its status and emoluments at the Disruption by a misreading of the law, but that in it we of the Free Church have literally *a permanent legal title* to the National Establishment. This view was pressed so far, that those who held it insisted that it would be a right thing in itself for the Government at any time to disestablish the body at present in the enjoyment of the endowments, and *to place the Free Church in its room*. Now, others with the lapse of years had been brought to look at the matter more temperately. While holding as strongly as ever that the Free Church had been forced out of the Establishment by an unjustifiable breach of its concordat with the State, they had been led by events to see two things more clearly than they had formerly done. The first was, that the endowments belong *of right* to no Church, but are the property of the nation. And the second was, that even if the British nation were to come sincerely to repent of its conduct before 1843, it would be quite improper to attempt to right the wrong by re-establishing the Free Church at the expense of its neighbours. A National Establishment in a country, it was felt, can only be justified when it embraces within it the great mass of the people; and whatever means the State may take ultimately to atone for the wrong it did at the Disruption, there ought to be no wish to see it making

a reparation which might be sentimentally pleasing to us, but which would be seriously objectionable in itself. The difference which emerged in connection with these views told necessarily on the controversy. Men discovered that they did not so entirely agree with one another as they seemed to do in the enthusiastic Assembly of 1863; and so the battle went on.

3. Another explanation of the opposition to the Union is to be found in the fact that by-and-by it became increasingly apparent that the idea of a *return to the Establishment* was being entertained in some quarters as by no means an illusory one. What lay at the very root of the origin of the proposal for incorporation with the United Presbyterian Church, was the assumption that the question of National Establishments had come to be for all Free Churchmen merely theoretical. In the Colonies the Presbyterians of every name had come together and formed Union Churches without very much difficulty, because there it was believed the formation of a State Church would never be attempted; and when the negotiations commenced in Scotland, it was thought that the process would be equally easy as between the Churches which were themselves disestablished. But it was discovered ere long that what could be accomplished almost without friction in a cleared country, was a very much more troublesome business in a country where a State Establishment still continued to exist.

This distracting influence told in various ways. There were some who frankly said that if they were in Australia they would not hesitate a moment about approving of Union between two such bodies as the Free and United Presbyterian Churches; but that in Scotland they shrank from committing themselves to a step which seemed to proceed upon the assumption that all hope of the reconstruction of the National



Establishment was to be for ever abandoned. With such, the hindrance did not exist in the region of *principle*, but only in that of *expediency*. In the case of others, however, the motives which influenced them to hang back were very different. We can now say this without any hesitation or breach of charity, because some of those who were loudest in their profession that they were opposing the Union from Free Church ground have shown what was really in their hearts by themselves going back to the Establishment. Such instances warrant us in affirming that Moderatism had to some extent reappeared in the Free Church. It was in fact distinctly traceable by its well-known marks. It could be seen in the place assigned by it to material as against spiritual considerations—in its want of faith in the Christian people—in its low views of the Church, and its anxiety to place it under the coercion of the courts of law—and in the exaggerated importance which it attached to State Patronage and Endowments. Men animated by the spirit of such a system were naturally alarmed at the progress of a movement which threatened to take them further from the centre, and to their disloyalty is to be attributed a very considerable proportion of all the bitterness wherewith the controversy was charged.

Perhaps we may add, also, that what helped to give strength to this counter-current was the fact that as the contendings proceeded the Established Church began to show signs of a willingness to meet half-way those who were moving toward it. In an unsettling age, the prolonged tolerance of an Establishment which was benefiting only a section of the people was not to be expected; and, naturally enough, it was looking out for allies. Such allies seemed to present themselves in the Anti-Unionists of the Free Church, and the reforms of which so much has since been made were effected to meet their demands. That the changes so accomplished have not availed

to draw away any true and intelligent Free Churchman, is in its way a most significant circumstance. But although the overtures have caused no breach in our ranks, it is easy to imagine how they must have told as a distracting force at a time when two theories of the ecclesiastical future of the country were being pressed earnestly upon public attention.

4. Only one other remark may be made in this connection. It is this, that, as the war waxed hotter, a very sincere, although we are persuaded a very mistaken belief, took hold of some good men, that the success of the Union movement was threatening the foundations of National Religion. What gave rise to that apprehension was the expression of certain extreme views on the Voluntary side. In vain was it pointed out that what the Churches recognized and were bound by was the doctrine of the Common Principles, and that if stress were to be laid on the utterance of exaggerated sentiments by individuals on the one side, the rule must go round, and the excesses weighed also on the other. By the time matters had reached this point, feeling ran too high to be allayed by reasonings and explanations. The Highlands in particular, by exaggerated statements and violent appeals, had been roused into wild opposition. And things had come to this pass, that if the Union had been consummated in 1873, the unity of the Free Church would have been broken up in a way that would have made that Church a spectacle in the eyes of the Christian world. The proposal to incorporate the negotiating Churches was therefore in the meantime wisely laid aside. But the ten years' conferences were not altogether in vain, nor did they issue in no practical result. Besides that the non-established Churches now know and believe in each other as they never did before, an arrangement has been agreed to whereby all these Churches have been brought into one great confederation; and all their

ministers are, under certain conditions, interchangeable. This is already a virtual union ; and few can entertain any serious doubts about the achievement in the long run of the still closer combination after which Dr. Buchanan so earnestly aspired.

In giving below a selection from the multifarious correspondence which was carried on during these years, our aim is simply to exhibit the spirit in which the negotiations were conducted. The letters are arranged in chronological order, and through them some glimpses are supplied of the course of the history. To those who lived through the controversy, the incidental references to current events will be sufficiently intelligible. But, for the sake of others, it may be mentioned that opposition to the Union was offered by some on doctrinal and financial grounds, as well as on the ground of a difference about the place of the Civil Magistrate ; and as the conflict thickened, and all available means were used to defeat the enterprise, the battle was waged along the whole line. At first, those who were friendly to Union took the matter very quietly. But the force of circumstances constrained them at last to vigorous action, and the result was that the majorities in the Assembly were fully maintained to the end, and that the whole subject came to be understood in a way that could not, in other circumstances, have been expected.

(*Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Cairns.*)

“GLASGOW, *May 14, 1863.*

“I understand the Union question comes up in your Synod to-morrow. It seems to me undesirable to be discussing it very largely, and especially to be going at any length into details regarding it, at this early stage.

“The desideratum, as it seems to me, is to get the broad fact admitted and recognized, that the union contemplated is greatly desirable, and then to have a *select* Committee of *wise* and *candid* men appointed to look at it more closely, and to confer about it with any similar Committee named by the Free Church.

“There are some people who have a great faculty for raising ghosts, but none at all for laying them. There are ghosts enough already stalking about on the arena of this Union question, frightening the women and children, and affording ample materials for the ‘fearful and the unbelieving’ to descant upon. Don’t let us raise any more; but let us try so to bring the light of calm and candid inquiry to bear on those that are actually abroad, as to scare them back into their graves.”

(*Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Beith.*)

“BIRKHILL, STIRLING, *July 23, 1864.*

“I should have written you sooner, to let you know the result of the late Union meetings, but I had a bad bilious attack, which the fatigue and excitement of the meetings did not help to put away.

“The meetings were most satisfactory. Nothing could be more clear, emphatic, and earnest than the utterances of our United Presbyterian friends on all the great doctrines of the gospel. The Reformed Presbyterian brethren took a most interesting and effective share in the discussion, which was really most edifying and most instructive. I could wish it had been possible our whole Church could have heard it. It resulted in the appointment of a joint sub-committee, to draw up an extended minute, exhibiting the entire agreement of all the sections of the joint committee on the great articles of the faith. In a word, the late meetings have, in my opinion, given a great impulse to the cause of Union. Our Reformed Presbyterian friends are a great accession to the cause. Every point was thoroughly canvassed, and no sort of divergency was found to exist.

“It was an interesting circumstance that in our own Free Church Committee Gibson frankly confessed that, having more closely examined the Brown and Balmer trials, he was obliged to say that no formal charge of heresy *could* be made out against them; and that it really seems to have amounted only to this, that they had used rash and unguarded language.

“Gibson behaved remarkably well in the discussions.

“*P.S.*—Dr. Harper, Dr. Robson, and Mr. Robertson of Irvine, all leading men in the United Presbyterian Church, spoke to me separately and spontaneously regarding my address on the Sustentation Fund; and all expressed themselves to the effect that the address had greatly impressed their minds as to the importance of our financial system, and as to its decided superiority to their own. They further said that, for their parts, they were now quite prepared to concur in adopting such a fund in the United Church.

“I felt this to be very encouraging.”

(*Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Beith.*)

“GLASGOW, *March 22, 1866.*

“I have been much gratified by your letter, assuring me, as it does,

that one in whose judgment I have so much confidence thinks I threaded my way safely through the complications of Dr. Forbes's overture.

"I quite believe with you that what *looked* so adverse, and was probably meant to be so, has 'turned out rather unto the furtherance' of the Union cause.

"I found everybody in great joy about it at the Union Committee.

"We had, as Mr. Cameron would tell you, a most satisfactory meeting yesterday. Even Dr. Wood was apparently quite satisfied; and Dr. Begg, as he assured me, was entirely so. He thinks the Union movement never was in so good a position as now. I am sure you would have enjoyed the meeting."

(*Dr. Cairns to Dr. Buchanan.*)

"BERWICK, *June 1, 1866.*

"Great occupation yesterday hindered me from expressing my great thankfulness at the issue of your discussion, and my obligations to yourself for your most admirable speech. God has again helped us through; and the kindly tone of the whole discussion, even from the adverse members, was a proof of his gracious presence. I do not fear any more trouble about doctrine, after the speech of Principal Fairbairn, who has laid us all under great obligations. I speak, of course, only for myself; but I hope all will be satisfied."

(*Dr. Buchanan to Mr. Meldrum.*)

"GLASGOW, *December 11, 1866.*

"Dr. Candlish means to ask two or three United Presbyterian ministers, and Dr. Goold from the Reformed Presbyterian Church, to meet one or two of us at the Offices on Tuesday the 18th, at eleven A.M., to talk over the intended meaning of the phrase, 'An open question,' as applied to the principle of State Endowments for religion in connection with the Union movement. I have seen the leading United Presbyterians here on the point, and find their views regarding it identical with ours."

(*Dr. Cairns to Dr. Buchanan.*)

"BERWICK, *April 26, 1867.*

"What is still more important is the debate in our Supreme Courts. I did not speak last year; but mean, if I can, to do so this. I feel that we have now reached the *pinch* of the question, and that every one who has had any responsibility in connection with it must come forward. My view is, that our Synod ought generally to approve our Articles of Agreement; but without giving them anything of symbolical or quasi-symbolical authority, but merely as a kind of tentative utterance preparatory to a basis of Union. This is now due alike to you and to ourselves; and I think, also, that we should emphatically endorse what our own Committee and our Presbyteries generally have said, as to the points of difference lying

outside these articles being made matter of forbearance. This should even be put to the vote, if need be; and thus the way cleared for your action. If we be favourable, as I hope and believe we shall be, I trust your Assembly will see its way more or less directly to take the same ground about forbearance, and thus virtually remove the first head of the programme out of the way. I have not consulted any one on the subject; but my own view is distinct and clear, that the firmest line of action is now the safest and the best. May God grant that this great work go forward, as hitherto, in spite of every hindrance, it has done."

(*Dr. Harper to Dr. Buchanan.*)

"LEITH, *May 16, 1867.*

"We have had a most triumphant vote in the United Presbyterian Synod—389 for Dr. Cairns's motion, 39 for the adverse one by Mr. Renton.

"I consider every difficulty in our Synod, on the score of principle, finally and completely surmounted. *Laus Deo!*"

(*Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Cairns.*)

"GLASGOW, *May 16, 1867.*

"I cannot refrain from intruding a single line upon you, even in the midst of your engrossing work, to thank you with my whole heart for your noble oration on the Union question. It cannot fail to give, both in your Church and ours, an immense impulse to the Union cause. I thank God for carrying both you and the Synod, as a body, so successfully and so worthily through a difficult and deeply important passage in the history of the Union movement.

"The division settles the question as to what your *Church* thinks about the articles of agreement, and demonstrates that the sort of Voluntaryism, with the ghost of which Begg and Gibson still labour hard to frighten the weaker brethren in the Free Church, is indeed dead and buried, if ever it really walked the earth at all."

(*Dr. Harper to Dr. Buchanan.*)

"*June 1, 1867.*

"Surely the good cause of Union must be making progress, when you can carry a motion in favour by a majority of four to one! and *that* notwithstanding active and persistent efforts, fair and unfair, to turn the tide the other way.

"If I may be allowed to say so, you never distinguished yourself more than in your speech on Thursday,—so luminous in the presentation of your case; so firm and resolute, yet unchallengeable and dignified in tone; with just as much of the philippic thrown in as was needful to scathe the tactics of some who would deter the Assembly by menace from the prosecution of a course which, in the judgment of the court, is the path of duty."

(*Dr. Cairns to Dr. Buchanan.*)

“ June 1, 1867.

“ I have just read, with intense interest and thankfulness, the result of your great debate. For the noble speech you gave I deeply thank you, and all the other leaders in this discussion. It has been a time to be remembered. I feel sad when I think of Dr. Begg and his friends, and their resignation. Would that it had been otherwise, and that they could have taken and kept their natural place to the end ! But the crisis did not admit of any other action than on both sides we took. May God now guide us onward, and keep the great movement in his own hand ! I am much solemnized at the whole aspect and issue of things.”

(*Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Cairns.*)

“ FREE ASSEMBLY HALL, June 3, 1867.

“ I have this moment received your kind and gratifying letter. Our debate was one of many marked indications that the finger of God is in this great Union movement. The whole strength of argument was on the side of Union. The *soul* of the Assembly was wholly and heartily with the Union cause.

“ The Union will now go on ; and that very circumstance, as you justly say, cannot but deepen in the mind of all of us the sense of responsibility.”

(*Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Beith.*)

“ GLASGOW, June 7, 1867.

“ How wonderful are the ways of God ! We shall now be able, in the Committee, to get much closer to each other's minds, and to search far more thoroughly every question that comes before us.

“ Meeting, as our United Presbyterian friends have had hitherto to do, with such a spirit of suspicion and hostility as certain parties displayed, it was impossible they could unbosom themselves on any subject. It was a matter of necessity to them to be always in an attitude of defence ; and real confidential conference, on many points, was made impossible.

“ It was altogether a wonderful Assembly.”

(*Dr. Duff to Dr. Buchanan.*)

“ June 7, 1867.

“ Yes ; the Union question is truly a great and weighty subject, requiring much wisdom and much prayer for Divine guidance. It is one in which I have always felt the liveliest interest, though, from my never getting into the condition of being wholly well, and from constant and severe relapses into a worse state, I have never been able to pay that attention to the details of the subject which otherwise I would have done.

“ My only difficulty, therefore, in joining the Committee, arises from my

comparative unacquaintance with the details of the vitally important discussions in which the Committee has been so long engaged, and, consequently, from my uselessness as a member.

“Besides, for several months to come it is most probable that I shall be away from Edinburgh, in the south, and so unable to attend meetings.

“But if, with these known drawbacks, which I think it right, in all fairness, to state, yourself and other members still wish me to join the Union Committee, I shall gladly do so,—first, as a disciple, to learn the past and the present; and then be ultimately prepared to assist in any way in which God may put it in my power to do.

“To be able to assist, even in the humblest possible way, towards the attainment of so blessed a consummation as a sound scriptural Union, I would reckon no ordinary honour.”

*(Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Rainy.)*

“July 3, 1867.

“I think we should try, at this first meeting of the Joint Committee, after all the late exciting proceedings, to get it pervaded by a high Christian and brotherly tone of feeling; and that, to this end, we should have special prayer. I have written Charles Brown on this subject, and have asked him to be present. The events by which Providence has relieved the Committee of those elements of discord and irritation that so often disquieted us, and which sometimes lowered most unpleasantly and unhappily the spirit and temper of our discourses, have given us an opportunity of getting our minds brought into a better frame, and having the whole subject handled and dealt with in a more befitting way.”

*(Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Cairns.)*

“July 5, 1867.

“The first meeting for the year of the Joint Union Committee is drawing on. I feel very deeply and increasingly the solemnity of the circumstances in which we are henceforth to carry on this great work. On the side of progress a great advance has been made by the resolutions arrived at in the late meetings of the Supreme Courts of the negotiating Churches. On the other hand, on the side of opposition, the formation of something like a party in the Free Church is an unpleasant event, and one which calls for the exercise, on the part of the friends of Union, of great circumspection. In the interests of the great and sacred cause we are dealing with, we will need much of the wisdom that cometh from above, and of the love which suffereth long and is kind. It occurs to me that it would be very suitable to mark the sense—which, I am sure, we all have—of the great responsibility that lies on us, were we to have, at our first meeting, special prayer for the Divine guidance. To inaugurate our proceedings in this way would be most agreeable, I cannot doubt, to all the sections of the



Joint Committee ; and if we were to begin with spending, say, one hour, in prayer, asking a member of each of the Committees to take part in these devotions, and interspersed with the reading of short portions of Scripture, might we not hope to get a double blessing on our deliberations ?

“ I venture most respectfully to make this suggestion to you as joint-convener of the Committee of the United Presbyterian Church, lest our honoured father, Dr. Harper, may not be present at the evening meeting of your Committee on Monday the 15th. I am, besides, unwilling to trouble him unnecessarily with correspondence. I have written Dr. Charles Brown on this same subject, and have expressed my hope that he will make an effort to be present with us.

“ How sad about Dr. James Hamilton ! The accounts yesterday were somewhat more favourable, though I fear that, as regards his public life and ministry, there is not much prospect of his being able to return to his post. He is one of those *unique* men who, when they disappear, have no successors.

“ The Assembly, and the subsequent visitation of Presbyteries on behalf of the new movement for increasing the Sustentation Fund, in addition to other and ordinary work, has pretty well used me up.”

(*Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Rainy.*)

“ December 9, 1867.

“ If this Union movement—so gravely and solemnly begun, so deliberately followed out for five years, and which has brought to light the existence of such an amount of agreement on the highest questions that should interest the Church of Christ—is to be abandoned, let us take care to see to it that God is actually shutting us up to a cause involving such tremendous responsibilities, and which is sure to be followed by consequences which one positively trembles to contemplate.”

(*Dr. Buchanan to Mr. Meldrum.*)

“ GLASGOW, December 10, 1867.

“ In issuing the notices to the members of the Free Church Union Committee for the meeting on Tuesday the 17th at seven p.m., please add, ‘The chairman requests a full attendance.’

“ My reason for this arises out of the published manifesto of the malcontents. It is absolutely necessary that a consultation should take place without delay, as to the right way of meeting this attempt on the part of a portion to concuss the Church.

“ There is great risk just now of timorous people losing their heads and being frightened out of their propriety.

“ All the more is there need for calmness, deliberation, and firmness.

“ The movement reminds me of the desertion and treachery of the *forty*, which was probably the main cause of determining the Government

to do nothing, and thereby the means of bringing out what was a much better thing than a settlement—namely, the Disruption.

“Let us be watchful, and wait, and God will make our way plain.”

(*Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Beith.*)

“GLASGOW, *January 15, 1868.*

“I am in good hope that, amazing as the existing excitement is, it will work for good. It will arouse the mind of the Church; and when men have had time to examine the real state of the question, truth and common sense are sure to prevail.

“Meanwhile, we have much need of that wisdom which God has so graciously encouraged us to ask, in difficult times, from him.”

(*Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Cairns.*)

“GLASGOW, *April 25, 1868.*

“God’s hand is so manifestly and wonderfully present in the events of this time, and especially as regards the relations of Church and State, that, with you, I cannot but regard the Irish question as, in his great and comprehensive plan, meant to have an important bearing on our Union movement.

“I have this very day received a letter from Ireland, asking me, on behalf of not merely the Irish Presbyterian Church, but expressly on behalf of a number of leading clergymen in the Irish Established Church, to send information about our Free Church Sustentation Fund, as they feel the necessity of setting their house in order, and are looking to us for light as to how it may be done.”

(*Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Rainy.*)

“*May 14, 1868.*

“Light is surely breaking in on our Union difficulties. The United Presbyterian Synod have acted nobly. Surely Cairns’s magnanimous speech must tell on those who are bent on obstructing Union at any price, and that at all hazards. The speech, too, of M’Leod of Birkenhead on the Sustentation Fund, shows how decidedly the United Presbyterian ministers are drawing towards our financial system. It will be a glorious thing if we can *establish* our Scotch Free Church Presbyterianism, United Presbyterianism and Reformed Presbyterianism included, on the solid platform of a great common Central Fund. It is the true and the only way to reduce State endowments to a position of unimportance, and to satisfy those who have the greatest reliance on them that they can quite well be dispensed with.”

(*Dr. Buchanan to Mr. Meldrum.*)

“GLASGOW, *May 14, 1868.*

“I have just read with very great satisfaction the United Presbyterian discussion on Union. It is truly admirable,—so wise, so magnanimous, so

conciliatory. It will tell powerfully, I am sure, in favour of the Union cause in our Church."

(*Dr. Harper to Dr. Buchanan.*)

"LEITH, *May 16, 1868.*

"At the close of our discussion on the Union question in the United Presbyterian Synod, I certainly felt that all had ended well; and the pleasure I have in looking back upon it is enhanced twofold to find that it has given you so much satisfaction. I never doubted that we should arrive at a favourable conclusion; but I was not without fear that some hasty word might be spoken which Anti-Union brethren of the Free Church might turn into an additional element of irritation to the distressing conflict in which you are now involved. But nothing of the kind.

"The entire absence of everything provocative, and the conciliatory tone adopted towards the dissentient brethren, must, I should think, have some mollifying effect on Drs. Gibson and Begg and their following, and so tend to facilitate the proceedings of the General Assembly when the subject of Union comes before them."

(*Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Rainy.*)

"*May 19, 1868.*

"Your letter, with its record of perplexing proposals, forcibly recalls to my mind the state of matters with which the Church was harassed in connection with Lord Aberdeen's Bill and Sir George Sinclair's clause, before the Disruption. They looked so like non-intrusion that it seemed hard to refuse them, with the certainty of the great break-up of '43 as the inevitable consequence of doing so.

"But, happily, the Church got the dust out of its eyes, and would not suffer itself to be seduced. Some of those proposals which your letter describes look uncommonly like Union; and those who make them *mean* Union—just as, at least, Sir George Sinclair meant non-intrusion.

"But any sentence that recalls the resolution of last Assembly, for the purpose of putting a stain upon it, however slight and guarded, amounts to an intimation that, on the footing of the resolution of last year, Union is given up; and on the footing of the resolution of last year,—on the *only* footing on which Union is, or can be, a practical question,—of course the coming down of a hairbreadth from the ground of that resolution is tantamount to giving the thing up."

(*Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Rainy.*)

"*November 23, 1868.*

"I am anticipating with no ordinary interest Gladstone's exposition of the process by which he has passed from his Church and State theory of 1830 to his Irish Disestablishment position of to-day. I have just seen, in to-day's *Herald*, the opening of the question, from which I gather that he

means to take up the ground that the State, as now constituted, is no longer in a position to decide for the nation which is the *true* Church, being the religiously composite body it now is; and that if it is to prefer any one Church now, it must have the people's concurrence. I do hope he will be found to have taken a standing-ground that will be firm beneath his feet."

(*Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Beith.*)

"GLASGOW, November 28, 1868.

"My conviction is, that instead of letting these discussions go on as they have done, in the form of attacks made on us the Unionists, it will become our imperative duty to turn it the other way, and that we should become the assailants. Anti-Unionism will otherwise destroy the Free Church. For what is this Anti-Unionism but a reaction against Free Churchism, and a cropping up again of Erastianism and Moderatism!"

(*Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Beith.*)

"GLASGOW, February 5, 1869.

"Allow me to thank you for your kind and encouraging letters. None of the newspaper reports of my speech give it in full; and the *Review* has left out several of the things in it I was most anxious to have published.

"All this, however, will now be remedied. It will appear in a pamphlet form to-morrow, when I shall have the pleasure of sending you a copy. My sole aim has been to endeavour to turn the current of the Church's thoughts into the old Disruption channel, which *is* the very channel of providence and of the times. There are men among us who, if they could, would throw it back into the rut of Moderatism and slavish dependence on the Civil power.

"I believe the heart of the Church is still sound; and my hope is, that this present movement, if wisely and vigorously followed up, will, under God, make that heart pulsate with fresh life and vigour, not only as regards Union, but as regards our whole spiritual work, local and general, as a Church."

(*Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Rainy.*)

"GLASGOW, April 3, 1869.

"I have just been reading the report of a discussion which took place two days ago in the — Presbytery. What but mischief, if not ruin to our Church, can come of such a state of things? I am heart-sick of it. I have borne up hitherto, hoping against hope that men would come to their senses. But the Lord has surely some controversy with us that we do not understand, and on account of which he is involving us deeper and deeper in these painful conflicts. All the more must we seek to know why he is so dealing with us, and what he would have us to do. I sometimes think it is my own position at the head of the Committee that may have got some-

how to be a cause of offence to the brethren who are fighting with us so unrelentingly on this question. I see, moreover, that preparations are in the course of being made by the same party for a fresh controversy regarding the Sustentation Fund.

“At my time of life, I cannot stand much more of this. It brings back what I remember Chalmers saying to me not long before his death: ‘I could go on somewhat longer *working* for this great interest of our Church, but I cannot go on *wrangling* about it.’ I have the same feeling so strongly, that I feel myself in the course of being driven to the conclusion that it were best for both myself and for the Church that I should withdraw—at least from any presiding place in connection with these questions—and leave them in younger and stronger hands. Both the Union question and the Sustentation Fund have reached a point at which the wish to be done in maturing them is in such a sense complete as might admit of my retirement without injury to these questions themselves, and without dishonour to myself. I have given utterance to these feelings to no one hitherto. It is for the present in confidence that I now express them to you.”

(*Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Rainy.*)

“GLASGOW, December 2, 1869.

“Is it really hopeless to approach Begg and his friends, and to endeavour to get an end put to this fratricidal war? If it goes on, it is not merely the mischief of obstructing the proposed Union we have to anticipate, but the worse mischief of making a schism within our own Church—a schism which, whether it bring about *separation* or not, will effectually alienate us from one another, and destroy the life of the Church.

“I am writing to Candlish to the same tune to-day. Will you and he talk it over with Moncreiff and Brown, and any other you like? If you see any daylight as the result of such a conversation, I should most willingly go to Edinburgh any day to help in following it up.

“By proposing to put the Union on the basis of adherence to the Standards pure and simple, with the allowance of the qualification with which they are accepted by the negotiating Churches recognized in some form or other, it might be possible surely to come to some understanding, and then to secure an incalculable amount of good, and to avert an equally incalculable amount of evil.

“If Begg can be moved,—and he has said nothing to make this impossible if the matter were put on the footing above indicated,—the others, I am confident, would give way. Ireland might help, and possibly Moody Stuart.”

(*Dr. Buchanan to Mr. MacLagan.*)

“GLASGOW, December 3, 1869.

“The account of the deeply interesting proceedings at Pittsburg, which appears in yesterday’s *Daily Review*, and which I had read some days ago

in the Pittsburg paper sent me by Mr. G. H. Stuart, cannot fail to help very powerfully the Union movement in this country. The noble resolve to raise a thank-offering of a million sterling, to be devoted to missions, is evidence of the goodness and pleasantness of dwelling together in unity. God is commanding the blessing.

“I have written to Candlish and Rainy yesterday, suggesting whether in some way we should not put to Dr. Begg Abner’s question to Joab, ‘Is the sword to devour for ever?’ It is plain, if he and his friends go on as they have been doing, it will indeed be ‘bitterness in the latter end.’

“You may remember that when the American, Dr. Davidson, came in with his telegram to last Assembly, and announced the certain prospect of the Union now accomplished, Begg got up and said something to the effect that Union on a like footing of adherence to the Standards would be welcomed by him. Now Begg could not but know that the Americans have long since put the Establishment doctrine out of the Standards. If, therefore, there was any intelligence in his remark, it should be held to imply that if only we would put aside the Articles of Agreement—and all *new* bases of union—and be content with adherence to the Standards on the American footing of *liberty* as to the Establishment question, he would see no serious difficulty in the way of Union. I have an impression that this is a way of escape which he may not be unwilling to avail himself of. I know that some at least of the Anti-Unionists would be satisfied with such a settlement. And what I wish Candlish and Rainy and some others of you in Edinburgh confidentially to consider is this, whether the time has not come for opening some communication with Dr. Begg on this point. What think you of this?”

(*Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Rainy.*)

“*February 5, 1870.*

“I do not see my way at all to do anything whatever *hoc statu*, except to make up our minds and be on the watch. My belief is that statesmen will be apt to think that the Voluntaries have put themselves out of court *for any claim*, by the fact of having come to the conclusion that State Endowments for Churches were unlawful. I see nothing in which they and we could agree as to this movement of the Established Church, except in saying that the application is too late, and that as the majority of the Scottish people were hopelessly estranged from the Establishment, it should be disestablished, and its funds bestowed on the cause of national education in all its branches.

“The action of Government may throw some light, but there is little or none at present. I *can* understand the wisdom of letting Gladstone know through some *private channel* that neither we nor the United Presbyterians will ever dream of going back into the Established Church.”

(*Dr. Buchanan to Mr. C. Cowan.*)

“GLASGOW, April 9, 1870.

“It is really provoking to have to fight with men who, whether they know it or not, are doing their best to damage the credit and character of the Church, and to alienate from it the esteem and confidence of thousands of its truest friends. It is a trial, and a very sore one, which He who is over all has laid upon us. Let us seek to be rightly exercised under it, and he will yet make it to work for good. If we wait on him, and commit our way in this great question to him, he will make light to arise in the darkness.

“I hope to have the pleasure, within a week or so, to send you a copy of a paper on the Finance of the Free Church, which I read recently to the Statistical Society of London. I prepared it at their request. It is a sign of the times to find a society of London savants and politicians asking for information on the finance of our Church.”

(*Dr. Buchanan to Mr. Meldrum.*)

“GLASGOW, April 30, 1870.

“I have just received an enthusiastic letter from Dr. C. J. Brown about the paper on Free Church Finance. Is it in the way of its being sent to all the ministers that he has received it? I believe it will be very serviceable to have it so circulated just before the Assembly. In the midst of the distemper that prevails at present it might serve a useful purpose, and help to show how ungenerous, as well as mischievous, is the style in which the Anti-Unionists are talking of the utter inadequacy of free-will offerings, or voluntary liberality, and of the hopelessness of maintaining the gospel without State Endowments.”

(*Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Cairns.*)

“GLASGOW, May 12, 1870

“I have read through, as reported in the *Daily Review*, the whole of your Synod’s Union discussion. It is everything I could wish. Your own magnificent speech is above all praise. From my heart I thank God for it. Even the speeches of Mr. Inglis and Mr. Hutton serve only to make more clear and unmistakable the utterance of the Synod. I cannot allow myself to doubt that the Lord has been with you of a truth. Our minority must be irreconcilables indeed, if your noble appeals fail to touch them. They will no longer be able to speak of the common principles as common only to the Committees. Mr. Brown Douglas’s calm and telling letter is a seasonable interposition. It will set some men a-thinking. Spurgeon’s story of the two bands of Israelites was most effective. Surely there is a higher than human hand setting all these influences simultaneously in motion. What a wonderful speech altogether that of Spurgeon (at the breakfast) was.”

(*Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Cairns.*)

“EDINBURGH, *May 30, 1870.*”

“I am truly glad and thankful that our debate and division turned out as they have done. The Union cause has received a real impulse, and is greatly strengthened in consequence of the proceedings of this Assembly. The debating on the other side was singularly poor, as a whole. And many men who came up wavering, and rather inclining to be adverse, became decided Unionists.

“The last *testing* division we had was in 1867. On that occasion the Anti-Unionist minority had 80 ministers, this year they had 76; and this after three years of the fiercest agitation.

“Meanwhile our whole Church is becoming more and more intelligent on the whole subject. It is no longer passive acquiescence we have now, but earnest longing for Union.”

(*Dr. M'Ewen to Dr. Buchanan.*)

“*June 2, 1870.*”

“Let me congratulate you on the admirable speaking on the *sensible* side of the “Union” question in your Assembly, and more especially on your own noble appearance there. Your speech is one of the finest even you have ever made. Your ‘Sustentation’ speech was equally good; but I venture to write these lines to say that I think you are doing too much—for your own health and strength, I mean. This feeling has been strong in my judgment for some time, and I trust you will not misunderstand my uttering it to you. I think if, in any way, you can give yourself entire rest for a time, you ought at once to do so. Although I can never think of you as an old man, still one who has been so long at important and responsible head-work as you have been, cannot count on the same *recuperative* force as formerly; and it is in the interest of the Christian Churches of our land that I beg of you to do what you can to spare yourself.”

(*Dr. Buchanan to Mr. MacLagan.*)

“GLASGOW, *June 4, 1870.*”

“The Assembly has, I really believe, been much blessed, and I have a very confident hope that this will appear more and more as the year runs on.”

(*Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Cairns.*)

“*June 1871.*”

“I see a great change passing over the minds of men in our Church, and all in favour of Union. Like you, I feel that these ‘educating discussions’ were needed—though, perhaps, we knew it not. We would often rush too hastily to the point we wish to reach. He who is over all interposes, and makes us advance more slowly, that we may advance more surely.”



(*Dr. Buchanan to Mr. MacLagan.*)

“GLASGOW, December 7, 1871.

“Dr. Brown has sent me your kind note to him as to your forthcoming notice of my City Hall address. You have obliged me very much by undertaking this service. There are some things in the address which it seems to me to be important to bring before the Christian public at the present time. The press for the most part is dead against the mere religious and spiritual aspects of all questions. We are especially ill off here in that respect. The — article on our meeting was much *worse* than that of the —. The want of such help will, I trust, throw us only the more earnestly and trustfully on Him through whom we can do all things, and without whom we can do nothing.

“*P.S.*—I am proposing to call a meeting of our Free Church Union Committee for Monday the 18th, at two P.M., to consider the matters remitted by the Joint Committee. I can see plainly that we are approaching a crisis of the Union question. If there is to be a fresh fight about the exchangeability of ministers, the United Presbyterians will not submit ‘to march through Coventry with us.’ It is not consistent either with their own self-respect or with the credit of their Church to do so.”

(*Dr. Buchanan to Rev. N. L. Walker.*)

“GLASGOW, December 15, 1871.

“The *softness* of some of our lay friends is very vexatious. To desist from what they call controversy is simply, in the present and prospective condition of the Church, to hand over to Dr. Begg and his friends the settlement of all the great questions now under debate, and to hand over with them the future fortunes of the Free Church itself. I should be disposed to withdraw from all connection with Church affairs, were such a policy pursued.”

(*Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Rainy.*)

“GLASGOW, March 11, 1872.

“I feel that I cannot bear the strain of these endless entanglements, and of the cross-firing of our own friends—unless we succeed in getting upon some clear and consistent line by next Assembly. I feel a constantly-increasing disposition to withdraw from a position too harassing for me at my time of life any longer to sustain.”

(*Dr. Rainy to Dr. Buchanan.*)

“EDINBURGH, April 3, 1872.

“I do not think that anything but evil could or can come from your withdrawing from the position in which you have been the means of

doing so much for us. I altogether deprecate it; but I will not write of it now.

“I confess to having been very strongly and growingly impressed (living *here*, one feels it more) with the obstinacy of opposition we have to reckon on, and the difficulty of carrying Union at present to a landing-place. I have often admired your cheerfulness and courage, and striven to imitate it. But *Union*, of all questions and objects, is the most difficult to drive on in the face of bitter opposition. It has often come over me, as it seems to have done with you, that God has some controversy with us; and hence my mind has turned often to the alternative of resting at the point we have gained, not for a definite, but for an *indefinite* time.

“On the other hand, God may be preparing to show us that difficulties which we cannot surmount *he* can. At all events, up to this time it was our duty to proceed. The more important to consider well the right course *now*.

“Only, if we should have to give the question of Union a longer pause than we thought of,—which will be, of course, very injurious to our Church’s public character,—will it not be the only safety to turn at once and with all our might to internal work—to the Sustentation Fund, Home Missions, and Foreign Missions?”

(*Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Cairns.*)

“GLASGOW, May 20, 1872.

“What the Anti-Unionists aim at by opposing the exchangeability of ministers, is to interpret our Standards as *excluding* from office every man who is not a believer in the lawfulness of civil establishments of religion. Our approval of the exchangeability amounts to a practical affirmation of the *contrary*. And to contend for this, as the *true* interpretation of our Standards, is not more necessary in order to open a door to admit ministers of your Church into charges in ours, than it is in order to *retain* in our Church ministers, elders, and deacons—very many—who could not continue in it if their doing so were held to imply an approval of the Church-and-State theory. It is, therefore, a really vital question we have to debate. We shall have a fierce opposition, just because our opponents see, as clearly as we do, the true nature of the issues involved. We cannot, however, do more than send it down as an overture to Presbyteries. We are under an absolute necessity of keeping to the precedent of 1865, when the Act, whose operation we propose to extend so as to include the United Presbyterian and Reformed Presbyterian Churches, was adopted. It went through the *barrier*, and the additions to it must do the same. It will, therefore, not be till 1873 that the door is opened on our side. But this will accomplish *so much*, as to be well worth fighting for and waiting for, till that time comes. I shall then be free of anxiety as to the ultimate success of the Union movement. A position will have been gained, and a bond of connec-

tion established, that will inevitably result in complete union. But, no doubt, a pause will, after 1873, be all but inevitable—unless in some remarkable way Providence interpose to sober some men's minds. To consummate a Union while our own Church is in such a turmoil would be a satire on union, and something like a scandal in the eyes of the whole Christian Church. It would be like inviting friends to a feast when the house is on fire. It is very grievous. I regard the stopping of this Union as the greatest calamity that could befall either our Church or our country. But God's ways are not our ways. He is suffering these hindrances to arise, and to vex and exercise us, no doubt for wise and right ends. It is, not improbably, to be his way of *compelling* us to look more closely and to search more thoroughly various questions which we might otherwise, for our own ease, have let alone. One of these, most certainly, is that of Disestablishment. Everything indicates that it is around that question the battle is to rage for some years. Till it is settled, it is very possible, perhaps probable, that the full settlement of the Union question cannot be reached."

(*Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Cairns.*)

"GLASGOW, December 9, 1872.

"I hope the joint English Committee will do the work itself.

"It is true your Scotch United Presbyterian Synod and the Reformed Presbyterian Synod may both be considered as having a right to be consulted in the framing of a Formula which the English branches of these Churches are to be asked to sign.

"But there is not the same reason for consulting the Free Church, and I should say it is not expedient that we should be consulted.

"At the same time, the framing of the Formula is a matter of high importance; and if well and wisely executed, it may, by-and-by, greatly facilitate Union in the north.

"If it be found practicable to introduce into the Formula some specific reference to the general doctrine embodied in the Articles of Agreement as to the duty of civil rulers to embrace and further the religion of the Lord Jesus, and to be guided by his Word, &c., and to respect the liberties and spiritual rights of his Church, I think great good would come of it.

"Anything, in short, that would manifestly imply the exclusion of national atheism, and that would indicate that the Formula goes no further on the subject of Church Establishments than to be neutral on that point, would be very important. Pray try your own hand at it; and perhaps you will, confidentially, let some of us see the draft."

(*Dr. Cairns to Dr. Buchanan.*)

"May 30, 1873.

"I have read with the deepest interest, as you may well suppose, and with prevailing satisfaction and gratitude, the extraordinary proceedings of your

Assembly on Wednesday and yesterday. My sole abatement is that the sense of poetical justice demanded the exodus of some of those who have created such commotion so groundless for years past, and then have wholly without reason (as it seems to me) recalled their whole procedure, and surrendered to you at discretion. You have not made the slightest concession in principle; nor have they gained anything but what they might, in all probability, have had as well with Union. I rejoice greatly in the firmness which you and Dr. Candlish and Dr. Rainy showed in the debate, and which, doubtless, had its own impression. You have vindicated the authority of Presbyterian government, maintained the liberties of your own Church on a vital point, and, by burying for ever the Establishment principle (in its lower sense) as a term of communion in the Free Church, immensely cleared the path of future Union. I do not think the general sense of our Church will complain of the declarations, which are but expressions of the radical truth of the Articles of Agreement; though it would, doubtless, have been better had circumstances admitted of as wide an opening for eligibility on the one side as the other, leaving it to men's own consciences to apply a check. In some respects the declarations will be a great relief to United Presbyterian consciences, compared with what would have been the case had the preamble to the Act of 1846 stood alone. Amidst my joy at your deliverance I feel great sadness at the stoppage of the Union negotiations—a feeling to which your touching and noble protest, tabled yesterday, gives perfect expression. I feel, also, the enhanced responsibility resting on our Church, which must move forward on its now abridged task alone. We shall miss you unspeakably; and though we shall be always eager for your counsel, we shall not have the comfort and strength of public joint action. But God may command a forward move sooner than we now sadly deem.”

(*Dr. Buchanan to Dr. Cairns.*)

“*June 3, 1873.*”

“It was a great joy to me to receive your letter of the 30th, and to have the assurance it gives, so fully and in such touching terms, that our proceedings and whole attitude at the Assembly, on the great question of Union, have your cordial sympathy and approval. The position in which we were placed by the action of our opponents was one of unexampled difficulty. By the extremeness and violence of the course which, especially during the last twelve months, they had pursued, interests of the highest moment, not only to our own Church, but to the religious peace and welfare of Scotland, were put in deadliest peril. How to conserve these interests, and at the same time to maintain, firmly and unalterably, the ground on which we had taken our stand, was the problem we had to solve. And had not the Lord been on our side, I believe we could not have solved it. In a large body there are always timid minds which are prone to break

down and give way in the presence of formidable danger. But by God's good hand upon us we were so guided and upheld that all came right in the end.

"I had made up my mind at all hazards to speak out, fearlessly and truthfully, on the style and spirit in which the Anti-Unionists had conducted their opposition. And I am deeply thankful that in this way the Assembly's judgment on that opposition was brought fully out, and will remain as a testimony to those who come after us. When the time comes for resuming Union negotiations—and I am not without hope that it will come sooner than many suppose—men will be able to understand how utterly indefensible was the conduct of those by whose intemperate and groundless opposition the present delay has been brought about. My belief is that the basis of ultimate Union is now firmly laid. The common principles are broad and solid enough not only to sustain mutual eligibility, but actual incorporation.

"Meanwhile, the results of last week's proceedings are wonderful. The enemies of religion are confounded; the mouths of the mass of our own people are filled with laughter, and their tongue with singing; and ——— and his company look like men who have been snatched from the verge of an abyss. The Assembly has been the quietest and kindest we have had since 1843!

"I need not say how much we all feel the stoppage of the negotiations: but it will not lessen the warmth of our attachment to your Church, nor the ardour of our desire for Union."

It fell to Dr. Buchanan at each Assembly to give in a Report on the progress of the Union negotiations. These Reports were almost invariably accompanied by statements of his own, which, as the crisis approached, became increasingly weighty, earnest, and eloquent. They took the shape, in fact, of orations of the highest order; and the desire has often been expressed that they might be collected and published in a volume. We regret exceedingly that it is impossible to include some of them within this Biography. But that cannot be within the limits determined upon. And we shall live in the hope that at some future time they may be given to the world in a shape fitted to be useful in a formative age. In Dr. Buchanan was furnished an illustrious example of a class of men of whom we have in these days most urgent need.

He was a Modern Evangelical Churchman—a Churchman to the core, but an Evangelical—an Evangelical of the most pronounced cast, but one whose mind was open to the best influences of his age. We require such men. And it is no mere empty panegyric to say that in his annual addresses to the General Assembly there are laid down the lines of an ecclesiastical system which is well worth the study of the present generation, and which may help in the direction of generations yet to come.

## CHAPTER XX.

### THE NATIONAL CHURCH OF THE FUTURE.

No intelligent man could look at Scotland after 1843, and conclude that the final adjustment of its ecclesiastical condition had at last been reached. What met the eye was this,—the ancient Church broken up into fragments; one section with a minority of the people having exclusive possession of the National Endowments; another section maintaining, as it had been doing for nearly two centuries, an attitude of irreconcilable opposition to the Establishment; and three or four others—all claiming to be more constitutional than the favoured sect—which had been driven into a state of separation on account of their very fidelity to the common principles of Presbyterianism. Such a state of things had no *look* even of finality about it. There were all sorts of reasons why it was inevitable that changes of one kind or another should be proposed, and the wonder is not that within the last few years burning questions should have arisen on the subject of the right relations of the Churches of Scotland, but that the discussion of that subject should have been so long postponed. The postponement, in fact, can only be explained in this way—that the Nonconformist bodies were for a good many years after the Disruption so taken up with the prosecution of the more direct work that lay to their hand to do, that they found no leisure to think very seriously of their inter-relations either to

one another or to the Establishment; while, on the other hand, the Established Church was too well satisfied to let well alone, to venture needlessly on an open policy of aggression.

This state of truce, however, behoved sooner or later to come to an end; and the causes that have led to the reawakened interest which is now exhibited in the ecclesiastical future of Scotland are not far to seek.

The waters began to be stirred when the Union movement commenced in 1863. The very proposal to combine into one body three of the sections of Scottish Presbyterianism implied of itself the raising of the question of a readjustment of the ecclesiastical situation; and the members of the Established Church were well warranted in thinking that the negotiations had some interest for them. It was not their business, however, to interfere; and we do not for a moment suppose that any of them did interfere, until it became increasingly manifest that while the Free Church, in its mass, was moving toward amalgamation with the descendants of Cameron, and Erskine, and Gillespie, a minority in that Church was inclining in a very different direction, even towards a reunion with those whom they had left in 1843. Under these circumstances, it was most natural that the friends of the Establishment should have begun to bestir themselves. They saw, in fact—they could not but see—what looked like a great opportunity. And from this point we date the launching of the new theory which has since been pressed upon us with so much urgency; the theory, namely, of *a reconstruction of the Establishment in a form to meet the altered conditions of the time*. After the idea had been entertained of trying to trim the vessel to catch the current breezes, it of course became a serious question—*what the conditions of the time really were*; and merely political considerations were allowed to have their weight. It was in so many words argued, for example, that we



live in a democratic age, and must needs be content to have a democratic Establishment. But the original idea of moving forward with a view to making the State Church more comprehensive and attractive was suggested, without any doubt, by the Union controversy; and however little we may like the thought itself, we cannot in candour refuse to acknowledge that the temptation to strike in then was very great, and that the succumbing to it in the circumstances was exceedingly natural.

We are afraid, however, that here our concessions must end. The friends of the existing Establishment in Scotland had as good a right as others to have their theories about the ecclesiastical future of their country. They were thoroughly well warranted also to argue, if they saw fit, that the best thing on the whole to seek for was the gathering of all the people into a reconstructed State Church. And nobody could have found fault with them if they had done their utmost, in ways that were not in themselves objectionable, to propagate their ideas, and otherwise to further their ends. But we hope that the candid men among them will do justice on the other hand to those who, in consequence of their methods of procedure, have been forced to take up positions which they might not so soon at least have thought of assuming. The step forward on the part of the Establishment has precipitated the discussion of questions which had been slumbering peacefully for a quarter of a century, and some of the means it has chosen to employ in furtherance of its purposes have infused into that discussion an element of bitterness which would have been much better away.

The matter of fact now stands thus: The people of Scotland have been challenged to say what they want to be done ecclesiastically with their country; and two replies have been given. Over against the answer of those who are in pos-

session of the Endowments, there is coming with increasing explicitness the response of those outside, *that the Church of the future must be reached through Disestablishment*. One is surprised to observe that so many members of the Established Church seem to have been shocked by that answer. They accuse those who give it of being "political," as opposed apparently to "religious." But surely the charge comes with an ill grace from those who have made no secret of the fact that they themselves were influenced by political considerations in the amendments which they introduced into the constitution of their Church, and who certainly made a most energetic use of their political influence in getting these amendments passed into law. In any case, it is of the last importance that it should be understood that *for the raising of the cry of Disestablishment the advisers of the Establishment itself are alone responsible*. They voluntarily elected to deal with the difficult business of the readjustment of the ecclesiastical situation in Scotland. They not only propounded their own theory for discussion, but, ignoring the other Presbyterian bodies who were occupying the field along with them, they undertook to settle the whole affair single-handed. The theory which they actually adopted they are now engaged in carrying into effect, and that in ways which, to say the least of them, are provocative of irritation. And it is certainly not reasonable, under these circumstances, to complain that those who feel an equal interest in the future of their country, and who are not at all persuaded that it would be good for Scotland that the whole of its people should be gathered into the Establishment as it is now constituted, are submitting another theory for which something can be said—namely, that the Nation may most profitably employ its bounty in some other than ecclesiastical ways, and leave the Churches of Scotland to mould

the future of their country without State interference or aid.

It need scarcely be said that this last was the theory of Dr. Buchanan. The little confidence which he had come to have in Politicians, the profound sense he entertained of the importance of ecclesiastical liberty, his unbounded faith in the capacity of the Church itself to sustain gospel ordinances, and his intense desire to see an end put to existing divisions,—all combined to convince him that the Sun-rising lies in the direction, not of a fresh alliance with the State, but in a combination of all the Churches acting independently of the State. What gave strength to his convictions in this connection was the fact, which was apparent to all, that conscience had nothing to do with the reforms proposed in the Established Church. He saw that the movement, which was commenced with the professed object of satisfying the scruples of Free Churchmen, drew none of its inspiration from the belief that any wrong had been inflicted at the Disruption. This indifference to the real merits of the great conflict in which he had been engaged, satisfied him that the whole thing was hollow; that there was no honest desire felt to get back upon the old evangelical lines; that all that was really thought of was the addition of a new device to the banner of the Establishment, with a view to the attraction of fresh recruits within its walls. And he was entirely confirmed in these thoughts when not only were the Churches most interested not consulted, to begin with, but all efforts were strenuously resisted which seemed to aim at recognizing them as in any sense parties in the case.

Looking at the movement in this light, and regarding it not as a mere internal effort on the part of a sister Church to reform itself, but as a political plan for the readjustment of the ecclesiastical condition of Scotland, and therefore a scheme in which all the Churches were directly concerned, he was

perfectly outspoken all through in expressing his dislike to it, and in asserting that the steps taken left the Free Church no option but to go to the Nation and demand the other alternative of Disestablishment. And he took up this position the more decidedly because, in his judgment, the changes actually proposed were themselves of a nature which no loyal member of that Church could accept as satisfactory under any circumstances whatever.

So early as 1865, Dr. Buchanan received distinct intimation that certain prominent ministers in the Established Church were in active consultation with various parties within his own communion about a modification of the Law of Patronage. These gentlemen, he was told, "were in great spirits" about the prospects of a reconciliation with old enemies, and were prepared to go very great lengths indeed to meet the exigencies of the situation. The plan most in favour with them seems to have been this,—to get an Act of Parliament passed enabling the people of a vacant parish to call a minister from any of the Presbyterian Churches, and authorizing the application of the Unexhausted Teinds to the support of the Free and United Presbyterian clergy. This scheme was suggested by one who is held in the greatest respect among all classes in Scotland, and was propounded in perfect good faith. But one can imagine the dubious smile with which a man with the experience of Dr. Buchanan would listen to a project so fanciful. He knew as no other man did what sort of ordeal a Bill so revolutionary would have to pass before there could be secured for it the consent of worldly politicians; and even although that difficulty could have been got over, he knew that other and infinitely more serious obstacles would be presented to the arrangement in the principles, and traditions, and prejudices of the communities which it was proposed gradually to absorb into an otherwise unreformed Establish-

ment. What encouragement the plan got from those whose actings had excited the hopes of the friends of the Established Church, we do not know; but this is certain, that the idea was at once set aside as preposterous by the men who had begun to move on an entirely different line.

Nevertheless, the agitation for reconstruction proceeded; and in May 1869 the General Assembly resolved to send a deputation to the Government, to ask it to try its skill once more in adapting the Establishment to the wants of the Scottish people. Dr. Norman Macleod, as Moderator for the year, headed the deputation; and one cannot help pausing to contemplate so remarkable a spectacle, and to express one's wonder at the singular turn thus reached in the wheel of History. Dr. Macleod, it will be remembered, was one of those who, according to his biographer, adhered tenaciously to the principle of fidelity to "*the Contract*,"—that Contract which, it will be also recollected, was "finally adopted by the Church after due deliberation." It is true that at this interview in 1869 he told Mr. Gladstone that he "*was a member of the Assemblies of 1843 and 1848, and knew that there was no sacrifice he and his brethren would not have made, and no legislative act they could have got that they would not have accepted, rather than have had the Secession.*" And that suggests the idea that in Dr. Macleod's mind, after all, the notion of "finality" was not so fixed even in the days of the Disruption as his brother imagines it to have been. But unfortunately there was no indication given *at the time when it would have been of value* of this disposition to make concessions for the sake of peace. Dr. Candlish's eloquent appeal to the Moderates, in the Assembly of 1841, to agree to let the Veto Act alone for the sake of peace, was, as we all know, made in vain. It has ever been a current belief among those best acquainted with the facts, that the

Government of the day made up their minds to refuse relief because they were assured, by the Moderate party in Scotland, that by continued "firmness" Non-Intrusionism would be suppressed. And it was news to Dr. Buchanan and others to hear from the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Established Church in 1869, that "there was no possible legislation that would not have been accepted in 1843, if thereby the Secession could have been prevented!" Apart from that, however, it is somewhat curious to find one whose theory was that "the Church had once for all settled her own constitution and come to terms with the State, and that these terms must, at all hazards, be enforced,"—it is curious to find the same person making an appeal to the State to alter the terms, and that in the direction of meeting the views of those who were driven into Nonconformity because they could not submit to the Erastian interpretation put upon them by the Courts of Law.

To return, however, to the interview. It so happened that the Prime Minister for the time being was no mere ordinary English statesman. MR. GLADSTONE knew something about Scotland and its history. He was capable also of appreciating the nature of the struggle which had rent the Church asunder. And when the deputation made its statement to him of how things had altered since 1843, and how there was now a strong desire for the abolition of that very Patronage, for the sake of maintaining which in its integrity the party then in the enjoyment of the National Endowments had forced on the Disruption, he put the very pertinent question, Whether the opinion had been asked, on the subject of this proposal, of any of those bodies which had been compelled at various times to leave the Establishment by the pressure of the very evil which it was now intended, in the interest of one sect, to remove? The reply given to this question was,

That it had not been thought necessary to do what the inquiry suggested. The deputation regarded the matter as essentially internal, and the Church meant to keep the management of it exclusively in its own hands. Whereupon Mr. Gladstone gave his view of the situation as follows :—

“It is the nature of an Established Church to have a large body of adherents who look at the institution very much in connection with its temporal expediency, and its effect upon social welfare, and other considerations which are outside the strictly ecclesiastical sphere; but speaking of the Scotch Church, I think it would be said by those who went through this struggle twenty-six years ago, that the ecclesiastical property should be made over to those who bore earlier testimony to the principle of Anti-patronage,—namely, the Free Church in 1843, and the various seceding bodies now forming the United Presbyterian Church.”

The deputation was not prepared on the spot to argue the point. Mr. Gladstone's way of putting the thing was singularly awkward and *mal apropos*. And without saying more than that they had really the good of the Free Church in their eye in what they were doing, they went back to Scotland with the determination to be better prepared for a discussion of the whole subject on some future occasion. By-and-by the fruit of their deliberations appeared in the publication of an elaborate Report on Patronage, which Dr. Buchanan read with astonishment. “Is Saul also among the prophets?” he asked, when he saw the names of certain old antagonists at the bottom of a paper pleading, in almost forgotten tones, for the privileges of the Christian people. “Have those who strained at the gnat of Non-Intrusion, made up their minds to swallow popular election whole and entire? Nothing surely but some unusual stress of weather could have brought together such contraries.....The claim, say they, for

the abolition of Lay Patronage, *has become historical or hereditary in the Church; the Church has ever on principle maintained the right of her people to have a voice in the appointment of her ministers.* No wonder the Scotsman felt its breath taken away by this astounding statement, coming from such a quarter. ‘What do you say?’ exclaims that journal; ‘the Church has always opposed Patronage! What Church? Certainly the Free Church, the Secession Churches, the Covenanting Church; *but never (until last year) the Church that is now speaking,—the Church of the Hills, and Cooks, and Robertsons, and Mearnes, and Bryces, and Macfarlanes.* From the middle of last century down to 1869, the policy of the Moderates has been identified with Patronage.’ And of the disingenuousness of the statement it is unnecessary to say more.”

Dr. Buchanan was equally astounded to find the Established Church of 1869 demanding the abolition of Patronage *as a claim of right, “as a matter of justice!”* “Justice to whom?” he asked; “justice to those by whom the cause of Anti-Patronage was ever opposed, and at last fatally betrayed? Justice to those whose zeal for the opposite system, and whose rigorous enforcement of it, has estranged from the Establishment the great majority of the Scottish people? To that extruded majority justice does indeed owe something; but the debt to them cannot now be paid by abolishing Patronage in the Established Church. For them such a proposal comes too late, and therefore they do not and cannot ask it, and cannot accept it as the sort of justice for which the case calls.”

He then went on to say, that even were all matters of that nature left out of sight, “the proposal to abolish Patronage does not touch the main grounds on account of which the Nonconformist Presbyterian Churches are in separation from



the Scottish Establishment. Those grounds of separation, in the case of the Reformed Presbyterian Church—as all the world knows—are much older than Queen Anne's Act, and could not be appreciably affected by its removal. In the case of the other Secession Churches, now all but entirely combined in the United Presbyterian Church, it is written on the broad face of history that from the very first their chief reasons for withdrawing from the Establishment were based on its corrupt administration, and on the many serious errors and evils that were tolerated within its pale. We rather think it will turn out that the same reasons are thought by the descendants of the Erskines to be fully stronger now than they were a century ago. It is also pretty generally known that, in addition to these older reasons, they have others of a kind which make union with the Establishment simply impossible. And as for the Free Church, it is notorious to all the world that in the Protest—which still lies unanswered upon the table of the Established Assembly—the fundamental cause and ground of the Disruption which took place in 1843 is expressly declared to be this,—that submission to 'the decrees, as to matters spiritual and ecclesiastical, of the Civil Courts,' had become 'a condition of the Establishment, and of the possession of the benefits thereof;' and accordingly the Disruptionists go on to say, 'that as we cannot, without committing what we believe to be sin—in opposition to God's law, in disregard of the honour and authority of Christ's crown, and in violation of our solemn vows—comply with this condition, we cannot in conscience continue connected with it, and retain the benefits of an Establishment to which such condition is attached.' That is the main substance of the Protest on the footing of which the Free Church broke off from the Establishment, and took up her new and noble position, in which

she has been so signally honoured and blessed. That ground of separation the abolition of Patronage leaves precisely where it was. In point of fact, what the proposal made in the Statement asks to have put in the room of the present Patronage law, would only multiply the points at which the civil tribunals might be able to step in and control the action of the Church."

Mr. Gladstone's style of speaking did not seem to hold out much prospect of help from a Liberal Ministry; but one member of the Cabinet—the Duke of Argyll—took up the movement with much earnestness as an individual, and it is almost certain that, if no change of Government had taken place, there would have been, sooner or later, a Parliamentary inquiry instituted, in a thorough, and as far as possible a dispassionate way, into the whole subject of the ecclesiastical condition of Scotland. We are not at all sure that any great good would have come of that, and we are just as glad that we have been saved by circumstances from the necessity of either opposing or concurring in it. But this much would have been secured under that arrangement,—that the historical relations of the different Churches would have been recognized, and their claims in equity to consideration would have been admitted in connection with any fresh adjustment of the alliance between Church and State. As it happened, however, the Nonconformists of Scotland were saved from all embarrassment. Of a sudden the Liberals were overthrown, and the Tories reigned in their room. The opportunity thus offered was too good to be lost. A Bill for the "Abolition of Patronage" was introduced into the House of Lords, and carried there with a rush. It encountered more opposition in the House of Commons, but in that place Mr. Disraeli was all-powerful. And within an incredibly short time the "con-

stitution" of the Church of Scotland, as by law established, was again altered in most material ways. The General Assembly had the proposed Bill courteously sent down to it; just as in similar circumstances the directors of the South-Western Railway would have had a measure transmitted to them which seemed likely to affect their interests. But such a thing as any real recognition on the part of the State of the Church's standing as *a party to a contract* was not once thought of by our legislators; and the regulations under which ministerial settlements are now made in the vacant parishes of Scotland, are regulations which have been framed and issued imperially by the British Parliament.

What view Dr. Buchanan took of the policy pursued by the Conservative Government at this time, is very explicitly expressed in the draft of an overture to the Assembly which is now before us in his own handwriting. It runs as follows:—

*“Whereas* it is publicly known that steps are being taken by persons representing the Church established by law in Scotland, with a view to alter in certain important respects the existing relations of the State to that institution, by obtaining from the Legislature important modifications of the law of Church Patronage; and

*“Whereas* any such application to Parliament, in behalf of a Church supported by national property, and owing its civil establishment entirely to the national will, amounts to a virtual appeal to the nation at large to give their sanction to the measure proposed; and

*“Whereas* the making of such an appeal entitles and requires the Free Church, in justice to herself, and in vindication of her solemn Protest against those encroachments on her spiritual rights and liberties which in 1843 compelled her, under constraint of conscience, to withdraw from the existing Church Establishment, to assert her claim to be heard in reference to the appeal in question; and

*“Whereas* the long-continued and oppressive action of the State in connection with the law of Patronage and otherwise, and especially at the period immediately preceding the Disruption, together with the oppressive action, during the greater part of last century, of the Church herself, in enforcing that obnoxious law, has led to the separation from the remanent Church Establishment of a decided majority of the Scottish people; and

*“Whereas* the ecclesiastical divisions thus created cannot now be healed

by any such measures as the one proposed, or by any measure consistent with political justice to the Scottish people, or compatible with their religious peace, it is hereby overtured to the General Assembly to take this whole subject into immediate and earnest consideration, to adopt such measures as may be expedient and necessary for resisting any attempt to rehabilitate by legislative authority the existing Church Establishment, and without further delay to raise the question whether the time has not come for discontinuing in Scotland a Church Establishment which has ceased to represent the mind of the nation, which is no longer necessary for its religious instruction, and whose existence as an Establishment forms the chief obstacle to the religious unity of the great mass of the Scottish people; or to do otherwise as to the Assembly may seem meet."

With regard to the assertions of some that the Bill actually passed in 1874 was one which conceded substantially the Free Church Claim, and would, if it had come earlier, have rendered the Disruption unnecessary, he was in the habit of speaking of these with something approaching to contempt. He never admitted that Patronage was abolished in the sense in which that act was demanded by such men as Dr. Andrew Thomson. The transference of a civil right from one man to a number of men—the conferring by Act of Parliament of a spiritual franchise on a hitherto unknown ecclesiastical party, *the adherent*—and the limitation by the same authority of the privileges of the Christian people to a period of six months,—these arrangements did not satisfy him that the Church had been put in the undisturbed possession of what its Head had given to it. But beyond all that he agreed emphatically with Dr. Julius Wood, who, although one of the keenest of the Anti-Unionists, affirmed, almost with his latest breath, that "it is vain and utterly misleading to allege that any recent legislation has acknowledged and secured that spiritual independence for which we contended in the Ten Years' Conflict, and the denial of which to the Church of Scotland brought on the Disruption." \*

\* "If the Tories and the Established Church," wrote the late Lord Ardmillan to his friend Mr. Maclagan in 1874, "were *right* in 1843, there is *no* need for this

Holding these opinions, he scarcely regarded the question of whether a way had been opened for loyal and intelligent Free Churchmen consistently to return to the Establishment as capable of serious discussion; and the only new point which he felt to be pressed upon him by the reconstruction of the Establishment, was that of the obligation or otherwise to be any longer silent on the subject of the alternative theory which on abstract grounds he had long seen to be the only practicable one, but which for many reasons he had, like others, been keeping merely *in retentis*.

What he came to think about this is fully expressed in an interesting letter which he sent to the Rev. James Dodds of Dunbar. We give the whole letter as it was written, although it is only the second part of it that concerns us particularly at present:—

“GLASGOW, April 19, 1872.

“MY DEAR MR. DODDS,—I have read your kind letter with much interest. Be assured that such letters are always most welcome. There are few men whose judgment on any matter—and especially on public questions connected with the duty and policy of the Church—I hold in higher estimation than yours.

---

measure. If wrong in 1843, which they have *never yet* acknowledged, then observe their position. Dwelling in the mauses quitted, and enjoying the stipends surrendered by the Free Church, a confession of error and of wrong may be *cheaply* made, as they retain all which the error and the wrong procured. See the King's speech in Hamlet:—

‘But, O, what form of prayer  
Can serve my turn? “Forgive me the foul murder”?  
But I have still the effects for which I did the murder,  
My crown, my own ambition, and my queen.  
Can one be pardoned who *retains* the offence?’

*We can say nothing* in favour of Patronage. But the repeal of the Law of Patronage ought not to *tempt* any to return to *bondage*.”

“I cannot concur,” his lordship wrote at another time—and one is glad to preserve here the opinion of one who was alike eminent as a Judge and intelligent as a Free Churchman—“I cannot concur in the views of those who would extend the right of election to persons not communicants [the adherents]. It is objectionable on *Church* principles. The most important feature of the measure as it stands—next to the abolition as an evil and a grievance of what these men have hitherto maintained to be a blessing, and a muniment, and an ornament—is, that the Establishment loses its *territorial* character, and in becoming *congregational* ceases to be *National*.”

“1. As to Union. On this subject we have difficulties on both sides: on the side of the friends of Union, as well as on that of its opponents. A large proportion of the former are impatient for action; and anything like a striking of the Union flag would produce feelings of disappointment and dissatisfaction that would cool not a little their whole interest in Church affairs. Of course, to go on to actual Union in the face of the present state of bitterness among its opponents, would be almost as unseemly as is their own conduct. It would be like inviting friends to a feast when the house is on fire. It would be a sort of scandal in the face of the world. I dare say *death* will have a good deal to do among us before the *set time* for Union comes. My firm belief is that we have entered on a time of commotion and conflict, in the course of which Establishments are doomed to pass away, and as the result of which all Churches will have to adapt themselves to a new state of things both in the social and political world. The silly notion that by dropping Union we shall get into a haven of rest and peace, can deceive only very ignorant or very thoughtless minds. But this leads me to your second point—the question of Disestablishment.

“2. On that question I have thought much and long, and I think I may say confidently that every one of the views you so clearly present has often and anxiously engaged my attention. I am, in fact, as nearly as possible at one with yourself as to the difficulties and dangers that beset the subject; with perhaps this single difference, that I apprehend more strongly than you appear to do the gravity of the dangers which lie on the side of silence and inaction on our part. It is quite clear to me that the length of time during which we have pursued this course has allowed a reaction in favour of the Establishment to take place that is both strong and pretty widely diffused. The simple and obvious fact that we have now to speak of the overthrow of the Establishment with bated breath—that we have lived to see men rising up within our own Church and siding openly with the Establishment, and treating those who speak a word against it as revolutionists—is the most impressive indication that could well be given of the change that has taken place. My conviction is, that had we gone on a little longer in the same way, we would soon have found ourselves in the midst of a state of things when we would have had no choice but to look on, and let the friends of Church Establishments gain a position that might have seriously menaced our influence—if not our existence—as a Free Church. I cannot but think, therefore, that it was high time to give forth such an utterance on the subject as to show, at least, what is in store, if the attempt be persisted in to confer a new lease and additional privileges upon the Established Church. Having done this, an important end has been gained. In following up this advantage we must, of course, take care to act prudently and with a due regard to the state of many men’s minds. But we must be prompt and firm when the time for more decided action comes. I am inclined to think that the question should be so raised in the Assembly

as to show the need of having a committee appointed to keep an eye on the threatened Parliamentary action of the Established Church. I do not, indeed, at this moment decide for such a course. Providence will probably open our way. And, of course, much must depend on the views prevailing in the Assembly.

“The Union Committee expect and desire nothing more than to be reappointed with the instructions of last year—which contemplate for the present co-operation only.—Always, dear Mr. Dodds, yours, with much regard and esteem,  
ROBERT BUCHANAN.”

A few weeks later, he wrote another letter in a similar sense to Dr. Cairns, who had been invited to deliver a lecture on Disestablishment in Edinburgh.

“GLASGOW, *May 4, 1872.*”

“MY DEAR DR. CAIRNS,—I am just starting for London, to be present at an interview on Monday with Mr. Forster on the Scotch Education Bill, and to aid in promoting it, as it goes into Committee that evening.

“I should greatly have liked to hear your lecture on Monday. It is a great question you are going to discuss, and I have no doubt it will be so handled as to convince men that it is no mere spirit of either jealousy or radicalism that is at the bottom of your objection to the continuance of the present Civil Establishment of religion in Scotland.

“It has ceased to be national; it is no longer *necessary* as a means of upholding by State aid the ordinances of religion in any part of the country; and its continuance is now incompatible with either political justice or the religious unity and peace of the Scotch people.

“May the Great Head of the Church give you a mouth and wisdom suited to the occasion and the times.—Always, my dear Dr. Cairns, yours most affectionately,  
ROBERT BUCHANAN.”

As may be supposed, his convictions on this subject strengthened instead of diminishing. As a mere theory, he held strongly that the peace and spiritual prosperity of Scotland were most likely to be secured by a combination of Free Churches, and he wished quietly to move on that line for himself. But as events developed themselves, and the other method was prosecuted in ways which seemed to him to be utterly objectionable, his step became more decided, and, while others were still timidly hesitating about the right course—*anxious to go on, and yet shrinking from agitation*—he grew to be perfectly outspoken,

and insisted at all convenient times that a termination of the existing connection between Church and State was absolutely indispensable to the well-being of the country. He refused to accept the Vice-Presidency of a Disestablishment Association, on account of his age and increasing infirmity; but it would give an unfaithful account of the history of his opinions, to refrain from saying that at the last his conclusions on the now burning question of the day were clear, emphatic, and unhesitating; and that one of his most earnest desires for the future was to see the ground cleared for the reconstruction of a National Church which should embrace the whole Evangelism of Scotland, and be left free from the embarrassments of a State alliance to develop, freely and to the fullest extent, its spiritual life and its independent resources.



## CHAPTER XXI.

### REVOLUTION IN THE SCOTTISH SCHOOL-SYSTEM.

DR. BUCHANAN was not spared to see a satisfactory re-adjustment of the ecclesiastical affairs of Scotland. Life in general is too short to admit of one man witnessing the rise and the consummation of any great and far-reaching work of reformation. "One soweth and another reapeth." And when the call came to him to go hence, he was found—not unsatisfied, not unhopeful—but with his face still set in the direction of changes which he felt to be necessary to secure to his country the outward advantages which were, in his judgment, indispensable to its spiritual well-being.

But in connection with another subject his life was not so incomplete. He lived to see a revolution in the educational arrangements of Scotland. No churchman of the true traditional Scottish type has ever been indifferent to the subject of Education. From the very first the theory of Knox has been kept in view, that real religious prosperity can only be hoped for in a country where churches *and schools* are maintained together. On this idea the Parochial System of education was founded; and there can be no doubt that we are to attribute to it, in a large measure, the reputation for intelligence with which Scotchmen have been credited in all parts of the world.

But the time inevitably came when the Parish Schools were found to be inadequate to meet the increasing wants of

the population. It was, in fact, with the schools just as it was with the churches. The framework grew to be too small for the multitudes that required to be accommodated. And as in the one case the pressure resulted, in the first instance, in the creation of extra-parochial or *Quoad Sacra* places of worship, so in the other the inadequate supply of education led to the erection of many *Side* or *Adventure* schools.

Such an irregular method of meeting the exigencies of the case, however, rendered it plain that there was something defective about the system. It ought to have been made capable of easy expansion ; so as to take in any fresh ground that required to be occupied. But it was not so constructed ; and although less notice has been taken of it, it is the fact that the difficulties connected with the establishment of a truly National scheme of Education for Scotland have not been unlike those which were encountered by the Evangelical party in the Church, when they were prosecuting their schemes of Church Extension. The hard framework of the Parochial System met them at every turn. Men would not see that what was suited to a country with a million of inhabitants was no longer suited to a country with two millions, and they interposed every sort of barrier to a generous comprehension of the new agencies which the progress of events had called into existence. The consequence of this kind of policy in the Church was, that it helped forward the Disruption ; and the attempt to apply it in connection with Education has issued in the adoption of a system under which the School is separated from the Church altogether.

It has been noticed that the public life of Dr. Buchanan began with efforts made by him in the interest of education. With a revived attention to religion, there came inquiries

into the state of the schools ; and it was speedily discovered that there was, in that quarter as in others, an urgent need for reform. The existing schools were too few in number. There were no available means for increasing them as they were required. And while the teachers had grievances of their own to complain of, a good deal of dissatisfaction was felt as to the quality of the teaching that was supplied. To meet the case thus presented, an Educational Association (as has already been explained) was formed in Glasgow,—the General Assembly and the House of Commons were alike applied to for help,—and the great step was taken of establishing a Normal School for the training of schoolmasters and the improvement of the style of instruction in the land. In all these movements Dr. Buchanan took a leading part. In this connection, indeed, he made his maiden speech in the Assembly ; and to him almost as much as to any other Scottish ecclesiastic that could be named (Dr. Candlish, perhaps, equally shares the glory with him) is due the success which has attended those training institutions which have contributed far more than is generally realized to our present reputation as a well-educated country.

When the Disruption arrived, the expansive power of the Parochial System was subjected to a new strain, which it was found incapable of standing. The party remaining within the Establishment insisted on a hard and literal interpretation of the law, and required all the parish teachers who joined the Free Church to demit their offices. It was needless to object that John Knox never conceived of such an application of his theory as the expulsion from his schools of truer Presbyterians than those who expelled them. The Statute sustained the Church in its actings, and a new educational framework was, *per force*, erected outside. Great good, however, came out of this evil. The Free Church set

itself with characteristic energy to establish schools of its own. Six months after the Disruption—at the Glasgow Assembly—one of those large-hearted proposals was made to meet the emergency which one likes to remember as illustrating the greatness of the faith that prevailed in those days. Mr.—afterwards Dr.—Robert Macdonald, then of Blairgowrie, now of North Leith, offered to undertake, for the erection of school buildings, the raising of a capital sum of £50,000. Few men would have faced such an undertaking; and fewer still could have carried it out successfully. But Mr. Macdonald had qualifications which peculiarly fitted him for the work. He was known as the friend of M'Cheyne,—as one whom God had greatly owned in connection with recent revivals of religion. And when such a man went through the country, throwing the whole influence of his warm heart, his genial manner, his evangelical fervour, into the cause of education, people were compelled to think that there was more in it than a matter of reading, writing, and arithmetic, and subscribed accordingly. As the result of his appeals, £60,000 were promised; and thus a scheme was started which issued, in process of time, in the erection of more than *six hundred* schools, every one of which was pervaded by an earnestly religious spirit.\*

But here was by no means a seemly state of things,—that Presbyterian Scotland should be divided upon a subject on which all the people were at bottom agreed. Why, it was often asked by members of different denominations, can we not come to some understanding about educating our children together? If we must worship in separate churches, is it

\* Dr. Macdonald still lives, one of the few remaining of a noble race of men. God has prospered him in his own individual sphere; he still ministers to a congregation of over a thousand members; but he has lived also *for the Church* at large, and will be always remembered as one of her most loyal sons and most devoted servants.

necessary that we should carry our differences into the schools? These questionings by-and-by bore fruit. One effort after another was made, by the present Lord Moncreiff, to secure the passing of a truly national system, but his success was only partial. Every step he took, however, prepared the way for what was coming; and at last Lord Young, when Lord Advocate, was enabled to carry through the measure which has resulted in the establishment of the existing order of things.

The present system has no doubt its defects, like every other system of human origin; and experience will suggest more amendments, probably, than have yet occurred to any. But this must be said for it, that it has already had a most remarkable effect on the education of Scotland. New schools have risen up in every corner of the land. Teachers have been impelled to address themselves more heartily to their work; a fresh interest in education has been awakened in the heart of the nation; and multitudes of children who might otherwise have grown up without instruction, have been forced into the schools by the operation of the Compulsory Law.

What has taken place is nothing less than a Revolution; and it is a mere truism to say that here we have another of the unintended fruits of that policy which precipitated the Disruption, and which was pursued afterwards in the vain belief that a section of a Church, when Established, can retain a position which was conceded to that Church when it was coterminous with the Nation. After 1843, the Established Church insisted that it was still its right to take the oversight of the entire education of Scotland, and it pressed the Parochial idea so far as to compel the Free Church to set up a system of its own. That that Church had six hundred schools to dispose of when the question of a readjustment came

to be discussed in earnest, gave it a standing that it could not have otherwise possessed. And so it has come about that the attempt to retain all has resulted in the loss of all. For under the present arrangement the superintendence of the schools has been absolutely transferred from the Church to the People—the ancient tie which bound the two together has been completely severed—and the Established Church Presbyteries have now no more to do with the *quondam* Parish Schools than the Presbyteries of any other denomination. We do not know of any more remarkable example of a policy of narrowness overreaching itself. Here is a result of the Disruption which can never be undone. Some consideration for the conscientious difficulties of the Parochial Teachers of 1843 would have prevented, in all probability, the establishment of a Free Church Scheme; and in course of time the Parochial System would have been expanded as was required from the centre. But the word was given that there was to be no toleration for Free Churchmen within the walls either of the National Universities or the National Schools; and the issue is what we have seen.

It would be very needless, at this time of day, to give the history of our Scottish educational agitations. It is sufficient to say that Dr. Buchanan took a leading share in them all, and spent much time and labour in endeavours to secure for his country a system which would work with the least amount of friction, and which would bring to the people the largest possible measure of advantage. Nor was he at this or at any time a mere political agitator, with a party purpose only to serve. He gave evidence all along of his actual personal interest in the processes of education; and when the Act passed which gave to Scotland a truly National System again, he at once indicated his willingness to take an active part in its execution.....He was a successful candidate, accord-

ingly, for a place in the first School Board that was chosen for Glasgow; and from the time of his election till his departure on his last journey to Rome, he laboured in the interest of the city in a way which called forth from all who were then brought into contact with him the most marked admiration.

Proofs of all this in abundance might be supplied very easily, but it will be enough to give the two following letters,—one from Mr. Morrison, the Rector of the Glasgow Normal School; the other from J. A. Campbell, Esq., L.L.D., of Stracathro, who was himself associated with Dr. Buchanan as a distinguished member of the Glasgow School Board:—

*(From Mr. Morrison.)*

“GLASGOW, April 3, 1877.

“The Established Church having a legal, although a doubtful moral, claim to the buildings used as a Normal School in Glasgow, resolved in 1843 to eject from that school all the Masters who had joined the Free Church. It was found that all the Directors save one, all the Masters without exception, had cast in their lot with the Free Church. For some time it was thought that the buildings might be left in the hands of the Glasgow Educational Society, through whose instrumentality they had been erected; but in 1844 it was authoritatively intimated that ‘all teachers of schools under the management of the Church of Scotland must be in communion and connection with that Church.’

“The Free Church was thus compelled to face the erection of a new building. Dr. Buchanan undertook to raise the necessary funds; and so successful was he, that the new buildings, which cost £10,000, were opened free of debt on the 12th of August 1845. From that time until his lamented decease, Dr. Buchanan was Convener of the Committee of Directors, and his interest in the institution never flagged. He was seldom absent from a meeting. In all times of difficulty,—and there were several such,—his sound judgment and matured wisdom carried the institution safely through. In the difficult and often delicate negotiations with Government, his services were simply invaluable. ‘It would be difficult,’ writes the Rev. Dr. Fraser of Paisley, the biographer of David Stow, ‘to over-estimate the service which Dr. Buchanan has rendered to the cause of public instruction, through assisting both institutions.’

“But Dr. Buchanan’s zeal in behalf of education was not limited to the

part he took in conducting the affairs of this institution. He was an active member of our Education Committee; he watched with great interest the various attempts made to secure a National System for our country. He never refused to lend his powerful aid to the promotion of this great object; and when at last Lord Young's Bill became law, he was elected a member of the first School Board of Glasgow. We have it on the authority of the late Chairman of that Board, Alexander Whitelaw, Esq., M.P., that no member of the Board did more effective service than Dr. Buchanan.

“And while thus helping on the work of education on a large scale, he was equally zealous in fostering it among those whom School Boards and similar agencies could not reach. He took the greatest possible interest in the school attached to the Mission district, wrought by his congregation; and scarcely a week passed without the teachers being cheered by his genial presence and a kindly word of encouragement.”

*(From Mr. Campbell.)*

“BRECHIN, April 4, 1877.

“I do not know that I can do better, in response to your request, than give you a copy of the minute which the Glasgow School Board agreed to as recording their sense of the loss they sustained by Dr. Buchanan's death. It was as follows:—‘The Board agree to record in their minutes an expression of the heartfelt sorrow with which they have received the intelligence of the death of the Rev. Dr. Buchanan, which took place at Rome on the 31st of March. The intercourse which the members of the Board enjoyed with their late colleague so impressed them with his invariable courtesy and kindness, that, apart from all considerations of a public nature, they now feel his death as a personal affliction. They desire also to acknowledge the valuable services which Dr. Buchanan rendered as a member of this Board. His attention to its business, notwithstanding his numerous other engagements, was earnest and constant, while he ever brought to bear on all matters under the Board's consideration the calmness of judgment and the extensive experience, both in educational work and in the general conduct of affairs, for which he was distinguished. The Board cannot but put on record their sense of the loss they sustain in the removal from them of one whose high character and other personal qualities added dignity to the office which he held, and whose wise counsels and co-operation were so eminently useful in promoting the work committed to this Board.’

“These, I may add, were not words of course. I believe every member of the Board felt the death to be a personal as well as a public loss.

“Dr. Buchanan's services as a member of the Board did not consist so much of anything he did in any particular department of the work, as in the attention he paid to the whole business of the Board, the advice and assistance he rendered, and the influence he exerted at all its meetings.

“No one who knew what he was in other capacities requires to be told



how regular and punctual he was in his attendance, and how thoroughly he always gave his mind to the business in hand. Nor need I say how courteous and conciliatory he was, even when combating the opinions of some of his colleagues. By these qualities he gained the respect, and, I may add, the personal regard, of all the members of the Board,—several of whom had no acquaintance with him before they met him in the Board-room, and some of whom differed widely from him in many of their opinions.”

## CHAPTER XXII.

### A CITIZEN OF GLASGOW.

IT would be to leave a marked blank in this biography, not to take any notice of the fact that Dr. Buchanan was recognized by the inhabitants of Glasgow as one of their most eminent fellow-citizens. He was distinctively a Churchman; but as there was no social or philanthropic question having any bearing on the welfare of the country at large in which he did not take an interest, so there was nothing that concerned the particular good or happiness of the people of his own city to which he ever showed himself to be indifferent.

The highest keynote of his policy as a Citizen was furnished by the motto on the municipal coat of arms.\* He quoted that motto so often, that to some ears the repetition must have sounded monotonous. But the frequency with which he referred to it, showed at least the profound impression which it had produced on his own mind. Whatever theories on the subject others might have, he was deeply and abidingly convinced that Glasgow could never "flourish" in any true and lasting sense except on the basis of "*the preaching of the Word.*" In the spirit of this belief, his chief efforts were directed to the propagation of the gospel,—to the erection of new places of worship where these were needed,—to the organizing of mission agencies for reaching the lapsed masses,

\* "Let Glasgow Flourish by the Preaching of the Word."

—and to the suppression of such hostile influences as tended in their own nature to prevent the setting up within the city of the reign of God. His labours in these connections have already been described, and we refer to them again now simply with the view of emphasizing the fact that he never acted more in character as a loyal citizen of St. Mungo's than when he was lecturing on "*The Schoolmaster in the Wynds,*" or pleading with the wealthy merchants of the city for money to extend the means of grace to the perishing. The value of his services in this connection will be appreciated by any one on the spot who will give himself the trouble to inquire what some parts of Glasgow would in all probability have been to-day if Buchanan's work of Church Extension had never been begun.

But his Christian zeal did not expend itself only in that department of effort. Now and again necessity has been laid upon all earnest evangelical men in Glasgow to combine for the common good of religion, and on such occasions Dr. Buchanan was always found in the front. We are indebted to a friend, whose profession led him to mark the course of events with some care, for some interesting notes in this connection. He recalls not a few stirring periods in the history of the city, during which scenes occurred that are now almost forgotten. The formation of the Evangelical Alliance, the battle for the preservation of the Lord's day against the encroachments of the Railway interest, Lord Palmerston's famous attack on the doctrine of a Divine Providence, the efforts led by Mr. Henderson of Park to place the Bible Society on a really national basis,—all these furnished occasions for the display of the catholic spirit of Buchanan, and of his readiness to join heart and hand with the members of other denominations in furthering without respect of party the cause of the kingdom of Christ.

“The desecration of the Lord’s day,” we are reminded, “by the running of passenger trains on the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway after its opening in 1842, excited much opposition on the part of the Christian public. Meetings were held to protest against the practice; which, however, was continued for about four years—two trains, one in the morning and one in the evening, running from each end of the line on Sabbath. On a new set of directors coming into power, the running of these trains was abandoned; and notwithstanding strong efforts made to induce a resumption of these trains, the directors remained firm, and their resolution was confirmed by a large majority of the shareholders. The directors had the moral support of the most influential men of Glasgow and other towns; which was shown, as respects Glasgow, in a memorial to the directors, adopted at a numerous and influential meeting held on the 4th December 1846, to which were attached 1361 signatures of ministers and laymen of all religious denominations. Among other names appended to the document was that of Dr. Buchanan, who regarded the subject as one of vital importance, and who, if more discriminating and prudent than some of his contemporaries in dealing with the question, was perhaps none the less zealous and courageous. For a period of nearly nineteen years—up till 1865—there was no railway travelling on Sabbath between Glasgow and Edinburgh, but after the amalgamation which took place between the North British and the Edinburgh and Glasgow lines, the Sabbath trains were resumed, and have since continued. The Sabbath Alliance of Scotland—of whose Committee Dr. Buchanan was a member—took active measures to oppose this traffic on the Lord’s day; and Dr. Buchanan, among other prominent men of various denominations, lifted up his voice against the evil. At a meeting of the Free Presbytery of Glasgow, on Wednesday, 1st February 1865, a

memorial to the directors of the North British Railway was adopted, asking them to discontinue all Sabbath traffic, and especially the running of goods trains on that day,—the running of passenger trains on the Lord's day between Edinburgh and Glasgow did not commence till September of that year. After a lengthened and able address from Professor Gibson in justification of the memorial, its adoption was moved by Dr. Forbes, seconded by Dr. Lorimer, and supported by Dr. Buchanan, who also entered somewhat fully into the subject. His speech concluded as follows :—‘ I do feel, Moderator, that the Lord has long entrusted to Scotland a very high place and privilege in connection with this subject of the Sabbath law. I believe that Scotland is, so to speak, the citadel of the Sabbath question, and that if we were to yield to the attacks, and reproaches, and scorn with which we are almost overwhelmed in following the course that we pursue—if we were to yield to them, it would be an evil day for England itself. For be assured that whatever length Scotland gives way, England will just give way in proportion so much the more ; and that in a very short time, and in consequence of our yielding to go as far as England, the latter country will be led to go all the length of the Continent. I hope, therefore, that we shall be steadfast and immovable on this question—that we shall set our faces as a flint in contending for the great object that that memorial has in view to support. There is really no room for concession ; this is not a question in which we can concede. Of course there is the limitation of the works of necessity and mercy, which our Church and our greatest theologians have always frankly made, and which we teach to all our children in the Shorter Catechism. And whatever can be held by any fair and charitable interpretation to come within the reach of that limitation of necessity and mercy, let us frankly concede. We do not weaken but

strengthen our position by conceding these limitations. But beyond that, let us stand firm. It is impossible to justify the conveying of goods upon railways on the Sabbath on any principle that will not justify the conveying of goods along our roads, or along our rivers and canals; and there is no principle or argument that can justify the conveying of goods on that day that cannot justify the opening of shops, and warehouses, and factories, and that will not set in motion the whole machinery of the industry of the country. We must, therefore, as I have said, take our stand firmly and immovably on this question; and I hope that, by God's blessing, Scotland will be honoured, not only to preserve the rest of the Sabbath for herself, but to influence by her opinion and example even that very England which is now trying to overthrow our position.' ”

The very earliest object of general religious interest with which Dr. Buchanan identified himself was the circulation of the Scriptures. He was ordained before the Church of Scotland had any mission either to Jew or Gentile; but antecedent to the missionary era was a time when the Scottish Evangelicals found an outlet for their zeal in sustaining Bible Societies, and among those who so long ago as 1829 contributed liberally to their support were the minister and parishioners of Gargunnoch. And this cause was never lost sight of amid the distractions of Glasgow. As has been indicated, he gave effective aid to Mr. Henderson of Park in his endeavours to establish the Bible Society on a national basis; and one of the very last honours conferred upon him was his election to be one of the Society's vice-presidents. His sudden death prevented his taking his place at the Board; but the directors did not need fresh service in that capacity to prove to them his title to their gratitude and respect.

“No testimony from this Board,” say they, “may add much to the general tribute which the whole community is prepared to render to Dr. Buchanan’s personal worth, and to his eminent services to the cause of evangelical religion in Scotland—altogether apart from his claims to the grateful remembrance of his own denomination. But it was not on the ground of his general eminence merely that he was elected a vice-president of the Society, nor is it on such grounds that a memorial of him is entitled to a place on its records.

“Dr. Buchanan had special connection with the Bible Society. He from the first co-operated with Mr. Henderson of Park and others in the effort to place it on a national basis. At the first meeting in Glasgow after the union of the societies in 1861, he gave it the benefit of his powerful advocacy, rejoicing in it as the best ‘point of union’ on which the Christians of Scotland could meet, as in, to use his own words, ‘a real Evangelical Alliance;’ and in December 1869 he presided over the meeting in Glasgow at which Mr. Jameson was designated to his office as the Society’s agent for Spain. The address which Dr. Buchanan delivered on this last-named occasion was remarkable, not merely for his usual comprehensive wisdom and rare felicity of diction, but for such an acquaintance with the details of the Society’s operations as evinced that, although not a director, he was taking a deep interest in its proceedings and welfare. At the request of the Board the address was subsequently published, and it is instructive to mark that towards the close the same ground of which he had spoken seven years previously, as specially endearing the Society to his regard, is again mentioned. ‘The National Bible Society,’ he repeats, ‘is a point of union for all who believe that the Bible is the Word of God.’

“At the last annual meeting Dr. Buchanan was unanimously and cordially elected to the office of vice-president, but ere two months have elapsed, and before he could take his place at the Board, he has been summoned to the enjoyment of his eternal reward.

“In the death of such a man—one with such catholic sympathies, with so rich a furniture of gifts and graces, identified for a long period with every holy and benevolent cause, wielding such an influence in the community, and respected everywhere for his singularly courteous and honourable bearing—any sense of the loss sustained by a particular society, however important, is entirely absorbed in the conviction, painful and solemnizing, of the loss sustained by the whole Church of Christ on earth.”

It was not, however, only in connection with the specially religious interests of Glasgow, that Dr. Buchanan approved himself to be a loyal citizen. He showed an active concern also in all that affected its social and material good, and he was ever ready to share with the other inhabitants in what-

ever enterprise they set on foot for doing honour to merit or relieving distress.

“In the beginning of 1847, for example, public sympathy was roused by the prevalence of famine and pestilence in Ireland, and by great destitution in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland, occasioned by the failure of the potato crop of the previous season.

“On the 12th January, a great and influential meeting of the inhabitants, at which ministers and leading citizens took part, was held in the Merchants' Hall, Glasgow, at which it was resolved to make an appeal to the liberality of the community on behalf of the Highland population. The appeal met with a generous response, and much was done for the sufferers. Dr. Buchanan was one of the most active members of the Glasgow Relief Fund Committee, the joint-secretaries of which were Mr. Charles R. Baird, a writer of great promise, who died long ago, and the late Mr. James Ritchie. Of the surviving members were Sir James Watson, Mr. James Hannan, and Mr. William Brown. Dr. Buchanan not only aided in superintending and arranging the distribution of the supplies, but was also of much assistance in procuring employment for the large number both of men and women who at that time flocked to Glasgow. Besides the quantities of meal and biscuit then sent out, there were, on his suggestion, also forwarded supplies of turnip and other vegetable seeds, with instructions to have these immediately planted; and great benefit arose from thus not only procuring an early supply of food, but also from inducing the crofters to cultivate these permanently. He warmly seconded the efforts of Sir James Watson to send out the necessary supply of boats and lines to dispose the people to procure a proper supply of fish. They succeeded, with the approval of the Committee, in forwarding twenty large boats, with a supply



of lines, nets, and hooks, and along with them experienced fishermen from the East Coast in order to teach the people how to use them.

“Dr. Buchanan also took a lively interest in the model lodging-houses which originated at this time in consequence of the large numbers coming to Glasgow in search of employment, and with which the names of Sir James Watson, the late Lord Provost Blackie, and others are so prominently and honourably associated. For several years he attended the annual gatherings of the lodgers, giving in his addresses salutary counsel and advice.”

One other service done to Glasgow in connection with the social labours of Dr. Buchanan it is right to make special mention of—all the more that the credit of originating the scheme we are now about to refer to has been claimed for another. “The only true secret of elevating the people,” says the Archbishop of Canterbury, “is to make them the agents in bettering their own condition.” This principle was fully recognized in the earliest days of the Wynd Mission; and proof of that is furnished in a minute, which is now before us, of the Free Tron Church Deacons’ Court. The minute is dated September 16, 1850; and records that the Moderator (Dr. Buchanan) stated “that the present meeting had been convened for the special purpose of considering the propriety of establishing a savings-bank in connection with the missionary operations in the parish.” A savings-bank was, of course, not in itself any novelty; but what was new in the scheme submitted to this meeting was the proposal to receive in deposit a sum so low as *one penny*. Such a thing had not entered into the imagination of the founders of the National Security system, and no provision had been made, accordingly, for meeting a state of destitution rendering an arrangement like that desirable. The smallest sum received from depositors

was one shilling. But those acquainted with the Wynds were persuaded, that without opening a wider door it would be impossible to awaken in any number of the people the belief that they could really save! The scheme, therefore, was earnestly prosecuted. The first Penny Savings-Bank in the kingdom was established within the territory which Dr. Buchanan was seeking to evangelize, and under his immediate superintendence. And it is a striking testimony to the practical utility of the idea that there are now, in and around Glasgow, over one hundred and fifty banks established on the same principle, and that the system has already been largely adopted also in the great commercial cities of England.

“Among the educational institutions in the city with which he was connected may be mentioned Anderson’s University, of which he was appointed a trustee on June 22, 1853; but his numerous other engagements prevented him from attending the meetings. Up till the time of the Disruption he was, *ex-officio*, a Patron of Hutcheson’s Hospital; and on the first election, which took place in October 1872, under the Act obtained that year for enlarging the powers of the Incorporation and for regulating its management, he was, with others, elected a Patron, and remained such until his death.

“In April 1860, Dr. Buchanan was appointed a member of the Committee of the General Council of the University of Glasgow, whose meetings then, and for some years after, were held in the Common Hall of the Old College in High Street. This was the committee for the management of academical business and for the suggestion of improvements, and Dr. Buchanan continued a member of it for upwards of four years, attending almost every one of its meetings. The meetings of the General Council are held in April and October; and during the period mentioned he took a prominent and most

useful part in the business, making frequent speeches, advocating various matters—among others, the removal of the University, now situated at Gilmorehill. He wrote a Report on the tutorial system, and the shortening of the arts curriculum by the institution of summer sessions, which was presented to the Council on October 30, 1861, and to which he afterwards spoke. At a meeting on the 26th October 1864, he was nominated to represent the Council as Assessor in the University Court, in room of Mr. Andrew Bannatyne, an eminent member of the legal faculty in Glasgow, since deceased. His proposer was the Rev. Dr. Alexander Macewen of Claremont United Presbyterian Church, and his seconder Mr. Towers Clark, writer—both of them now gone. It was thought by not a few that Dr. Buchanan was peculiarly qualified for this office, possessing as he did judicial gifts which, had he been trained for the Bar, might have won for him a place on the Bench. In opposition to him, however, there had previously been nominated the late estimable Christian judge, Lord Kinloch, who was proposed by the Rev. Dr. Smith of Cathcart, seconded by the late Sheriff Logie. The show of hands was in favour of Dr. Buchanan; but a poll was demanded on behalf of Lord Kinloch, which resulted in the election of the latter by a considerable majority. There was a strong muster of the Nonconformist interest in favour of Dr. Buchanan—Dr. Begg, among others, coming through as a supporter; but the Church party proved numerically more powerful, and it is only to be regretted that the electors should have had to decide between two such candidates, either of whom alone would have been so acceptable.

“In 1872, on the election of the first School Board of Glasgow, Dr. Buchanan was returned, and continued a member of it till his death. As senior member, he sat on the right of the chair, and usually opened the meeting, when

present, with prayer. Many testing questions came before the early meetings of the Board, on which his opinion carried much weight, the other members having every confidence in his judgment. He gave great attention to the business; and on the news of his death, the chairman (Mr. Alexander White-law, M.P.) paid a graceful tribute to his worth."

Perhaps it was his ecclesiastical eminence rather than his interest in education that was considered when, on the death of Dr. Fairbairn, Dr. Buchanan was at once named as his successor in the office of Principal in the Free Church College of Glasgow. But the distinction would have been as appropriate in an educational as in a Church point of view. The appointment lay with the General Assembly, which does not meet till May; but the inferior courts of the Free Church have the right to recommend names for such vacancies; and during the winter of 1874-75, so many Presbyteries had expressed their minds, that, if death had not intervened, Dr. Buchanan would have been appointed Principal, in May 1875, by acclamation.

Dr. Buchanan often appeared as a prominent citizen on the occasion of great municipal gatherings. The magnificent enterprise, for example, had been completed of bringing an abundant supply of water into Glasgow from Loch Katrine. Such an event, speaking so emphatically at once for the resources of the city, for the intelligence and energy of its inhabitants, and for the skill and ability of the engineer under whose superintendence the works had been carried through, could not be passed by without special notice and commemoration. Her Majesty the Queen had honoured the city by presiding at the opening of the water-works; and it was only natural that, as a finish to the whole proceedings, a banquet should

take place, at which the relations of the new scheme to all concerned could be expounded. The banquet was given in the Corporation Galleries, in special honour of Mr. Bateman, the engineer; but the speaking was comprehensive enough to embrace all subjects that were supposed to be connected with the event, whether these were moral or material, personal or the reverse.

To Dr. Buchanan was assigned the appropriate task of proposing "The Moral, Religious, and Social Improvement of the People;" and in speaking to this he delivered himself in a way which was so characteristic, that we must make room for the greater portion of his speech. It is not often, probably, that such addresses are delivered on what are called "festive occasions":—

"What I suppose," he said, "the Committee of Arrangements to have meant (in assigning me this subject) by doing so was simply to arrest attention on the fact that, in the judgment of this numerous and influential assemblage of the citizens of Glasgow, mere material appliances, however important in their own place, will never reform human society, will never suffice to make any community good or wise. We have come together, indeed, this evening, for the special purpose of celebrating the completion of perhaps the greatest public work of which any city in the British Empire can boast; a work which has conferred upon Glasgow, as I verily believe, the most important boon of a material kind which it was possible to bestow. All honour to the genius that planned it, and to the scientific skill and indomitable energy that carried out the vast and noble undertaking. Bailie Nicol Jarvie looked upon it as a great extravagance to think of carrying the comforts of the Saltmarket into the wild and far-off country of his kinsman, Rob Roy. But what would he have said of a proposal to convert the Highland lake which sheltered in its ample bosom the most inaccessible fastness of Rob Roy's great ancestor, Roderic Dhu, into a washing-tub for the weavers of Glasgow! The very conception was magnificent, and its successful execution is one of the not least illustrious achievements of our age. Still there are some things, and these by far the most essential to the well-being of this immense community, which cannot be effected by any means of that kind. The worst stains that are to be found on the fair face of our city are not those that can be washed off by the waters of Loch Katrine. It has been said, indeed, that cleanliness is next to godliness;

and though the saying is rather small and martinetish, as I think, there is no doubt a certain measure of truth in it. At least there can be no doubt that filth is a great enemy and hindrance to godliness. To live in it, is almost inevitably to lose that self-respect which lies at the bottom of all moral and social progress. But though physical filth may go a long way towards destroying self-respect, I am afraid that our excellent Water Commissioners, even with Loch Katrine at their back, would find it too hard a task to create that powerful principle in the garrets of the Goosedubs or in the cellars of the Wynds. Water-pipes, multiply them as you may, will not do it. If that be all your specific, there will probably be a good many pipes broken and a good deal of water wasted, but the grimy hands, and foul clothes, and foetid houses will remain pretty much as they were before. There is indeed a stream of a different sort, which, if you can only succeed in getting it to flow down these dark lanes and into these dingy dwellings, will soon work a wonderful change. I allude to that stream of which an old prophet once had a vision. It issued from a source far higher than Ben An or Ben Venue; it flowed down into a desert, and wherever it came there was no more barrenness and death; and the reason was, that this stream found its way not only to men's doors, but to their hearts. The stream of which I speak is the gospel. Let that living water be made to circulate through all the dwellings of the city, and then it will be found that, though even Loch Katrine flowing through our streets cannot create cleanliness, godliness will create it, and a great many other blessings besides. I suppose, indeed, that to recognize and to bring out the very plain but also very important truth which I have just been propounding, was precisely what was intended by giving so prominent a place in the proceedings of this evening to the subject of 'the moral, religious, and social improvement of the people.' I do not know who it was that framed this text for me, but it is admirably constructed. The words are all right, and every word is in its right place. There are three leading words in the sentence—each representative of a great human interest—moral, religious, social; and that word *religious* standing in the middle, between the other two. It is a great thing for a community to be in a good moral state. It is a great thing for a community to be in a good social state. But you cannot have these two things without the third. Religion—the true religion, the religion of the gospel of Christ, as taught in the Bible—is the keystone of the circle. It is that which binds society together, and gives it both stability and beauty. Religion is the parent of morality; and it is the mainspring of social well-being. Withdraw that keystone—the stone cut without hands—and the great circle of human society in this fallen world crumbles into ruin. Might I venture, before sitting down, to add a single word? I am very desirous not to be misunderstood. In speaking as I have done—in claiming the first place for religion, and in ascribing to it the chief motive-power in reforming human society—I have been simply asserting that familiar truth

so often and so eloquently pressed upon this community in other days by Thomas Chalmers—namely, that the moral rules the economic. Rectify the moral disorders of society, which cannot be done otherwise than by God's own remedy, the gospel, and the social disorders will soon disappear. But in maintaining the cardinal doctrine, neither Dr. Chalmers, nor any man in his senses, ever meant to make light of the enormous hindrances to religion which social degradation and physical wretchedness interpose. In regard to all wise and well-directed efforts for the amelioration of those physical evils which abound in this city, I have nothing else to say but this, and I say it with all my heart, 'These things ought ye to have done.' If they have not been done before, do them vigorously now; and therefore I say, my Lord Provost, God-speed to your new Police Bill, with its sanitary improvements, and its regulations for preventing human cupidity from crowding our working-class population together like pigs or cattle, without distinction of sex or age. Only let not the other and still greater things be undervalued or undone. Let not those who, like myself, have striven for years to introduce education and religion into such localities as our Vennels and Wynds, be told, as I have been publicly told, that we are beginning at the wrong end—that we must first wash, and clothe, and comfortably house, and feed the denizens of these neglected districts, and then try and make them religious. I say No; we are not beginning at the wrong end. Our Saviour did not first seize the poor demoniac, who was dwelling in filth and misery among the tombs, and begin by washing and clothing his poor defiled and naked body. No; he began by casting out the evil spirit, by restoring him to his right mind, by healing his soul; and immediately the man washed and clothed himself, and came and sat down at the Saviour's feet."

These notes give mere glimpses here and there of Dr. Buchanan's work and appearances in the town where he resided for so many years. And, after all, as one of the oldest and most respected citizens of Glasgow\* remarks in a communication now before us, "Much that might have been said of his citizen-life must remain for ever unrecorded. For a whole generation there was hardly a meeting at which the cause of humanity was to be advocated, or the best interests of our citizens promoted, whether it was convened by public authority or by private individuals, in which Dr. Buchanan was not called to take a prominent part. At the annual

\* Dr. James Mitchell.

gatherings of our religious and charitable societies, also, he was a frequent and always a greatly appreciated speaker. He dealt with whatever cause he advocated in a manner that was at once appropriate, convincing, and persuasive. These speeches may not now be easily traced, but the impression left by them and by his whole conduct as a citizen is, we believe, quite universal; and his loss is felt among us as that of a Christian statesman, a philanthropist, and a patriot."



## CHAPTER XXIII.

### LAST YEAR AT HOME.

WITH the conclusion of the Union negotiations the public work of Dr. Buchanan seemed about ended, and toward the close of the year which saw the disappointing of his hopes there occurred an event which—more than almost any other that could have happened—gave him, as he frequently afterwards expressed it, a sense of “*loneliness*” in the earth, and led him to think that he would ere very long be called upon to lay down his armour altogether and enter into his rest. The event we refer to was the death of his life-long friend and companion in labour, DR. CANDLISH. Dr. Buchanan has left behind him, in his own handwriting, an account of their last interview; and anything more touching could, we think, scarcely be imagined. It is as follows:—

“Went to Edinburgh, 14th October 1873, by 10.30 A.M. train, to see Dr. Candlish, of whose alarming illness I had heard, by letter, from his son. On arriving at 52 Melville Street about mid-day, I found him asleep, partly under the influence of an opiate. At one o’clock he awoke, and was told I was in the house; expressed his gladness to hear it, and sent immediately his daughter M. to ask me to come to his room. He was much moved on seeing me; and as he grasped my hand he drew me towards him, and as I bent over him he kissed me with the tenderest affection. Continuing to keep hold of my hand as I sat down at his bedside, he went on to speak of his happiness at seeing me once more, and of the peculiar comfort it gave him to think that through all the long years that had passed since our personal intercourse and private friendship began no cloud had ever come

between us ; that no misunderstanding or coldness had ever, even for a day, divided us ; that in the midst of the many trying scenes through which we had passed together during the last five or six and thirty years, though we had sometimes differed as to the course to be taken, there was never for a moment any alienation of feeling. 'I have been thinking over it all while lying here,' he said, 'and I cannot remember that there was ever an unpleasant sentence in any one of all the multitude of letters that have passed between us.'

"He then spoke of his approaching end, which he did with the most perfect calmness, but with deep and solemn feeling. He would fain have had a more vivid and realizing sense of eternal things—of sin and salvation—and of the great coming change ; but he was resting on the *Word*, which was sure and unfailing—resting wholly on Christ and on his finished work.

"Alluding to our intimate and lengthened connection with Church affairs,—'We have passed side by side through one eventful chapter of our Church's history. Another,' he said, 'will soon open for the Church at large, and I fear it will be a troublous one.' '*Our work*,' he added, 'is done. Let us be thankful to God that he has enabled us, in some way, to do it.' In so speaking, he was evidently, from his tone and manner, looking at the future as a field with which he had nothing and I had little to do. In connection with that future, Dr. Rainy seemed to come up before his mind, and of him he proceeded to speak with the warmest affection and the highest esteem. His voice trembled with emotion as he gave utterance to the feelings of love and admiration with which he regarded him ; and he fervently blessed God that he had given such a man, at such a time, to the Church. And he begged me, on my return to Glasgow, to tell Dr. Rainy's dear old father what a place his son had in his (Dr. C.'s) heart.

"Before we parted he asked me to pray with him. As I did so, he responded in some brief and broken utterance to almost every petition, and this he did with a burst of deep emotion when I sought for support and comfort in behalf of Mrs. C., who was kneeling at the other side of the bed, and who was the only person present besides our two selves. As I rose from my knees he thanked me most tenderly, and then poured out his grateful acknowledgments to God for all the goodness and mercy he had made to pass before him and to surround him still. He alluded to the many valued and loving friends God had given him—to the members of his own family, and specially to his wife, whose hand he fondly took, and then, turning to me, said, 'What a precious woman she has been to me !'

"I saw he was getting exhausted, and proposed to leave. 'Yes,' he said, 'I am very weak ; unable to stand.' As I raised him up to have his pillow adjusted, his attenuated frame had hardly the weight of a child.

He had a nearly constant pain in the region of the stomach, but made no complaint of any kind; and spoke only of the graciousness of God's dealings with him. His heart seemed full of love to every one about him, and full of contentment and peace. His countenance had lost its careworn look. The furrows of time, and toil, and anxious thought seemed all to have been smoothed out from his broad bright brow. When I took his hand and was saying farewell, he once more drew me towards him and kissed me again; and I went away."

When the death occurred, the fact was at once communicated to Dr. Buchanan by Mr. Meldrum, and the request added that he would comply with the dying wish of Dr. Candlish and preach the customary funeral sermon. His reply was this:—

"GLASGOW, *October 20, 1873.*

"MY DEAR MR. MELDRUM,—Before your telegram arrived, the newspapers had made me aware that Dr. Candlish was no more. It is a sad event for our Church, and especially for those who, like you and myself, stood to him in relations so close and endearing. It gives me a feeling of loneliness such as, under all our many previous bereavements, I never felt—at least, in anything like the same degree—before. The request your telegram conveys—though, of course, to comply with it is inevitable—puts a terrible strain upon me. To stand up in his empty pulpit and to speak of him as dead and gone, is what I do not know how I am to get through. The only comfort in the view of so trying an occasion is, that though the servant dies, the Master lives; and that He has said, 'As thy day, so shall thy strength be!'

"If I find it *possible*, I shall, of course, be at the funeral; but you must arrange with the family to assign me no duty. ROB. BUCHANAN."

To Mr. Maclagan, also, another elder of St. George's, who had been the true and trusted associate at once of Dr. Candlish and of his surviving friend, he wrote a week later:—

"GLASGOW, *October 20, 1873.*

"MY DEAR MR. MACLAGAN,—It was a great gratification to me to receive your affectionate letter two days ago. You have rightly judged of my feelings. The death of our beloved friend has given me a feeling of loneliness such as I never experienced before. This world is no longer the same world to me. This loss has sensibly loosened the ties of time. I trust it has drawn closer those of eternity. I need not say what a strain it will put upon me to go into his pulpit and to speak of him to his people

on Sabbath next. But the promise is sure, 'As thy day, so shall thy strength be!' The great thing is to be rightly 'exercised' under this trial; and not we only, but the Church at large. The loss we have sustained is greater than any of us can easily estimate or fully realize. The comfort is that the Lord liveth, and that he is our Rock. May this sad event keep us all nearer to him.

"I feel deeply thankful that I was privileged to spend a full half-hour with our departed friend as he lay on his death-bed, and while still in full possession of all his powers of mind. *There*, with the great change full in view, he was the same man as ever; only softened into a deeper tenderness. He spoke of his end with perfect calmness and naturalness, and with the most affecting humility. To myself he manifested a warmth of affection I never can forget. Holding my hand in his, he went over our life-long friendship and unchanging attachment to each other. 'Lying here,' he said, 'I have been thinking over it all, and I cannot remember that there was ever a cloud between us for a single day, or that in all the countless letters that passed between us there was ever one unpleasant sentence!'

"I thank God that it was really so; and I also thank him that in you and others, very dear to me, I have still friends whose presence and sympathy will continually recall him who is gone.

"ROB. BUCHANAN."

We may add to these letters another which Dr. Buchanan received from a very old friend—Mr. Percival Bunting. Mr. Bunting is a son of the distinguished Wesleyan minister, Dr. Bunting. Like many others of his communion, he had taken a deep interest in the events of 1843; and was present, for example, at the Inverness Assembly:—

"LONDON, *January 3, 1874.*

"Ever since Dr. Candlish left us, I have thought almost daily of you with much interest and affection. You were so bound together in my still vivid recollections of the great Disruption period, that I have felt as if your twin-soul had been torn from your side, and I stood by to mourn the calamity. But, after all, there is a settled sunshine around it all. He has died just as we might have wished; and you survive well, as our repeated inquiries after you always assure us, happy, honoured, and with the sense of great service, and the certainty of future service, to the same blessed Master. May your days yet be many, your labours successful, your family increasingly happy, and the Church which owes you a debt she can never pay, united, prosperous—all her history demands from her.

T. PERCIVAL BUNTING."

This loosening of his ties to the world, however, did not lessen his interest in the Church, or cause him to neglect what it still seemed to lie to his hand to do. He began, indeed, to make arrangements for his retirement from public life, and it was manifest to all that he was taking every convenient opportunity to give place to Dr. Rainy, whom both he and Dr. Candlish, with a generous confidence, recognized as providentially raised up to occupy the position which they themselves had been so long enabled to fill. But there were two things with which he felt he had still much to do. The one was the Sustentation Fund; the other was the Union which it was proposed to form between the Free and Reformed Presbyterian Churches. The Reformed Church had been one of the negotiating bodies; and in 1873 the Conferences came to an end with it as well as with the others. But there were no strong objections felt in any quarter to a union with this branch of the Church of Scotland; and hence, after a brief pause, the question was raised whether one breach at least in our Scottish Presbyterianism might not even yet be healed. Dr. Buchanan was not spared to witness a consummation in which he would have delighted. The amalgamation of the Free and Reformed Presbyterian Churches did not take place till May 1876; but we know in the most direct way that his heart was intently set upon it, and that one of the things which greatly occupied his mind and engaged his active attention before he set out for Italy, was the making of the arrangements required for having the business connected with the proposed Union carried satisfactorily through the Assembly of 1875.

“I have been confined,” he writes to Mr. Maclagan on January 5, 1875, “to the house since Sabbath week by a sharp bronchial attack. It is now taking its leave under the more mild temperature we now enjoy; and especially in the

absence of the terribly stifling and *choky* atmosphere which for twenty days enveloped the city. I never had anything like so severe and uncomfortable an attack before. I quite remember how the *strain* of the Ten Years' Conflict told on my health for some years after it closed; and I suspect I am now feeling, in the heart's somewhat languid action, the result of the anxieties that were connected with the later part of the Union struggle. Besides all which, the load of seventy-two years is an enfeebling burden.

"I am beginning to make arrangements for my approaching visit to Rome. Mrs. Buchanan and two of my daughters—Charlotte and Harriet—go with me, which makes the prospect much more agreeable than it would otherwise, at my time of life, be. Our intention is to start on Monday the 25th. We shall make breaks of a day each at London, Paris, Turin, and Florence. At the last we shall probably stay three or four days. We hope to get to Rome about the 3rd or 4th of February. I am *due* on Sabbath the 7th in the Scotch Free Church. I take only one diet each Sabbath; the other will be taken, probably, by a minister of the Established Church.

"I have written to Dr. Goold to acquaint him with my approaching absence, and to ask whether he and his Reformed Presbyterian Committee will be ready for another joint-meeting the week after next. This, I suppose, will depend on their being ready with their written statement of the footing on which they are willing to unite with us. I should like much to see the matter taking shape before leaving home. I mean to ask Rainy to act as vice-chairman of the Free Church Union Committee. Goold's statement at our last meeting was most admirable, and gave you, I am sure, as much satisfaction as it did all the rest of us."

The last Assembly at which Dr. Buchanan was present was

that of 1874. He spoke very little in the course of its proceedings, and he even left the direction of the business of the House very much in the hands of Dr. Rainy; but he was ever ready with his counsels: and those who witnessed it will not soon forget the affecting proofs which were then, as formerly, given of the affectionate veneration in which he was held. In a popular Assembly, when exciting questions are being discussed, it is impossible to prevent an *emeute* occasionally taking place,—a momentary confusion being the order of the day, with several speakers, it may be, on their legs at once, and a chaos reigning on which ordinary people look with helplessness and dismay. Such scenes have sometimes occurred even in the grave Assembly of the Free Church, and when they have happened there they have occasionally defied for a season the pacificatory efforts of the Moderator himself. But the rising of the stately form of Buchanan was always the signal for a subsidence of the storm, and men of all parties at once settled down with a hush to hear what the Nestor of the Church had to recommend.

His only speech of any length at this Assembly of 1874, was one on the Sustentation Fund; and we quote some sentences from it here, not merely because it was one of his last public utterances, or because it illustrates his life-long interest in the Scheme, but because the words themselves contain a weighty testimony in favour of a system of Church Finance which other Churches may be constrained by-and-by to study very earnestly for themselves:—

#### RECOGNITION OF GOD'S GRACE.

“This, which I now lay on the table of the General Assembly, is the thirty-first Annual Report of the Committee on the Sustentation Fund. In the course of that lengthened period our Church has passed through many trying vicissitudes. Thrown as she was, by the Disruption of 1843, into a position altogether new, and compelled, in consequence, to deal with questions and to adjust herself to a state of things of

which she had no previous experience, it is no wonder that serious differences should have at times arisen among us—differences grave enough to have more than once greatly agitated us all, and to have threatened the Church itself with dangers of a truly painful kind. From these conflicts of opinion the Sustentation Fund has by no means been altogether free. Views at entire variance with one another, as to the principles and methods of its distribution, have been occasionally discussed and pressed with a keenness which it was impossible to contemplate without anxiety. If hitherto we have been carried safely through these commotions, and if our great Central Fund has gone on steadily increasing in spite of them all, I believe it is due to the fact that our differences were, in the main, honest and sincere. If brethren took opposite sides in these hot debates, it was because they held opposite views of what was best and wisest and most for the good of the Church. He who is ‘the Head of the Body,’ and whose patience with us presents so striking a contrast to our impatience with each other, has borne with us in consideration of the ends we were seeking; though, doubtless, the way in which we sometimes sought them must have been deeply grieving to his holy and loving Spirit, and ought, in the recollection and review of it, to humble us in his sight. Surely it is on some such grounds as these that alone we can explain the present singularly encouraging condition of our Sustentation Fund. Twelve months ago, things were in such a state among us that not only those who were waiting for our Church’s halting, but very many even of her best and warmest friends, were in the full belief that we were on the eve of a great disaster. But the dark clouds which then hung over us, and which seemed ready to burst in a desolating storm, broke suddenly into calm and sunshine; giving us, as had so often happened before, only a fresh occasion for setting up another stone of remembrance, and for saying gladly and gratefully, ‘Hitherto the Lord hath helped us.’ A year which threatened to be one of calamity and strife sufficient to have blighted and marred every work and interest of the Church, has thus become, under the gracious working of God’s mighty hand, a year of perhaps greater prosperity, both material and spiritual, for our Church, than she has ever before known since the memorable 1843.”

#### STATE ENDOWMENTS OR FREE-WILL OFFERINGS?

“As regards the Sustentation Fund, the increase amounts this year to no less a sum than £15,789, 8s. 6d.; and its total income since last Assembly has reached the goodly figure of £152,112, 8s. 4d. In other words, while the increase within the year represents a capital sum of nearly £400,000, the total income of the fund within the year if it were the produce of an endowment, would require that endowment to be of the value of at least three millions seven hundred and fifty thousand pounds. For my part, I greatly prefer to see this noble annual revenue for the sup-



port of the gospel coming in as it does from the countless and continuous free-will offerings of the Church's own members, rather than to have had it provided by the gigantic and once-for-all contributions, whether of a whole community or of half-a-dozen millionaires. I frankly confess that once I was of another mind. Education and habit, and the one-sidedness which results from looking at a subject from a single and a prejudiced point of view, led me to think very differently on this matter from what I do now. I can now look at it from more sides than one. I have now had a pretty full experience of both systems, and I have come to a clear and conclusive judgment in favour of the one with which Christ's Church began, and which he evidently meant to be permanent when, by his Holy Spirit, he guided an apostle to say, 'Let him that is taught in the word communicate to him that teacheth in all good things.'

"It is certainly not easy to show how it can be either right or expedient that one generation should take upon it the support of Christ's Church, in any particular community, for all the generations that are to follow. Such an arrangement may be very agreeable to our natural selfishness and love of ease, but it undoubtedly tends to deaden the sense of personal responsibility, to repress that spirit of self-sacrifice which is the very law of the Christian life, and to hinder the cultivation and exercise of that sense of dependence on God which is so needful to keep us, both as individuals and as a Church, ever looking to and ever leaning on him."

#### NEED OF LIFE IN THE CHURCH.

"It is quite true that this system of support can be successfully and permanently maintained only in a living Church. But surely this, instead of being regarded as a defect or a disadvantage, ought rather to be viewed as a recommendation and a blessing. Although, in order to carry on her work, the Church must have money, it is not her money that converts and saves men's souls. This is, under God, the Church's work; this is her great and glorious mission; and being, as it is, a mission and work purely spiritual, it can be successfully prosecuted only by spiritual means. Not, therefore, the Church that is richest in money, but the Church that is richest in spiritual gifts and graces, richest in the knowledge of divine truth, richest in love of Christ, richest in faith, richest in spiritual wisdom, in holy devotedness, in prayerful zeal, is the one that will do most for the real furtherance of God's cause and kingdom in this fallen world.

"But while nothing save this freshness and fulness of spiritual life in the Church can fit her for the high and sacred service given her to do, it is not less true that the same state of things which ensures the Church's spiritual prosperity will also, in all ordinary circumstances, equally ensure the supply of all her temporal wants. When the members of a Church have first given their ownelves unto the Lord, they will not fail to give both

of their sympathies and of their substance unto his servants, 'according to the will of God.'"

THE RESULTS AND THE LESSONS OF THE DISRUPTION.

"I sometimes venture to think there is a book which has yet to be written, and which perhaps might have for its title, 'The Results and the Lessons of the Disruption.' Its results have been many and various; and so have been, and are, its lessons too. One of its results, and certainly not the least, is our Sustentation Fund; and one of its most valuable lessons is the illustration that fund has given of the reliance that may be placed on the voluntary liberality of the Christian people. The revenues of the Crown, imposed and exacted by statute law and civil force, do not come into the nation's treasury with greater steadiness or regularity than does this fund of ours. It has in it the divine 'quality' of that 'mercy which is not strained, but droppeth as the gentle dew from heaven.' It blesses 'both him that gives and him that takes.' To the givers it is a means of grace—a means of elevating and ennobling their own souls. To the receivers it is a precious encouragement in their work, and a sweet assurance of the love and faithfulness at once of the people to whom they minister and of the Master they serve.

"When we were leaving our churches and manses, our stipends and glebes, and, under constraint of conscience, were following our King and Lord into the seemingly desert place into which allegiance to him had brought us, had we been then and there told that the five barley loaves and the few small fishes which constituted our slender store, would so swell and multiply as not only to suffice and sustain our entire ministry, even after it should have grown to twice its original numbers, but so as at the end of a whole generation to leave much more than there was at the beginning—the man who so prophesied would have been treated, by even the most sanguine of us, as one that dreamed. And yet all this has been to the letter realized.

"Our Sustentation Fund, under the immense impulse of the Disruption, rose in the very first year of its existence to the goodly sum of £68,000. And now, in its thirty-first year, after the Disruption has receded into the comparative remoteness of a bygone generation, instead of being exhausted or even impaired by this lapse of time, it has much more than doubled its original amount; while the entire revenue of our disendowed and dis-established Church has this year reached the noble amount of £511,000—a sum which, as annual income, would represent a capital of nearly thirteen millions. In view of facts like these, well may we, with mingled wonder and gratitude, exclaim, 'What hath God wrought?'"

THE TIMES AND THE SCOTTISH PEOPLE.

"The times in which we live are remarkable times. The cost of living, even since 1867, is very greatly increased. In the year in question, I

presented statistics to the Assembly which clearly proved that the average advance of remuneration for service in secular life was not less than forty per cent. in the case of artisans; and that, in the case of the higher kinds of labour, it was not less than one hundred per cent. That great advance has become greater still in a very remarkable degree during the last seven years. In these circumstances, it will be both unworthy and unwise on the part of the Free Church, if it fail vigorously to carry forward the movement in which we are so hopefully engaged for the increase of the Sustentation Fund. The wealth of the country has risen in a far greater proportion than that of any of the claims we are proposing to make upon it. The liberality also of which last year has given us so striking an example, in the case not only of the Sustentation Fund, but of all the funds of the Church, seems conclusively to show that God has been giving to our people the fundamental requisite of a 'willing mind.' So much is this the case, that one feels as if we had got back again into the loving and large-hearted spirit of Disruption times. Many other things, indeed, at this particular juncture carry back our thoughts to that memorable era of our Church's history. Events and movements in the political world are reminding us of the great principles for which we testified and suffered in 1843, and are loudly calling on us to stand by them as firmly as ever. All things are thus conspiring to remind us of what the men of that day did and sacrificed for the honour of Christ's kingdom and crown, and to suggest, with equal force and tenderness, what the members of the Church ought to do on their side in support of the same noble cause. And in order to recall to the Church what those sacrifices were, and what was the noble spirit in which they were made, I do not know that I could find fitter, or truer, or more touching words than those of Lord Cockburn, the distinguished father-in-law of our Moderator,\* as we find them recorded in his recently published and intensely interesting Journal. The words to which I allude are these --and with them I conclude. Speaking of the sacrifices and the men of the Disruption, he said,—'Yet those sacrifices were made by Churchmen, and not by a few enthusiastic ones; and with no bitterness, with some just pride, but with no boasting, no weak lamentations, but easily, contentedly, cheerfully. I have conversed with many of them, especially of obscure country ministers, who are below all idea of being consoled by the fame and the large congregations which may support a few of the city leaders, and their gentleness and gaiety are inconceivable. But the truth is, that these men would all have gone to the scaffold with the same serenity. What similar sacrifice has ever been made in the British Empire? Among what other class, either in Scotland or in England, could such a proceeding have occurred? The doctors? The lawyers? Oxford? The English Church? The Scotch lairds? It is the most

\* Dr. Stewart of Leghorn.

honourable fact for Scotland that its whole history supplies. The common sneers at the venality of our countrymen, never just, are now absurd !”

The public life of Dr. Buchanan was, as we have seen, a sufficiently busy one ; but in following *it* only, we necessarily form a very incomplete conception of the amount of labour he endured for others. No one who has not had the opportunity of looking over his correspondence, can have any adequate idea of the time and thought and care he gave in private to help and advise those who were in difficulty or perplexity. People wrote to him from all parts of the country, and about all sorts of things ; and nothing could exceed the courtesy and kindness and patience with which he endeavoured to be of service. It is said that, in the English Church, Keble became in his later years a centre around which the members of his party circled, and that nothing was ever done by any of them without more or less of consultation with him. It may be said of Dr. Buchanan, that he occupied at last such a position in the Free Church. To take counsel with him, was the resource which naturally suggested itself to very many everywhere when anything occurred which affected the weal of the Church at large, or was invested with difficulties which it did not seem easy rightly to overcome. As but one specimen of the kind of service he was thus able to render, we may give the following note, which the venerable Dr. Roxburgh of Glasgow has placed at our disposal. Dr. Roxburgh, on account of failing health, was proposing to resign his charge.

“2 SANDYFORD PLACE, *October 31, 1874.*

“MY VERY DEAR FRIEND,—I have read the papers herewith returned with much emotion. They have touched my inmost heart. ‘We all do fade as doth a leaf!’ I am three years your senior ; and though I have enjoyed wonderful health, the tokens are silently gathering about me which foretell the near approach of the time when necessity will be laid upon me to follow your course.

“Meanwhile, I need not say how willingly I shall do anything by

which I can testify the warmth of my affection for you. The papers are *perfect* in all respects; nothing could be more complete. I think the representation of the session and congregation should be there at the opening of the Presbytery, at least by half-past twelve o'clock; and I shall take care to have the case brought on immediately after the reading of the minutes.

“The fact that such a service is to take place, is an additional reason for my getting away from the Presbytery early.

“I fondly hope and pray that your release from the labour and anxiety of pulpit and pastoral work may be the means of prolonging your valuable life, and greatly adding to the ease and comfort of your latter years.—With affectionate regards to Mrs. Roxburgh and yourself,

“ROBERT BUCHANAN.”

The idea that Dr. Buchanan should spend a winter in Rome, was first suggested by the late Sheriff Cleghorn, who was at the time Convener of the Free Church Continental Committee. He had certainly much need of rest; and as the state of the Church in 1874 was such as to admit of his absence for a time without inconvenience, the propriety of his going was probably pressed upon him by various friends. He entertained the idea, when it was placed before him, with considerable cordiality. “The idea of our going to Rome,” writes Mrs. Buchanan, “when first mentioned took me very much by surprise. As the time drew near when it was necessary for him to give his answer, I found his heart seemed more and more set upon it. He thought it was something worth spending a little money upon, and that he would like two of the girls to accompany us. There is no doubt he had a strong impression that his health would be much benefited by the change, and having the opportunity of spending the most trying part of the winter in a better climate. I can never feel anything but thankful that his desire was gratified, and that he was not only permitted to see and also enjoy Rome, but, what he prized much also, had the opportunity of preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ there.”

Of course, when it was understood that his mind was set

on going to Rome, a willingness was expressed on all hands to smooth his way. His colleague in the College Church, Mr. Reith, at once, for example, offered to charge himself with all the trouble of procuring supply for their joint-pulpit in his absence.

“GLASGOW, *December 29, 1874.*”

“Accept my warmest thanks for your very kind note,” was Dr. Buchanan’s reply. “I am reluctant to lay on you so heavy a burden as that of finding supply for the pulpit during my contemplated absence from home; and all the rather that your hands, one way and another, are so full of work. I can think of it only on the footing of your availing yourself freely of the help of co-presbyters, many of whom, I know, are most willing to take a share of the work. I mean, of course, to tell the Presbytery of my appointment to a three months’ charge at Rome, and to ask the necessary leave of absence. This will be done, *D. V.*, to-morrow week. On that occasion it would be expected that I should give the needful assurance that my place in the pulpit will be supplied under your auspices; and in doing this it will be a good occasion for me to express my hope that brethren will occasionally help.”

To Mr. Reith he wrote again a week later, expressing his regret that he could not be present at a meeting of Deacons’ Court, and indicating at the same time some of the reasons which had influenced him to undertake the service which was now before him:—

“2 SANDYFORD PLACE, *January 5, 1875.*”

“Though I find myself very much better, and hope to be able to go out to-day to see one or two ailing people, I shall not venture out at night, and will in consequence be absent from the meeting of Deacons’ Court, which I much regret. In my absence will you kindly mention to the brethren that it was my intention and wish to have formally communicated to them—what I dare say they already know by public report—that the Assembly’s Continental Committee have urgently requested me to take charge of our church at Rome this spring during the months of February, March, and April? I have agreed to do so, subject to the consent of the Presbytery, partly on considerations connected with the importance of the charge, and the privilege of preaching the gospel, before my ministry closes, in that remarkable city, and partly also on grounds of health. The bronchial affection from which I have suffered so much within the last few weeks makes me very willing to try the effect of a more genial climate during the cold east winds of a Scotch spring. In addition to these reasons for

accepting this appointment of the Continental Committee, there is this further argument, as *they* think, that it may be in my power to be of some use in the way of *trying*, at least, to bring about a better understanding between the Waldensian Church and the *Chiesa Libera* of Italy. It is most hurtful to the cause of the gospel that these two bodies should be so ill agreed as they are at present. I am, as you know, to have only one service each Sabbath; the *other* we give to some representative of the Established or United Presbyterian Church. I believe Dr. Munro of Campsie is likely to be my colleague. The object of this is to avoid the needless multiplication of churches in the face of the common enemy.

“Of course you will kindly explain the arrangements we have agreed on for the College Church. I hope to be present at the meeting of Session next week, when these arrangements will be talked over.”

The Free Church has all along taken a very deep interest in the Continent, and, chiefly through the influence of Dr. Stewart of Leghorn, it has been led to devote a great deal of its attention to Italy. In connection with its work in that country, it has established regular charges in several of its cities,—in Leghorn, in Florence, in Genoa, in Naples, and in Rome. For some time since the lamented death of Dr. James Lewis, its first minister, the church at Rome has been vacant, and it has been supplied during successive seasons, until a permanent minister could be obtained, by relays of ministers sent out from home. It was to fill this post for three months that Dr. Buchanan was invited by the Continental Committee; and although his acceptance of the appointment led to his last journey, so that when he turned his face toward Italy he left Scotland for ever, yet it is satisfactory to know that those who were dearest to him never regretted the step which he took; that, indeed, in their opinion, he thus in all probability prolonged for a brief season his life in the world. By an arrangement intended to prevent the exposure in such a city of the spectacle of a divided Presbyterianism, the Free Church has for some winters invited several of her sister Churches to share with her in the main-

tenance of religious services. In consistency with this plan, Dr. Munro of Campsie was selected in 1875 to represent the Established Church of Scotland. He and Dr. Buchanan occupied the pulpit of the Roman Free Church alternately ; and it will remain as a pleasant memory to the survivor, that the two colleagues carried on the work most harmoniously, and parted at last with a feeling of mutual respect.



## CHAPTER XXIV.

### ROME.

ACCOMPANIED by his wife and two of his daughters, Charlotte and Harriet, Dr. Buchanan left home on the 25th of January 1875. After spending two days in London, they proceeded, by way of Dover and Calais,\* to Paris; and from thence, by the Mont Cenis Tunnel, to Turin. Florence was reached late on Saturday evening, but the long and rapid journey had left no evil effects. Dr. Buchanan preached next forenoon for Mr. M'Dougall in the Free Church, and was "as vigorous as possible." He also took part, on Monday afternoon, in the prayer-meeting. Four days were given to Florence, and were spent partly in sight-seeing, partly in conference with Dr. Stewart and Mr. Miller of Genoa, who had come to the city to hold a Presbytery meeting. On Thursday, the 4th of February, the party proceeded on their way to Rome, and reached it the same evening at half-past six. For the first two days of their residence they lived at a hotel; but they succeeded after some trouble in securing very pleasant rooms in 25 Via dell' Angelo Custode, and there they remained during the whole time of their stay. The Carnival was going on when they

\* Dr. Buchanan had a great fondness for the sea. Hence his intense pleasure in the yacht-voyages to which reference has already been made. One is prepared, therefore, to find that the crossing of the Channel, which so many remember with horror, was a pleasant reminiscence to him. "The crossing from Dover to Calais," he writes to his son, "was to me a great enjoyment."

thus took up their abode in the Eternal City, and they spent a portion of their first Saturday afternoon in a balcony on the Corso, watching the many extraordinary sights which are to be witnessed there at that season.

On the same day (Saturday) he sent his first letter from Rome to his daughter Isabella, who was left behind in charge of the household in Glasgow.

(To Miss Isabella Buchanan.)

“ROMA, February 6, 1875.

“We have been in such a constant bustle since getting to Rome on Thursday night, as to have found it impossible to write. The journey from Florence was delightful; the scenery often magnificent, and the day delicious. But next morning all was changed. It rained in torrents—a cold *sleety* rain—and blew hard. I never experienced a worse day in Scotland. In the midst of it we had to set out on a search for lodgings. After long labour and climbing stairs till I was done up, at last we lighted on excellent apartments,—dear, but excellent,—with a south exposure and no *back* rooms. Seeing people and making arrangements have exhausted every moment,—and we have still a multitude of details to attend to,—so that I simply write a line to let you know we are all well.

“We were eager to get out of the hotel, which was not comfortable, but which was extravagant, and would have soon ruined us.

“Rome is a most expensive place—travelling is fully dearer than in England.

“We have done *nothing* in sight-seeing yet, except that we climbed the Pincian Hill for a *coup d'œil* of the city. It cleared up yesterday afternoon, but was bitterly cold.

“To-day it is *brilliant*, but still as cold as Scotland. We shall all write in *fulness* on Monday, after the quiet of the Sabbath.”

When Sabbath the 7th of February came Dr. Munro had not arrived, and as no suitable help could be procured Dr. Buchanan conducted both the services in the church. With regard to this and other things he thus writes to his colleague, Mr. Reith:—

(To Rev. G. Reith.)

“ROMA, PALAZZA TORLONIA, 25 VIA ANGELO CUSTODE,  
February 8, 1875.

“At length we have got ourselves settled in the ‘Eternal City.’ We arrived on the evening of Thursday last, after a most pleasant and interest-

ing journey from Florence. Indeed, the weather all the way from Glasgow was most favourable—for the most part bright and reasonably warm. *Here*, on the contrary, it is cold as a Northern winter. The day after we arrived it rained in torrents,—a sleety rain,—that froze one's very bones. Towards evening it cleared up, and since then it has been as bright as one could wish, but still as cold as ever. Our first employment was to find suitable lodgings. After climbing many a long stair, we at last fell on this house, which promises to suit us pretty well. It sounds very grand to date one's letters from a palace; but most of the lodgings here are flats of old palaces, and our apartments are of this class. They are dear enough. The price we pay would be considered high in Edinburgh. Any minister who undertakes to come to Rome to serve the *Chiesa Libera Scozzese*, must lay his account with being a good deal out of pocket. I began work yesterday, and had to preach twice, as no suitable supply could be got for the afternoon. Dr. Munro does not arrive till some day this week. The two services and a walk of a mile *four times* were about as much as my strength was equal to, but I am thankful to say I feel none the worse. The church is neat outside, and the interior is very pretty. In the forenoon we had an audience of above a hundred, and in the afternoon about *eighty*—which was considered an unusually large attendance for that diet. Travellers hitherto have been much fewer than in former years, but it is expected that from this time they will increase. Rome is approaching the end of the Carnival, and is *en fête* accordingly. The Corso on Saturday was a scene of the most ludicrous kind. It was a realization of, 'All the world's a stage, and all the men and women merely players.' Such an exhibition of *tomfoolery* could be seen nowhere else in the world. Indeed, it was little better yesterday. When we came out of church we found ourselves immediately in the midst of a crowd of mummers and masqueraders of the most fantastic description. Such is the result of the religious teaching of the Church of Rome—here, at the very seat and centre of its power.

“At Florence I preached in Mr. M'Dougall's church, which is a perfect beauty—model of elegance and good taste. His house is part of the same building, which is an old palace of the Medici. The whole establishment is such as to give the Free Church a good social position in Florence, and helps Mr. M'Dougall to draw people around him. I went with him to see the old church, which he bought and refitted for the Italian missions carried on by the Chiesa Libera, and also the schools connected with it; and was much pleased with the whole. I also attended a meeting of the Presbytery of Italy, which was attended by Dr. Stewart and Donald Miller from Genoa, and also by M'Dougall and two or three elders. Their next meeting is to be here—in Rome—on the 27th March. Along with Miller I went over the Waldensian College in the Salviati Palace, and saw Professor Comba teaching the students—fourteen in number—a nice-looking set of young men. I met also with the other Professors—Geymonât and Revel—

and thought them all capable men, and much taken up with their work. At the same time I examined their elementary schools, which seem to be well conducted. I also saw their printing-press in full operation. Altogether, the Waldensians are evidently doing a good work.

“I fear there is no sympathy between them and the Chiesa Libera. I must be very cautious in what I say or do here on this subject. For a while I must *look on* and judge for myself. There are evidently many *cliques* and *coteries* in Rome, and one must feel one’s way among them before knowing how to act and whom to trust. The people here are all in great spirits about Garibaldi. He has behaved so well, and is in such friendly relations with the king. I saw His Majesty yesterday driving in an open carriage, unaccompanied by any guard. He seems very popular. On Saturday night the editor of the most Radical and Republican journal was stabbed to death in his own office by an assassin. It is said to have been a *vendetta privata*, and to have had nothing to do with politics.”

A meeting of Kirk-Session was held on the 11th, when it was decided to have the communion on the 21st, and to resume the weekly prayer-meeting—that meeting to be held every Tuesday in Dr. Buchanan’s drawing-room, the church being rather out of the way. Dr. Munro arrived on Saturday the 13th, and after that the burden of the whole services was divided between them.

(To Mr. Maclagan.)

“ROMA, February 13, 1875.

“I had the great pleasure of receiving in due course your most welcome letter; and on the very next day Mrs. Buchanan and I called at the Hotel Possidoni, which is not much more than five minutes’ walk from this house. Mrs. Ker and her party were all out; but they returned our call on the following day. Fortunately we were at home, and it was a great pleasure to us all to make their acquaintance. We hope to see them often; and have been much delighted with what we have already seen.

“The weather is much colder than I had expected it to be. We have strong frost every night. I saw *icicles* yesterday two feet long! The only counterbalancing circumstance is that the sky is generally *brilliant*. Its *blue* is something wonderful. To see the domes, and towers, and lofty buildings glowing in the golden radiance of the setting sun, and *framed*, so to speak, in the azure heavens, is something indescribable, and never to be forgotten. It is the thing that strikes me more than anything else. It gives a glory to the architecture of the city which it would utterly lose if it stood under our colourless and murky skies.

“Our Free church is a neat little structure outside, and in the interior is really elegant and most commodious. I preached at both diets last Sabbath, as Dr. Munro had not arrived. He came last night; so that henceforth I shall not be overtaken. I am going to announce to-morrow that there will be a prayer-meeting in my apartments every Tuesday forenoon at eleven A.M., which for a week-day is judged to be the most convenient hour. I am to dispense the communion to-morrow week.

“We had upwards of a hundred at church last Sabbath forenoon, and over eighty in the afternoon. The *latter* attendance was thought very large. Visitors from both Britain and America have been few this winter, but it is thought they will increase from this time.

“I have met with the representatives of various Evangelical Churches since I came here,—the Waldensian, the Chiesa Libera, the Wesleyan Methodist, the American Methodist Episcopal Church. *Cliques* and *coteries* abound. In moving among them one must ‘gang warily,’ keeping eyes and ears open, and mouth shut; or, as the Italians say, ‘Viso sciolto, ma pensieri stretti.’

“Gavazzi called on me two days ago. From him I heard that the great *move* the Liberals in the Italian Chamber are preparing for, is, in case of the Pope’s death, to resist the granting to *his successor* of the privileges guaranteed to himself. He says that to aid in this movement is *one* of the objects which has brought Garibaldi to Rome, and which has induced him to take his seat in the Parliament.”

After his second Sabbath in Rome, Dr. Buchanan writes as follows to his son-in-law, Mr. John M'Laren :—

(To John M'Laren, Esq.)

“ROMA, February 15, 1875.

“I assure you it is no easy thing to find time for correspondence amid the engrossing sights and distractions of this wonderful city. I had intended to write you much sooner, but have found it impossible. We are now beginning, however, to feel a little more at home, and are getting to know the ways of the place. Friends are gathering around us; we are gradually finding out what we have got to do; and we shall be better able by-and-by to settle down. My colleague, Dr. Munro, has arrived, which takes a good deal of the work off my hands.

“To-day, for the first time, it is a little warmer, and they tell us that very soon the cold will pass away. Strange to say, I have taken no harm from the cold. I suppose it is the dryness and clearness of the air that keeps one all right. I am certainly very much better in health, and very much stronger, than when I left Scotland. We have all most ravenous appetites; and as the food we get is excellent, and admirably cooked, we

are thriving immensely. Living here is quite as expensive as at home—in many things *more* so. It is only, I think, the wine that is cheaper; and it is *very* cheap—that is, if one is contented to drink the wine of the country, which all sensible people do. It is sold in flasks, which hold about three English quarts; and the price of the flask is about a shilling! It is an excellent wholesome wine—not strong, of course, but pleasant and refreshing.

“As yet we have been so much occupied in getting ourselves settled, and in meeting with the people connected with the congregation of the Free Church, that we have not done very much in the way of sight-seeing. St. Peter’s, the Coliseum, the Arch of Titus, and a few other things, have only served to whet our appetite for the feast of sight-seeing that is awaiting us.

“We have met with the ministers of most of the Protestant Churches here,—the *Evangelical* Episcopalian, the Wesleyan Methodist, the Waldensian, the Chiesa Libera Italiana, the American, &c. All of them have called on us, and seem to be worthy men. Garibaldi we hope to see by-and-by. Gavazzi called on us, and told us a great deal about what is going on.

“I see from the Roman newspapers that there is a good deal of uneasiness on the part of the Italian Government as to the proceedings of the bishops and clergy of the Papal Church. Vigliani, the member of Government who has the charge of what they call ‘grace and worship,’ has just issued a long letter to the Attorney-General of the Roman Government, instructing him to see that the utterances of the clergy, in their addresses to the people during *Lent*, are carefully watched, and that any attempt to use the pulpit for purposes of political mischief be reported at once, and properly dealt with.

“But I must close. Warmest love to dear Annie and all the children.”

“Our sight-seeing,” writes one of the party, “was done deliberately; that is to say, we never went sight-seeing from morning to night. We visited one or more sights every day, but that had to be varied by visiting friends. Many people who sat in the Scotch church were kind enough to call, and tea-parties were incessant. As to the sights we did see, they were innumerable. Places like St. Peter’s, the Coliseum, the Cæsars’ Palace, the Capitol, the Pantheon, St. Paul’s, St. John Lateran, &c., we went to frequently. The Vatican and all the different galleries we visited once or more. In the Vatican the stairs are endless; but papa went up them as easily as any of us,—only remarking to us at the

time, 'I couldn't have done this at home!' Of course Rome was not new to papa; still he was as eager and enthusiastic a sight-seer as any one could be. Sometimes in the afternoons we visited some of the studios, or took long drives to some of the villas in the neighbourhood. On one occasion papa drove with some friends out to Appii Forum and the Three Taverns. Another day Mr. and Mrs. White of Overton drove papa and mamma to Tivoli. They started at nine in the morning, and stopped on the way at Adrian's Villa, spent an hour and a half rambling over the ruins and grounds, and then drove on to Tivoli. At Tivoli they dined; and afterwards the whole party, mounted on donkeys, set off for the waterfalls and Neptune's Grotto, which are indescribably wonderful and beautiful. Then they went to the Villa d'Este, a grand place, fast going to decay. From the balcony of the villa there is a splendid view of the vast plain between Tivoli and Rome. They did not reach home till half-past seven in the evening. Papa and Mr. White visited Gavazzi's schools near the Vatican next day, and were greatly pleased with them."

This short summary gives a general idea of the way in which a portion of the time of Dr. Buchanan was spent in the Eternal City. For a closer view we must resort again to his correspondence:—

*(To Principal Douglas.)*

“ROMA, February 16, 1875.

“Our *salon* is quite large enough to accommodate the congregational prayer-meeting which we are to have every Tuesday forenoon. This prayer-meeting had been suspended in order to make better room for a *union* prayer-meeting. It turned out, however,—I do not quite know from what cause,—that the union meeting, meant to include all the Evangelical Churches, has had actually a smaller attendance—not so many as twenty—than was wont to assemble in connection with the Free Church congregation alone. At a meeting of Session after I arrived, we resolved, in these circumstances, to resume our own meeting, and to give, at the same

time, as much countenance as we can to the union meeting too. The first of our own meetings takes place this forenoon. The girls are at this moment preparing the room for the reception of the company. Dr. Munro will preside alternately with me; but the meeting will always be in the same place. On Friday the *union* meeting is to be held in the Free Church; and the Rev. Fairfax Nursey, of the *Evangelical* Episcopal Church, is to preside. His church was got up chiefly by Dr. Gason, a medical man here, as a refuge from the ultra-Ritualism and *more than semi-Popery* of the regular Episcopal Church. It is melancholy to think of the representative of a Church which used to be boasted of as 'the bulwark of the Protestant faith' going almost the whole length of formally renouncing Protestantism and siding with the Church of Rome. But so it is; and though it is, the English people crowd to it as readily as if there was nothing wrong. The power of *habit* and *fashion* is, with the majority of English Church people, omnipotent.

"There is evidently considerable uneasiness at present, on the part of the Italian Government, as to the proceedings of the Papal clergy. Vighiani, the Minister of 'grace and justice,' has just issued a public letter to the 'Procureur-General' of the Roman Court of Appeal, calling on him to take special care that the pulpits of the Roman Church be not turned into engines of political mischief, by sowing sedition among the people. He orders the high legal officer in question to take measures to *watch* their proceedings, and to report immediately any infraction of the laws on this subject, that repressive measures may be adopted. I suppose this manifesto is meant to have special reference to the harangues of the *Lent* preachers, who have just begun their annual work. I intend going to hear some of them by-and-by.

"I fear it will not be easy to bring about a reconciliation between the Waldensians and the Chiesa Libera. The one will hardly believe anything good of the other. I am feeling my way among them, trying to get at facts, and meanwhile holding my tongue.

"Our prayer-meeting is over. We had upwards of thirty present, and everything went off very nicely. It was a most encouraging commencement.

"I have met with the representatives of nearly all the Evangelical Churches here. They are good men. But as yet the gospel has no *great* man to represent it here. *That* is what is needed. Many of the Lent preachers are powerful popular orators. We want a Savonarola, a man of his earnestness and eloquence, and with clearer views of divine truth."

(To Principal Douglas.)

"ROMA, February 19, 1875.

"I shall be interested to hear what comes of Candlish's motion about a united theological college. If sound sense and the real good of the



Christian Church were to rule the decision, he would have an easy victory. But I fear things are not ripe for such a result. It may be well, however, manfully to raise the question. The seed sown by a judicious and informing speech, such as he will no doubt give, will take root in many minds, and the fruit will be gathered by-and-by. The differences between United Presbyterians and Free Churchmen grow very small, when looked at in the light of such tremendous forces as the truth has to contend with here.

“All the Evangelical Protestantism which as yet exists in Rome is scarcely sufficient to attract the notice of the Papal power. I fear the specimens we have of the Protestant Churches are some of them little fitted to promote its interests. On one side we have the Church of England aping Popery itself, and playing the game of the Man of Sin. On the other extreme we have Plymouthism weakening the hands of the Christian ministry, and by its cliques and coteries disintegrating the Christian Church. What Italy wants is a modern *Savonarola*, with clearer views of divine truth and a more entire dedication to the gospel. A man of his heroic courage, consuming zeal, and commanding eloquence, would do more to shake the Papal throne and to stir the soul of Italy than a thousand of the commonplace men who alone have yet appeared to represent the faith once delivered to the saints.

“As for our own station and most of the others, American and English, they do little more—and it is *much*—than help to preserve their own countrymen from losing the path of their fathers amid the allurements of Rome.

“Our own little church is, I hope, one of the most useful in this way of them all. It draws toward it some of the best of our travellers, and presents to the preacher a most interesting audience. I have very great pleasure in occupying its pulpit. I am to dispense the Lord's Supper in it on Sabbath first. We invite strangers who are members of other Evangelical Churches to join with us—of course, on their *own* responsibility. Some truly pious people always do join on such occasions, and are thus refreshed and strengthened in a dry and thirsty land. Dr. Munro promises to be quite agreeable as an associate in the work. He is sound in the faith, and kindly and courteous in all his relations with me.

“We have had so much to do in opening a friendly acquaintance with the families who belong to the congregation, that we have as yet not been able to do a great deal in the way of sight-seeing. Still we are doing a little. St. Peter's, St. John Lateran, the Coliseum, the Albani and Barberini galleries, are among the places we have visited. We were to have made a thorough inspection of the Palace of the Cæsars yesterday, under the guidance of Dr. Philip; but it rained all day in torrents, and the thing was impossible. The rain has brought heat, and we shall now have a *rush* of vegetation. The rain was much wanted. We are all in excellent health. For myself, I have not been as well for a long time as I feel since coming

here. We have excellent, airy apartments, excellent food, noble appetites, and enough to do to give a constant stimulus to both body and mind."

(To Dr. Adam.)

“ROMA, February 23, 1875.

“I have received your most welcome letter this evening. As to matters of business, I note what you say about the Disestablishment Association. I have made up my mind to limit as much as possible all my *extra* work. Many reasons require me to do this. It is no answer to say the Association would not expect me to do much. I must either take an active and responsible part, or none at all. I cannot possibly give the time and thought to the movement which the position of a vice-president would imply and demand, and I feel myself shut up to the decision of not accepting the office.

“The weather is again very cold. Judging by this season, great delusion prevails as to this climate. It is less damp, less foggy, than Scotland, but quite as cold; while the houses *cannot* be made warm. Now and then we have brilliant days, but in the *shade* it is always cold. Some days ago we thought this state of things was at length at an end, but to-day it is as bad as ever.

“I am getting used to the work here, and feel its importance to be very great. None but those who live here can have an adequate idea of the countless influences that are at work here to draw our countrymen away from serious religion, and to break down their Christian habits and principles. Our Free Church station is one of the most helpful forces on the other side which exist in Rome. I dispensed the communion in the Free Church last Sabbath. We had a congregation of 150, and about 60 joined in the sacrament. It was a sweet and solemn season, and seemed to be much enjoyed. Among the rest there were two English Independent ministers, and the brother of Samuel Morley, the well-known M.P. We have a most encouraging prayer-meeting in our private apartments every Tuesday forenoon.

“We are taking the *sight-seeing* gradually. The place is full of all kinds of interest. I read the Roman newspapers every day, and learn a great deal from them as to the state of feeling here on public questions; but on these I cannot enter. I am sorry to hear of your difficulties about a house. I would fain hope the sky may yet clear, and reveal a way out of the perplexity.”

In the following letter to his son-in-law, Dr. Wilson, Dr. Buchanan describes his visit to Appii Forum and the Three Taverns :—

(To Dr. J. G. Wilson.)

“ROMA, February 26, 1875.

“Through Edith, and others of the family, I have no doubt you have been hearing from time to time of our experiences of life in this profoundly interesting city. One-third nearly of our time here is already gone, and it seems as if we had hardly begun to make ourselves acquainted with the endless objects and scenes of deep historic interest of which the city is full. Two sights of notable importance we have within the last two days explored. One of these is the Appian Way, which stretches out nearly all the way to Albano, fifteen miles off. Under the superintendence of Canina, an eminent archæologist, the ruined monuments which line the way have been disinterred, and present a singular spectacle. From the ground plans and other remains Canina made sketches, by way of showing how beautiful and impressive the Appian Way must have been as the ancient approach to the illustrious capital of the Old World. The evangelist who wrote the Acts of the Apostles tells us that as Paul came towards it his Jewish friends went out to meet him ‘as far as Appii Forum and the Three Taverns.’ About eight miles along this famous road we came to an undoubted *forum*, with all the usual adjuncts of such a place; and quite near it, on the same side of the road, is a building undoubtedly Roman, with three separate entries, and which the contadini, or country people, have known from time immemorial as the ‘Tre Taberne.’ But this is not all. The point of the Appian Way at which these remains are found is the highest point of the road, and commands a complete view of the whole line of the way from Rome on the one side to the horizon on the other. The distance is like that which friends might be expected to come on such an errand, and must have been a natural point at which to wait and watch for his coming. It was deeply interesting to realize such a meeting on the spot where in all probability it took place. The vast Campagna lay all around, stretching away to the sea westwards, and to the Sabine and Alban Hills, and to the snowy Apennines towering above them. It was a scene never to be forgotten. Yesterday, under the guidance of Dr. Philip, who is a master of this kind of work, we went all over the Palatine Hill, which is covered with the ruins of the massive palaces of the Cæsars. There we saw the Judgment Hall in which Paul was condemned, and from which he was led over to the slope of the Capitol, and immured in the Mamertine dungeon, till he was brought out for execution. The palaces of Caligula, Vespasian, and Tiberius are all there,—the very apartments in which the monster Tiberius was brought up,—and wonderfully entire. The whole arrangements of old Roman life among its chiefs and mighty men can all be traced out to this day. There, too, on the same hill are seen the remains of the old Etruscan city of Latium to which Eneas came when he fled from Troy. It is a scene that will require several visits, the ruins are so immense.

The massive mason-work of Latium, constructed as it was of great blocks of travertine, distinguishes it at once from the Roman buildings. But I fear I weary you with these details. They amount to only a mere sample of what Rome has to show. Upon the whole, we have kept wonderfully well. Colds are very prevalent here, and we have not altogether escaped, but we are getting on nicely."

To his son Lawrence he comments with humorous severity on the weather, of which, he tells, the Romans themselves were heartily ashamed.

(To Mr. L. B. Buchanan.)

“ROMA, March 2, 1875.

“As for us *here*, we are sharing, under the modifications of an Italian climate, your bad weather. Of late it has been very variable,—a good deal of rain, the last *two whole days* without stopping. The Romans, like Stewart of the old inn at the Trossachs, ‘are clean ashamed of the weather.’ They don’t know how to hold up their heads in support of a climate that gives such a surprise to strangers. The truth is, so far as *this* season goes—and I suspect it is usually much the same—the reputation of the Roman climate is a delusion. Delicate people ought not to come here. It is a brighter climate than ours, but *quite as cold*, and greatly more treacherous. Their winter, however, I *suppose*, will turn out to be much shorter than ours; and *spring here* will, I hope, be really spring. The doctors are obliged to confess that everybody is ill; but then, they say, ‘nobody dies!’

“In spite of all this we are getting on wonderfully well. We have now been four Sabbaths here, and I have been at my post on all of them. The attendance continues good. But all who know *Rome* remark that it is becoming for English people less of a residence and more of a thoroughfare. People going to and from India come and go this way, and remain only for a week or two, instead of living here for months. My letter to Dr. Wilson will tell you of some of our recent explorations. The last two or three days sight-seeing has been out of the question, save for people hard pressed for time. The Tiber rose very much two days ago, from the melting of snow on the Apennines, and alarmed the people a little. The *ordinary* level of the river at Rome is only eighteen feet above the level of the sea! Of course there is a sluggish flow, and when a flood comes the water cannot get away. Four years ago the river rose twenty-eight feet above its common level, and half drowned the city. Had the Pope had the sense to have come out from his so-called prison in the Vatican, as a true St. Peter in his fishing-boat, with plenty of bread and money for his cargo, he might have carried the day with the poor Romans. What he did not do *Vittoria Emanuele did* and he made Rome truly his own. The Pope was on the

spot, and might therefore have been first; but his bigoted obstinacy lost him his chance, and he is not likely to get another."

After a month's experience, he felt himself entitled to speak with some emphasis of the utility of the services which his Church had established in Rome; and on this and other related subjects he sent an interesting letter to his colleague, Mr. Reith:—

"ROMA, March 11, 1875.

"The attendance at the church is very good indeed. Last Sabbath forenoon, when I preached, it was just about *full*; and the afternoon attendance is now upwards of one hundred. I am more and more convinced that the maintenance of such a church here is not merely a means of greatly adding to the *prestige* and influence of the Free Church with the great body of British people who come to Rome, but a powerful help to their religious life, which there is so *very much* in Rome to chill, if not to deaden and destroy. It is a most interesting audience, always changing, but always important, to which we have thus an opportunity of preaching the glorious gospel of the blessed God. Many of those to whom we preach are either in delicate health themselves, or have relatives with them in that condition. Such hearers are often in a peculiarly receptive and impressible state of mind. Others, again, dazzled by the sight of the imposing ritual of the Roman Church, are not a little in danger of forgetting and forsaking the simple and unpretending worship of our own purer faith. But love of country draws them towards us; and some of them, I trust, nay, I *know*, have got a word in season which has revived their older and better sympathies, and which has come with a power it had hardly ever perhaps exerted at home.

"I have now seen a good deal of what is going on here among the different representatives of Evangelical Churches. By means of schools, week-day and Sabbath, and by preaching in the Italian tongue, a certain amount of good is being done among the natives. But as yet it is not much. The people are willing enough to listen to attacks on the Papal system, but they are for the most part careless and callous as to spiritual religion. At present I see no man in the field at all likely to move the hearts of the people. The process of sap and mine, is the one that is going on at present. Popery is being fatally *weakened* in its influence on this country, and especially on the educated classes; but for *positive* religion, it hardly exists. I am quite convinced that the British and American Churches ought to increase greatly the interest they take in the religious condition of the Continent. To gain the Continent, would be to gain the world. I enter *strongly* into the feeling to which Gladstone has given such eloquent and solemn expression in the close of his second pamphlet. By its

recent action the Papacy has consummated the evil which its whole system and history have been continually intensifying, of destroying all religious belief among those who know of no other religion than that which it teaches and exhibits. Unless God raise up a fresh body of Calvins, Luthers, and the like, in Roman Catholic countries, it does seem as if we must inevitably have ere long an outburst of infidelity which the world has seen nothing to equal, and that may throw even the horrors of the French Revolution of 1789 into the shade.

“But I had no intention of getting into this Cassandra vein when I sat down to write.”

To one who had been all his life long at once an earnest Protestant and a zealous Presbyterian ecclesiastic, there was naturally something very gratifying in the incident which he mentions to Dr. Douglas :—

(*To Principal Douglas.*)

“ROMA, *March 18, 1875.*”

“We had a most interesting meeting of the Presbytery of Italy *here*, in my apartments yesterday. We had Stewart, M'Dougall, D. Miller, and Mr. Gray (presently occupying the Naples charge), and two elders. Of course I also acted, as representing Rome. The Presbytery is in a healthy and vigorous state. I asked Dr. Munro to come and see, and was not sorry he had an opportunity of witnessing the ability and earnestness of the members of Presbytery, and the importance of the work they have in hand. A correspondence was read by Mr. Miller, which has just taken place between him and the Under-Secretary of State of the Italian Government on the subject of the tenure of our Free Church property in this country. Things are in train for a satisfactory settlement of a difficult business.

“The Presbytery, on the representation of Mr. Gray, requested me to go down to Naples to address the congregation there, and to arrange for an election of office-bearers. Gray is an admirable man, and will, I hope, be induced to accept the Neapolitan charge. The schools there have an attendance of from three to four hundred. There is a handsome church and manse, and a tolerable congregation, including some earnest people.

“The Presbytery sat three hours. All the members and some other Scotch friends dined together, and spent a most pleasant evening. It is one of the *signs* of this wonderful time that all this should be possible in Rome!

“Our Scotch church is now about full every Sabbath. We had the Duchess of S—— and her suite in the congregation last Sabbath.”

On the Sabbath after the Presbytery meeting (the 21st of

March), Dr. Buchanan took as usual one of the services in the Free Church. Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of the same week were spent in sight-seeing, and also in writing a long letter to his congregation at home. This letter was received in Glasgow in time to be read at the annual meeting of the Free College Church, which was actually being held at the very time he was lying down to die. The letter ran as follows:—

*(To the Office-bearers and Members of Free College Church.)*

“ROMA, *March 23, 1875.*

“I am truly sorry to know that even since I left home some esteemed and valued members of the congregation have passed away from the Church below, to join, as we fondly trust, the general assembly and church of the first-born whose names are written in heaven! Such events ever and anon taking place, ought surely to keep alive in our minds the recollection of our own mortality, and to stir us up with increasing fidelity and diligence ‘to occupy till the Lord come.’ To myself the lesson is specially applicable. Since coming to Rome, I have entered on the forty-ninth year of my ministry, and am now more than half through the seventy-third year of my age. In such circumstances, my time for serving God in that noblest and best of all departments of human labour, ‘the gospel of his Son,’ cannot be long. In this very view of my position, it has been a peculiar gratification to me to have been permitted, before the close of my career, to preach Christ in the city where the inspired author of some of the grandest and most precious portions of Holy Scripture suffered martyrdom for the faith which he himself taught with such consuming earnestness and power. Paul’s character has always had a special fascination for my mind. Save in our Lord’s *own* life, I know of no other that seems so fitted to inspire admiration and love, and to stimulate the Christian ministry. Though there is much to awaken a deep and thrilling interest in the vast ruins on the Palatine Hill of the palaces of the Cæsars, —the palace in which Tiberius, the cotemporary of our Lord, was brought up; and the still more massive and gigantic structure which was the dwelling of the father of Titus, who was the arm of the Lord’s vengeance against Jerusalem,—I confess that the walls on which I looked with the strongest feeling were those of the Imperial Judgment Hall, where it is beyond all reasonable doubt that Paul stood at Cæsar’s bar to receive the sentence which doomed by far the greatest man then living upon earth to a bloody death.

“One of the many things the Church of Rome has done to expose it to just indignation, is the way in which it has degraded the most solemn

events in history by its absurd and puerile traditions. At a certain spot outside the walls, and not far from the magnificent modern Basilica of St. Paul, which cost £4,000,000 sterling, and which is set down where there are hardly any people, the place is pointed out where, they say, Paul was beheaded by one stroke of the executioner's sword. All very well: so far the tradition *may* be true. But the tradition goes on to tell that the dis-severed head of the martyr struck the ground with such force that it rebounded thrice from the earth, and that each time a fountain burst forth! It is 'a lie with a circumstance,' as Shakespeare says; for no doubt the three fountains are there to this day. But so it is. Here in this city of the Popes almost everything is overlaid, and, in many cases, is made utterly childish and ridiculous, by the silly legends with which superstition and priestcraft have been at pains to surround it. I did not wonder therefore to hear, the other day, a very able Nonconformist minister of London say, 'Is there *really* anything in the sights shown us here which one can venture to believe? For my part,' he added, 'I never was so afflicted with *doubts* as at this seat and centre of infallibility.'

"I suspect,—indeed, I am sure,—the same sort of feeling, and on the most sacred of all subjects, has gone broad and deep into the soul of the Italian people. The late acts of the General Council have confirmed and completed this sceptical state of mind. In reading the Roman journals, which I do almost every day, I see conclusive proof of this state of things as being all but universally prevalent among the educated classes of society. But these journals, though they write ably and well against the Pope's arrogant pretensions to dictate to States and Governments, and to interfere with the civil rights and interests of individual men and of society at large, they have nothing to put in the place of the Papal religion. Philosophy, literature, science, the arts,—on all these they can and do discourse with great intelligence, and also on political questions generally; but of true religion—the religion of the Bible—they know nothing, and I fear I must add, they do not care to know.

"Of course there is a Church party here, as in other Roman Catholic countries. There is a considerable section of the old Roman aristocracy who have been long dandled in the lap of the Papal Court, and whose ignorant conservatism only moves them to dam up those waters of public opinion which ere long, in all human probability, will burst their banks and sweep all before them. And there is, at the other extreme of society, an ignorant and degraded class, who are either godless infidels and communists, or blinded victims of the most abject superstition, and to whom the shows and ceremonies of Papal worship are the very sort of religion which they desire to have.

"In so describing the existing state of things in this community, and which does not materially differ from the state of things in Italy all over, of course I do not forget or dispute the fact that even in this apostate



Papal Church there are elements of a better kind. Doubtless there are within it both pious women and good men, who do their best to shut their eyes to the grosser errors of the system, and who have no sympathy with its vices and its tyranny. They have been brought up in accordance with its creed and worship, and they have learned to look at these chiefly on the side that is most in harmony with their own sincerely devotional feelings, and with their own purer and better desires and thoughts; but, alas! they do—and they *can* do—nothing to alter, or even to modify, the essential character and tendencies of the vast and complicated institution to which they belong. I firmly believe, indeed, that it is a system so knit together in all its parts, and that even its very worst peculiarities have become so indispensable to its existence, that for the Church of Rome reformation is simply impossible. This institution of the Papacy, as a friend said to me not long ago, under the gorgeous dome and surrounded by the hierarchical magnificence of St. Peter's, 'this institution cannot be amended. It has got to be destroyed'—yes, and in His own time and way God will do it!

"In view of all this, one would fain see some appearance of the raising up 'of sons of thunder' to sound, with a voice like Luther's, the rousing cry,—'Come out of her, my people!' There are voices being lifted up, but they are not of the class to which the men of the sixteenth century belonged. Help, Lord! We must not despise the day of small things. The Lord is mighty; and he is working *mightily* in ways that are all preparatory to the final fall of this great Babylon.

"My own work here has been very pleasant. I have a much stronger impression than I had before coming to Rome of the value of the work our Church is doing in Italy; but of that I may have an opportunity of telling at another time and in a different form, when I get an opportunity of meeting our Continental Committee at Edinburgh.

"Hoping that the Reports of the past twelve months, to be laid before your annual meeting on the 30th, may be satisfactory and encouraging, both in a financial and in a spiritual sense; and looking forward with great delight to the prospect of being again among you by the month of May, believe me to be, my very dear friends, always yours affectionately,

"ROBERT BUCHANAN."

On Thursday (March 25) he complained, after breakfast, of not feeling very well. After sitting for a time over the fire, he went and lay down in his own room. "It had been arranged," says one of his daughters, "that we were to go with a friend at one o'clock to visit Garibaldi, and papa hoped till the last moment that he would be able to go. But finally he gave it up. He seemed to be suffering

from severe indigestion, and was in great pain. We sent for the doctor before dinner, but papa was rather better when he came. On Friday the doctor saw him again, and thought him *very decidedly* better. On Saturday and Sunday he seemed so much restored, that, although he did not go out, he went about the house as usual [and was able to write that last letter of his to Mr. Meldrum, which is given elsewhere].\* On Monday afternoon Dr. White (a friend whose acquaintance we had made in Rome) called, and sat a long time. He and papa talked over all our future plans; about our going to Naples, which we had fixed to do that day week; and also about the route we meant to take (by Venice and the Tyrol) in coming home. On Tuesday, the 30th, papa did not feel quite so well in the morning—his old pain from indigestion had returned slightly; and, as it was the forenoon of the prayer-meeting, we persuaded him to remain in bed till it was over. He got up in the middle of the day, but seemed a little tired. About four in the afternoon two Edinburgh ladies called to say good-bye, as they were about to leave Rome; and he had a pleasant chat with them, saying, at parting, that he hoped to see them in Scotland before long. He went to bed early; and when mamma went to see him after he had had a short sleep, he expressed himself as feeling *most* comfortable, and decidedly better. Mamma read a chapter beside him, and he prayed, *specially* remembering Mr. Reith and the congregation at home, as it was the night of the annual meeting. About eleven, when Charlotte was saying good-night, papa said he felt very much exhausted, and would like a little brandy and water; which he got. A little later mamma heard him moving in his bed, and asked if there was anything he wished, and he said, ‘No, nothing;’ and that was all we knew till the morning.”

\* Page 285.

So much for Miss Buchanan's account. Some more particulars are given in a letter written next day by Mrs. Buchanan to her daughter Isabella at home. The chapter which Dr. Buchanan asked to be read to him was the third chapter of 1st Peter. After this had been done, he engaged in prayer, "commending very specially to God our children and grandchildren, our congregation, the meeting of that evening, and Mr. Reith; giving thanks for his acceptance with the people, and for the evidence of it to be given that night. He prayed also that his own trouble might, God willing, be rebuked, and in any case that it might be sanctified to him. About twenty minutes past twelve the pain again returned, and he asked that a poultice might once more be applied. This was done, and the relief given seemed to be effectual, for he sank again into what seemed a quiet sleep."

"At five o'clock," Mrs. Buchanan goes on to say, "the ringing of bells awoke me, and I saw the daylight beginning to stream into the other end of the room. Perfect stillness reigned. I looked over to the bed, and thinking, 'How sweetly he sleeps!' I crept out and gently closed the half-open shutter lest it might wake him, and lay down again; but the stillness half troubled me, and between hope and fear I stood at the bed and raised my hand to touch him. The unnatural coolness of the forehead startled me. I spoke to him—named him again and again—and opened the shutter.....He was safe in the arms of Jesus; and lying so peacefully, that it was difficult to believe that he would not awake out of sleep..... The eyes were closed, his lips apart, the bed-clothes unruffled, and his whole appearance as if he had just laid down to rest."

The end had come, and that in the form of one of those "translations" which seem so appropriately to close a life of active service for God, and which one can scarcely help thinking of as one of the rewards of such a service. "To

look at him as he lay there," writes a friend, who saw him while the room in which he had passed away yet remained undisturbed, "just as he had laid himself down, you would say that the pains of death had got no hold on him, but had come as a welcome visitor.....There was not a ruffle on the bed-clothes; and he looked just like the photograph you have seen of Dr. Chalmers as he lay in his last sleep. You can imagine the picture; the form lying so still, like one of the marble statues of which Rome is full."

## CHAPTER XXV.

### THE NECROPOLIS.

No cemetery we have ever seen more perfectly realizes the ideal of *a City of the Dead* than the Necropolis of Glasgow. Crowning the hill, and running down on all sides into the valley, are literally streets of monuments; and in the dim light of late evening or early morning one might easily fancy oneself standing among the ruins of a place that had once been inhabited. What strengthens the illusion is the absence of greenery of any sort. The smoky atmosphere around renders the growth of flower or shrub almost impossible. Père la Chaise, with its spaciousness and its trees and its garden look, is suggestive of the country. But the Cathedral Burial-Ground of Glasgow is what it professes to be—a Necropolis, a CITY occupied by the Dead. Here, overshadowed by a beautiful Iona cross, with its impressive symbolism, suggesting eternity and atonement, lie the remains of ROBERT BUCHANAN.

When the death took place, it was instinctively felt by all who had any interest in his history that the dust of such a man ought not to be left to lie in any cemetery, however beautiful it might be, in a foreign city. His body, however, was first carried from the old Roman palace in which he died, to the Mortuary Chapel of the Protestant Burial-Ground; and in connection with this funeral there were not a few devout men even in Rome to make lamentation over him. Among

the residents, the greatest possible kindness was shown by Mr. Lowe, Mr. Bruce, and others. Most fortunately, also, Dr. Stewart of Leghorn was able to come to the city at the very moment when his advice and assistance were most necessary. And within a few days the telegraph had brought to the side of Mrs. Buchanan her son Lawrence, and her son-in-law, Mr. M'Laren. Dr. Stewart preached a most impressive funeral sermon on the Sabbath after the death; and at least one other minister of the Free Church—Mr. Stuart, formerly of Kelso, now of Edinburgh—was present as a mourner at the grave.

It was found to be by no means an easy thing to convey the remains to Scotland. Every facility, indeed, was offered for their removal from Rome, for the habits of the American residents had made the Roman authorities familiar with such a practice. But it was ascertained that the most serious difficulties were to be apprehended in attempting to pass through France; and at last, after much consultation, it was resolved to give up the thought of an overland route altogether, and to convey the body home by sea. It was therefore carried down to Leghorn, and placed on board one of the steam trading-vessels of the Messrs. Henderson Brothers of Glasgow. Nothing could exceed the kindness and attention of that firm. They refused to accept any pecuniary acknowledgment whatever for the services which they rendered. They also kept the family at home constantly supplied with telegraphic information regarding the course of the ship. But the vessel was not at the time directly on its way to Glasgow. It was appointed to call for commercial purposes at various ports in the Mediterranean. And thus it was not till after the middle of May that it at length arrived in the Clyde.

The funeral in the Necropolis took place on the thirty-fourth anniversary of the day of the Disruption.

“Seldom at any time,” we are told, “had the streets of

Glasgow witnessed a more stately and imposing procession than that which then defiled through them to accompany the remains of the late Dr. Buchanan to the tomb. The time which had elapsed since the death of Dr. Buchanan in Rome, had permitted the feeling of regret at the death of so eminent a citizen to permeate all classes of the community, and to soften the asperities of those who were inclined to take a sectarian instead of a catholic view of the life of the deceased. The result was seen in the demonstration of respect for the lamented dead, irrespective of sect or party. Ministers and laymen of all the Presbyterian and cognate Churches assembled with one consent to do honour to the memory of one who, though a strong and even a mighty sectarian, was ever a Christian first, and a Free Churchman afterwards. From an early hour in the forenoon, crowds began to assemble in front of Newton Street Free Church, where the service for the general public was to be, and gradually extended thence to Claremont Street, beyond the residence of the deceased. At the Free College Church, where a service took place, and whence the body was removed in the hearse to the house at No. 2 Sandyford Place, there was also a considerable assemblage. But the scene along the line of route was one never to be forgotten. From North Street to the Necropolis, upwards of two miles, the streets were lined with one continuous crowd, and the windows filled by groups of equally sympathizing spectators. We should estimate the number of those who patiently waited till the funeral cortége passed by at between fifteen and twenty thousand. The procession was preceded by a detachment of constabulary; and no sooner had these begun to move forward than the striking appearance of the procession became manifest. Following the representatives of the general public came, in rank four deep, the ministers and office-bearers of

the various Churches. And they were indeed a goodly sight to see! It seemed as if both our Assemblies, which are said to exhibit the grandest display of heads in the kingdom, had come bodily into the procession; and it was with a premonition of a real and practical union in the future that one looked upon Established, Free, and United Presbyterian Churchmen walking side by side in honour of a good man, whose goodness was of no sect. Following them came the Dean and Council and other representatives of the Faculty of Procurators, the President and representatives of the Faculty of Surgeons, and the Lord Provost and Magistrates, whose carriages immediately preceded the hearse. Perhaps the most imposing view of the procession was obtained from the top of the hill east from Newton Street; but, indeed, all along the route the decorum and sympathy of the spectators were manifest. Many women were in tears, and we noticed that not a few gentlemen observed the custom prevalent in other countries of reverently uncovering their heads as the hearse passed by. At the entrance to the Necropolis the procession opened up, to permit the carriages and hearse to pass on; and on closing in again, the whole slowly defiled up the winding avenue to the grave, which is situated about thirty yards to the north-east of the monument of John Knox. The terraces of the Necropolis were crowded with spectators, as was also the vicinity of the grave; but the most perfect order was observed, and the coffin was committed to the dust amid the tears of some, the emotion of many, and the regret of all."

Dr. Buchanan left behind him two sons and six daughters. His eldest son, Alexander, has been long a resident in England, and is partner in an engineering firm in Derby. His youngest son, Lawrence, has adopted the profession of Law, and practises as a solicitor in Glasgow. Of his daughters, three are married—one to Mr. John M'Laren, of the well-known firm of Messrs.



W. M'Laren, Sons, and Co.; another to the Rev. R. M. Thornton, minister of Wellpark Free Church; and a third to Dr. J. G. Wilson, an eminent Glasgow physician. It will not be felt to be out of place here to add that Dr. Buchanan was not one of those public men who allow the affairs of the outer world to interfere with the cultivation of the domestic affections. He did not shut himself up within a world of his own, but took his family into his confidence, and made them as far as possible his companions. And in this he had his reward, for not only was their attachment to him peculiarly warm and tender, but they all caught his spirit. During the time of the late religious awakening in Scotland, Mr. Moody was heard to say that from no Christian household in Glasgow had he received heartier sympathy or more effective help than from that of Dr. Buchanan. One thing more only may be referred to in this connection. It is this—that his love for his own family descended with, if possible, an increased intensity to the succeeding generation. There was a great mutual affection between himself and his grandchildren. The more energetic among them found often a resting-place on his shoulder; and the messages which he sent when from home, always showed that he retained an affectionate recollection of them wherever he went.

## CHAPTER XXVI.

### “ULTIMUS ROMANORUM.”

WHEN a man who has filled for long a great place in the public eye at last disappears, the onlooking world at once begins to ask itself questions about the nature and amount of the loss that has been sustained. And it is curious to glance over what has been said or written about the value of the life-work of Dr. Buchanan.

Among the first reflections suggested by the telegram which flashed the news of the death from Rome, was that Glasgow would miss from her streets “a grave and stately figure” with which almost all the inhabitants had become familiar. Dr. Buchanan had indeed a “presence” which would have distinguished him anywhere. Tall, erect, and stately, with a handsome face and person, he attracted observation in all companies; and the impression produced by his appearance was always strengthened and confirmed by what has been called “the splendid courtesy” of his manner. “Sometimes,” says the *Glasgow Herald*, “one could not look at him without thinking what a fine ambassador he would have made in some German capital, with his stately appearance, his splendid courtesy, his perfect reticence, and his shrewd insight into men and things.” In his youth he was famous for his athletic qualities. His feats in walking were constant themes for talk between

himself and his college intimate, Mr. Brown of Lanfine. And it is a true story which has often been told of him, that when minister of Gargunnoch he swam across the Forth to bring over a boat needed to convey himself and a friend to a dinner-party on the other side. It is also suggestive in its way, that in the old days, when the Church was content to be a hanger-on in ministerial ante-chambers, Sir Robert Peel expressed a preference for intercourse with Buchanan, on the ground, as he said, that he was so thoroughly a gentleman. These are small matters in themselves; but they are not without their value in connection with the presentation of an outstanding historical figure. No one acquainted with the past will for a moment think of placing Dr. Buchanan on a level with Knox, or Melville, or Henderson, or Chalmers, but that he has occupied in his day and sphere the place filled in former generations by Carstares, and Robertson, and Dr. John Erskine, cannot be doubted; and the time may come when the Church of the future will hear with interest, that one who was in the van of the movement which issued in the revolutionizing of Scotland was in person and demeanour neither a fanatic nor a demagogue, but one who might have borne a part becomingly within the circle of a Court.

On this very manner of his, however, has been founded a reproach. It was sometimes said that he had more qualities than that of courtesy to fit him for diplomacy; that, in fact, there was more management in his methods than was consistent with perfect Christian simplicity. The charge is stated broadly, because we are certain that it can be shown to be utterly baseless. In times of difficulty and trial, the Church naturally looked to him and others to advise and lead; and when he was thus looked to he acted like a man of common sense. He consulted with friends

of experience as to what might be the best plan to recommend, and he (as far as he could) carried through the plan which was in the end considered to be the best. That he was no mere diplomatist, in the worldly sense, is proved by the fact that he had no belief whatever in the theory that the future can be moulded to any shape that is wanted by clever manipulation. Others might have faith in the power of Acts of Parliament to change the deepest currents of a nation. He had no such faith. Beyond and above all outward laws and visible organizations, he saw forces in operation which he felt sure would in the end prevail; and in forecasting coming events, he never left out of his calculation the consideration of a Divine Providence, the vitality of sound principles, and the certainty of true ideas in the long run asserting themselves no matter under what an amount of political rubbish they might for a season be overlaid.

Perhaps the oldest surviving friend of Dr. Buchanan is Dr. Roxburgh of Glasgow. Their acquaintance stretched over a period of between fifty and sixty years. During thirty of these their intercourse was constant and intimate; and no man, therefore, is better qualified to speak on the point of character to which we are now referring.

“As is known to every member of the Free Church,” says Dr. Roxburgh, “Dr. Buchanan’s wisdom and sagacity, and generally his statesmanlike gifts and abilities, marked him out as eminently qualifying him to be entrusted with the conduct of the public business of the Church, and in particular brought him much into contact with governments, Whig and Tory, and with politicians of every school, in negotiations about Church extension, and endowments, and spiritual independence. From this cause has proceeded the only breath of reproach I have ever known attempted to

be breathed upon his fair fame. Some less scrupulous adversaries have not hesitated to represent him as more a man of management and artifice than a simple-minded minister of Christ; as if, because he had of necessity much to do with politicians, he necessarily became a politician himself. They have sought, indeed, to degrade him to the rank of a mere diplomatic Churchman, actuated by other than his professed aims, and wanting in simplicity and godly sincerity. Considering the place which Dr. Buchanan occupies, and will continue to occupy, as a historical character in connection with one of the most eventful periods in the history of the Scottish Church; considering, moreover, what is due in equity and justice to the memory of one of Scotland's noblest sons, it is incumbent on those who best knew Dr. Buchanan, in duty to him and to the cause which he so nobly served, to repel the unjust and injurious aspersions to which I have referred; and as one whom he honoured with his friendship, and who loved him as a very brother, I rejoice humbly to testify that I never knew a more single-hearted, single-eyed servant of Christ, a man more purely and unselfishly devoted to the advancement of the best interests of his fellow-men, and more scrupulously upright in his choice and use of the means by which he sought to promote his ends.

“In my sermon preached in Free College Church, Glasgow, on the occasion of Dr. Buchanan's death, I adverted to the same features of his character to which I have referred in this note. It may not be amiss to introduce the passage here :—

“I would like to add my humble tribute of reverence and love to those testimonies which have been so eloquently and affectionately borne to the virtues and graces of his character from so many of the pulpits of the land. I have purposely selected these two words, *reverence* and *love*. For, analys-

ing the feelings of my own heart, I can find none that so expressively describe the sentiments which his rare combination of gifts and graces habitually awakened within me. My first recollection of him is as a young student in his college gown, during the course of his first session at college ; and, although only three years my senior, I well remember the reverential respect with which I was even then inspired by his sedate, self-possessed, and courteous bearing. This was subsequently followed by an early intimacy, and this intimacy at length ripened into a cordial friendship, which it has been my unspeakable privilege to enjoy for more than thirty years. Looking back on all my intercourse with him during this lengthened period, I have to say that, whether viewed as a public man or in the privacy of domestic life, I have never known a man of higher and purer principles and aims ; a man more real and genuine, and more sincerely and unselfishly devoted to the advancement of the best interests of his fellow-men. I have never known a man less actuated by the promptings of fleshly wisdom, and whose private convictions and public professions were more entirely in harmony.

“In contemplating any movement or course of action, the great question with him never was, Is it expedient ? Is it politic ? Will it be good management ? But simply, Is it right ? Once satisfied on this head, then, sustained by conscious rectitude, he applied himself to the prosecution of the object with unflinching resolution, undeterred by the difficulties of the undertaking or the formidable opposition offered to it. For he was not only a wise and a good, but a brave man ; and under his bland and placid exterior he possessed no small measure of the indomitable spirit of our heroic Reformer, over whose grave it was said, ‘There lies one who never feared the face of man.’

“If the qualities to which I have referred were fitted to inspire that profound respect which all the intimate friends of Dr. Buchanan felt towards him, he possessed other qualities no less fitted to inspire *love*. He himself was not demonstrative in the expression of his feelings. Persons of an opposite temperament, and superficial observers, were apt to mistake his reserve for coldness. But there could be no greater misconception. Under the unruffled surface there flowed a deep, warm current of natural kindness and Christian affection. Accordingly, his house was the resort of brethren in distress from all corners of the land. Was any one perplexed with difficulty, or suffering from injustice, or discouraged by trials ? recourse was forthwith had to Dr. Buchanan for counsel ; so that to a large extent it was true that there came upon him daily ‘the care of all the churches.’ Nor did they resort to him in vain. A friendly welcome ever awaited them. If their cause was good, it awakened forthwith a ready sympathy, followed by ungrudged and self-sacrificing efforts to effect relief or deliverance, or by that wise counsel which his sagacity and ripe experience knew so well how to adapt to the circumstances of each case.

“In a word, take him all in all,—his manly and commanding form, his benignant countenance, his dignified and courteous bearing, his great and varied talents and attainments, and the noble uses to which, under the direction of a sanctified mind, they were applied, and his long and willing services to the Church and the community,—we may not expect to see his like again. To which let me add, that those who would worthily appreciate his character should have known him in the bosom of his friends and family. But into that sacred enclosure we shall not intrude further than to express our tenderest sympathy with those who have been bereaved of one distinguished by the faithful and affectionate fulfilment of all the duties that belong to a husband and father. Let me assure them that they will never cease to occupy a large place in the inmost heart of the people of the Free Church of Scotland; and specially of the citizens of this great city, which he who is gone has laid under such a debt of gratitude by his invaluable public services. Truly, ‘a prince and a great man is fallen in Israel;’ and we shall see his face and hear his pleasant voice no more in this world.”

With regard to the more private and personal character of Dr. Buchanan, it may be said that those who saw him only at a distance were perhaps not unlikely to form mistaken or imperfect impressions in regard to it. That he was generous, and unselfish, and free from the vanity of little minds, they might infer; but his stateliness was apt to suggest the idea of a want of geniality, and his apparent absorption in the conduct of public affairs may have led some to suppose that he would take little interest in the common cares of those who were living immediately around him. The following notes by Mr. Morison will help, therefore, to present him in what to some may be a new aspect. Certainly the anecdotes will not surprise any who had much intercourse with him. His pleasantry in society was well known; and the kindness of his nature was constantly manifesting itself in his attention to the sick, in his readiness to help those who were in perplexity or trouble, and his general willingness to oblige.

“There was one phase of his nature for which, I suppose, the public would hardly have given him credit, and on which I can only speak from one instance. This was his apprecia-

tion of humour. On one occasion he was asked to give an address at the close of the Young Men's Literary Society in connection with the Free Tron, while he was still the minister of that church. The subjects discussed during the preceding session had been those common to such societies,—history, politics, philosophy, and literature, or literary and historical men. In this address the Doctor took up the various subjects discussed by the young men, and, after commending the objects of the society, and encouraging the members to steady, careful preparation for the work they had taken in hand, he then ran off into raillery, light banter, and humour, touching all the subjects which had been taken up during the session with such fun and wit as fairly carried away the audience with laughter. Before he was done he himself caught the infection, and, unable to go on with his address, had to sit down, completely overcome with laughter also. It is impossible to narrate the scene or give the points of wit and humour, but the recollection of it clings very vividly to my memory yet, after the lapse of over twenty years.

“One other incident, illustrative of another side of his nature. Some time about a year before his death, I had occasion to consult him about a blind girl who had been baptized by him while the congregation worshipped in the City Hall. The girl's mother had been dead for about twenty years, and she was living with an only sister. Her mother's brother had died in America, and left a sum of money, to which the two sisters were heirs. Before they could get the money, however, it was necessary to prove their connection with the deceased. In the case of the elder girl this could be easily done, as her birth or baptism had been registered; but the blind girl's had not been registered in any way. As Dr. Buchanan had baptized the child, it was proposed to get a certificate from him to this effect. Before this could be done



a good deal of negotiation had to be gone through, necessitating his calling upon me several times, and this at a distance of fully two miles from his own house. I had also to call very often upon him, till I began to fear he might fret at being interrupted so often on a matter which many would have looked upon rather lightly. Not so, however; for, so far from showing impatience or feeling annoyed, he entered into every point with the greatest minuteness and care. When it became necessary for him to go before the Lord Provost to sign a declaration on the subject, I almost anticipated that he would scruple at this, but found him as ready to put himself to the trouble of calling on the Provost as he had been through all the preliminary arrangements. He was then over seventy years of age, and must have walked miles, and spent hours, on this matter.

“The last time I had the privilege of speaking with him, I had the satisfaction of telling him that the case had been successful; the document he signed having been held sufficient in the court of the United States where the case had been decided.

“It may be not altogether unworthy to mention that the occasion on which I spoke to him last was within a few weeks of his leaving Glasgow for Rome. It was in the Session-house of the Free Tron Church. He had agreed to preach in the forenoon of that day for Dr. Smith, and I called at the Session-house to speak with him for a minute or two before he went into the pulpit. It struck me that day that his manner was more than usually solemn; and during the few minutes I spent with him, he referred more than once to his feeling the infirmities of age. So marked was this, that I introduced the subject of the blind girl, to bring in another topic. He seemed greatly pleased, saying, as I left him, ‘You have greatly delighted me.’

“He occupied the pulpit of the Free Tron that day for the last time; and it is not a little remarkable that his text was, ‘I, such an one as Paul the aged’ (Philemon 9). He read at that service the fourth chapter of First Corinthians, and seemed to me to read the fifteenth verse of that chapter with marked pathos and emphasis. At all events, I had a strong conviction that he was under the impression that he was occupying his old pulpit for the last time; and so it turned out to be. I never saw him again.”

A still more touching letter lies before us from the Rev. James Wells. He and Mr. Howie have been all along identified with whatever work of revival has taken place of recent years in Glasgow. And they agree in testifying that Dr. Buchanan was no mere hidebound ecclesiastic, but a warm-hearted Christian minister, who desired above all things the deepening and expansion of the spiritual life.

“Strangers,” says Mr. Wells, “who saw Dr. Buchanan only from a distance, might perhaps suppose that he was above all things a zealous Churchman and an unsurpassed ecclesiastical statesman. But I have heard poor Wynd-folk describe with warm admiration his patient and hearty attention to the obscurest details of territorial work, particularly in the mission school, and in cases of individuals belonging to the district. They could scarcely believe that at the very same time, as they found out afterwards, he was burdened, besides his pastoral work, with the care of the churches, and was preparing speeches that were read over the whole country. He had these two marks of rare Christian nobility—he was as faithful in the least as in the greatest, and he could further the schemes of others as heartily as his own. Along with the other Wynd ministers, I had often to make considerable demands upon his time and patience on behalf of mission enterprises. It was not his way to give gushing assurances

of sympathy ; but, of many willing helpers among ministers and laymen, I am not sure that any cherished a higher appreciation of such work, or were more ready to aid in a generous and unselfish spirit. His sympathy with revival movements was decided. The most enthusiastic supporters of these movements are known to have accepted some of his public utterances, as setting forth just what they would have liked to have said themselves about the revival. This was the more remarkable, as he was preoccupied with other work, and his own individuality did not mark out for him that special form of Christian effort. He was very cautious in forming his opinions about the work ; his position imposed caution, because many in all the Churches, as he must have known, were guided by his judgment ; yet he was among the first ministers in the West End who opened their churches for daily services during the revival of 1860-61.

“ ‘He was a good and true man that, sir,’ said a sailor to a friend at the time of Dr. Buchanan’s death. ‘But what do you know about him?’ was the rejoinder. ‘Well, I was on board the yacht in which he spent his holidays one summer. It was often my watch on deck about the time they were turning in to their berths. I could not help seeing sometimes what was going on in Dr. Buchanan’s berth, as I stood right over his skylight. There was something in his praying that struck me. Come what might, in fair weather or foul, he was always the same then. His religion was a reality. Ah ! he was a true man that, sir ; no mistake.’ ”

The Union negotiations led to Dr. Buchanan’s becoming intimately acquainted with leading men outside his own Church ; and these men in their turn came to know him. The result was the awakening of a degree of mutual esteem which did the highest honour to both parties. When the death occurred, many of the ministers in the Reformed and United Presby-

terian Churches spoke of the event as one that had entailed a loss upon themselves, and some of the generous words they uttered it does one good even yet to remember.

Dr. Goold said: "When the grave closes over Dr. Buchanan's remains, I shall feel as if I had buried a generation. I can remember the funeral of Andrew Thomson, and I have walked at the funerals of Chalmers, and Gordon, and Cunningham, and Guthrie, and Candlish, and amongst men of other Churches, such as John Brown and Dean Ramsay. Robert Buchanan, in his own special qualities,\* and in relation to ecclesiastical struggles in Scotland, deserves a place beside them; and he has left none of the same age and rank behind him, excepting two venerable missionaries, as devoted as himself to the same great principles. Good and able men in all parties are left us, but none exactly of the same standing.....

"In administrative capacity he was unrivalled; and his successful management of the great Fund by which the ministry of his Church is supported, has made it a model for Churches in various lands. Adorning the office he held, and yet most catholic and comprehensive in his views respecting the interests of true religion, he was always the divine among statesmen, while, at the same time, he was the statesman among divines. Hence the series of magnificent utterances on behalf of Christian union which, year after year, he poured forth in the Assembly, to the delight of all who could appreciate in them the calm wisdom of the Christian statesman, and the zeal of the Christian patriot so finely attempered and sanctified by grace, and so intent on the reunion of our Presbyterian Churches. Privileged to share with him during eleven years in the negotiations for Union, both public and private, and in the responsibilities of convenership, I can attest with emphasis that Dr. Robert Buchanan in these transactions was the very soul of honour and courtesy. I pity the man who could doubt

this quality of his character, even though a ducal coronet surmount his brow."

That a man so occupied with the outward activities of life should not have contributed a great deal to the literature of his profession, is certainly not to be wondered at. The surprising thing is that, with his manifold distractions, he found time to use his pen in the way of literary effort at all. He had, however, in a very decided form, the literary gift; and we must not close this record without noting, what we have had no proper opportunity for mentioning before, that he published an elaborate exposition of one of the books of Scripture. The book so singled out by him was *Ecclesiastes*; and concerning his success in the work this much may be said, that Mr. Spurgeon, in his "Commenting and Commentators," places the exposition in his first and highest class, as one which all ministers should get who wish to be themselves properly prepared for the interpretation of the book to their people.

After all, however, the most suggestive thing about the life of Dr. Buchanan is this, that it runs parallel with an epoch. His career began when a new chapter was opening in the history of the country, and in following his after-course we are always led along the highway from which the development of that history is visible. A thoughtful writer in the *Glasgow Herald* says:—"There is not, on the whole, any such outstanding personage left of all those who had helped to make the history of Scotland during the past half-century; and now it almost feels as if the last link were broken between this age and the old times of ecclesiastical conflict, when the Kirk had a reasonable hope of being National as well as Established. Respected by all, trusted by very many, more looked to, perhaps, in Glasgow than any other clergyman, Dr. Buchanan is gone; and how much of the past seems to have gone with him!

The men who have lived through a great era, and taken part in its great struggles, naturally carry their influence forward into the new times which, perhaps, they understand less, and are less fitted to guide than others of lesser note. But there are not many men who, standing high among the leaders of a former age, have carried forward, on the whole, a wiser spirit, or a clearer comprehension of the new state of things, than the author of 'The Ten Years' Conflict' brought from anti-Disruption days into the singularly altered conditions of modern thought and action. He was qualified to lead, because he went forward with the times."

It is true. Dr. Buchanan, like Mr. Gladstone and other such men of the generation, was "qualified to lead, because he went forward with the times." But when we look closely into his history, we find that he never wandered from his fundamental principles.

He never wavered, for example, in his devotion to evangelical religion, to those doctrines of grace which form the basis of the system, and to the way of salvation through faith in the finished work of Christ which it has been its chief glory to proclaim. Nor had he ever but one conviction about *the Church*. In his thought it was always the divine institution on whose life and spirituality and freedom the prosperity of religion in the world depends; and the key to his whole public life is found when it is realized that concern for THE CHURCH was, throughout, his ruling principle of action. That his attitude toward Establishments seemed to change, is true enough. But it is only one superficially acquainted with his history that can see in this any radical inconsistency. He never at any period of his life attached such an overwhelming importance to an alliance with the State as to imagine it to be indispensable to a Church's existence or prosperity. Even during the Voluntary controversy,

he intimated in the plainest terms that the only Establishment which he would ever be at the trouble to fight for was one that recognized the Church's independence. When the Ten Years' Conflict came, he gave practical proof of the sincerity of his convictions on that point by sacrificing his own connection with the State for the sake of spiritual liberty. And he was only carrying out in another form the same idea of the comparative unimportance of the alliance, when he pled that a theoretical difference of opinion upon the subject ought not to prevent a union for Christian purposes of Presbyterian bodies which on all other matters were agreed. His intimate connection with the Sustentation Fund, indeed, opened his eyes to the advantages connected with the support of a Church by the free-will offerings of its people. He thus learned that a Church has within itself resources whose greatness he had not before suspected; and he saw also in the discipline which GIVING entails moral benefits which he had previously taken little account of. And this experience increased his indifference to the question of a re-establishment of his Church upon any terms. But that was a mere incident. The great pervading fact remains that Buchanan's ruling idea, from the very first to the very last, was the purity, the freedom, the practical utility of THE CHURCH, and that with this thought ever before him the question of the Church being sustained or not by the State was *always* with him a secondary and subordinate consideration.

How strange it must have seemed to him to look back from the elevation of his later years on the way along which he had been led! He began his public life in the days before the flood. When he was settled at Gargunnoek in 1827, Lay Patronage was still flourishing unchecked, and Moderatism commanded an easy majority in the General Assembly. And as with the Church, so with the State. Town Councils were

self-elective, and they, along with the landholders, sent the representatives of the people to Parliament. A few years later, and this whole close system was broken up. Then came the Reform Bill and the Veto Act, and the masses began to realize their importance in the land. It seemed easier, however, to adjust the new order of things to the political than to the ecclesiastical sphere. There occurred no revolution in the State, although that was sometimes threatened; but the change in the Church produced a convulsion which terminated in disruption. This result took the politicians by surprise; for it has never been one of the distinguishing characteristics of their class to estimate with much correctness the force of religious motives. But they hoped that the mistake would by-and-by correct itself. The summer flood of excitement would become spent, and things in course of time would return again into their ancient channels. This expectation, however, was not realized. The report of the blow delivered in Scotland reverberated across the Channel, and brought down the Establishment in Ireland. And with regard to the country more immediately concerned, new currents were originated which altered in the most material ways its whole social, religious, and political condition. Scotland, from being a singularly steady-going and Conservative province of the empire, became intensely Liberal. From being able to boast of having the most compact and effective Established Church in the kingdom, it has become a stronghold of Nonconformity. And in place of its being able any longer to show a Parochial School system such as gained for it its traditional reputation, it is now under an education law which ignores in its working the Church altogether.

These were not the consequences which were looked for by the Tory politicians, who imagined that by keeping the Church in strict subordination to the State they would



repress within safe limits what they supposed to be the instincts of a lawless spiritual democracy. No wonder they began in time to doubt about the wisdom of their policy; and no wonder either that, when the opportunity offered, they should have doubled back, as it were, and tried to regain their lost ground. But not the furthest-seeing man in 1843 could have predicted what has actually occurred. As in the State, so in the Church, the party which forty years ago opposed alike Non-Intrusionism and Reform have tried to out-manceuvre their opponents by out-bidding them. Mr. Disraeli met Mr. Gladstone by proposing universal suffrage; and he has distanced the Veto by conferring the ecclesiastical franchise, not on the communicant only, which was all Chalmers asked, but on the adherent also!

An anti-climax so odd Dr. Buchanan lived to see, but he has not been spared to hear the issue. That remains for the present or the immediately succeeding generation. In the meantime, however, what has happened strengthens the feeling that we have not reached yet the close of the epoch. The tide which had slackened has now again received a fresh impulse. A revived interest is being taken in the Church and its problems, and thoughtful men will look on with attention while the experiment is being tried of reducing to order the ecclesiastical chaos of Scotland, by a parliamentary expedient owing its existence to the very same political party which caused the Disruption.

In his very latest speech, Dr. Buchanan proclaimed his utter want of confidence in any such methods. His hopes for his country lay in the life and energy of the Churches themselves. For any permanently satisfactory result he looked to moral and spiritual, and not to political forces; and although he well knew that it is in the power of a State, when it intermeddles with religion, to do much mischief if it is not

guided by right principle, and he clearly foresaw that the new adjustment of the Establishment in Scotland might give it for a season an access of factitious strength, he never doubted for a moment that the deepest, and strongest, and most permanent currents flowed outside, and that in the long run they would prevail. In this faith the greatest Churchman of the present generation died, and time will show whether his beliefs and expectations were well founded.

“Though my friendship with Dr. Buchanan,” wrote Dr. Cairns to Mrs. Buchanan after his death, “did not begin till 1863, I do not think that any of his older friends could revere him more deeply or love him more warmly than I did; and I feel that his absence makes a blank in our ecclesiastical horizon which cannot be supplied. All through, though others nobly supported him, he was the animating soul of our Union negotiations, and bore the burden and heat of the day, which very few except myself and one or two others could estimate at its full severity; and as we trusted him so much, and threw so much upon him, his share of the load became all the more oppressive; and I cannot doubt that, whatever was the secret cause of his sudden death, he must have suffered permanently from the strain and pressure of these trying duties, so that in going through them he did not count life itself dear. This was the essence of his character,—heroic devotion to public duty, an unflinching adherence to principle, and consuming zeal in arduous work, which under a calm exterior made him capable of any labour and of any martyrdom for conscience’ sake. His unfailing sagacity and vast experience commanded in every council the fullest attention; and I have never seen in any other man so much tact, grace, and courtesy as he uniformly, and by a kind of instinctive prompting, displayed in the most unexpected circumstances, though never to the sacrifice of truth

or principle. His bearing towards the representatives of the United Presbyterian Church was not only generous, but chivalrous; and his whole conduct through these trying years will make him as much a cherished and lamented memory with us, as in the Church which he did so much to found and to strengthen. I cannot think how different the future will be without him. I always conceived of him as in some sense leading the van in all the united efforts of our still unhappily divided Presbyterianism. Following, as his removal does, so quickly that of Dr. Candlish, I have a sense of desolation in regard to the future, which, with all the great and good men left, I can hardly express."

"There are no words which I could use," wrote at the same time Lord Moncrieff, "which could express the affection and respect in which I held Dr. Buchanan, or my sense of the irreparable loss we have all sustained. Personally, as you know, I owed much to his steadfast friendship and deserved influence; and it makes me very sad to think that we shall look in vain for the future for the sage counsel and the mature wisdom which so largely promoted many interests and objects we had in common. The sympathy of such a man was one of the most gratifying reflections which public life has left me.

"But the loss to the country and to the Church is in some sense irreparable; others will take his place, but I do not expect ever to see it filled. The calm, lofty tone of his course in public affairs, the index of his thoughts and character, the happy blending of suavity with vigour, and the unruffled serenity of his strength, made up a leader of men such as has been rarely found. I regarded him with unfeigned admiration, and deeply and bitterly deplore his loss. He has left a noble inheritance in a great reputation, an unsullied name, and the universal grief of all classes and sections of his countrymen."

We cannot do better than close the Life of Dr. Buchanan with these two letters. He could be no ordinary man who so impressed himself upon such men as Dr. Cairns and Lord Moncrieff. But, indeed, he needs no testimony from others. His own history, so prolonged, so eventful, so various in its interest, and in every way so honourable, speaks for itself. He was often pointed to during the closing year of his life as "*Ultimus Romanorum*"—the last of a remarkable race; and whether that title was strictly and literally applicable to him or not, this is certainly true, that with him, in the judgment of the onlooking world at least, there ended a generation.















1 1012 01039 0989