

APPENDIX.

A.

(See page 7.)

JAM de sacerdotio breviter sic habendum, finem et usum ejus esse ut sit mediator purus omni macula, qui sanctitate sua Deum nobis conciliet. Sed quia aditum occupat justa maledictio, et Deus pro judicis officio nobis infensus est; ut nobis favorem comparet sacerdos ad placandam iram ipsius Dei, piaculum intervenire necesse est. Quare ut hoc munus impleret Christus, cum sacrificio in medium prodire oportuit, nam et sub Lege sacerdotii fas non erat sanctuarium ingredi absque sanguine; ut scirent fideles, quamvis sacerdos interpositus esset deprecator, non posse tamen Deum propitiari, nisi expiatis peccatis. Qua de re prolixè Apostolus disputat in epistola ad Hebræos a septimo capite fere ad finem usque decimi. Summa tamen huc redit, nonnisi in Christum competere sacerdotii honorem, quia sacrificio mortis suæ reatum nostrum delevit, et satisfecit pro peccatis. Quanti vero momenti res sit, ex solenni illo Dei jure jurando, quod absque poenitentia prolatum est, monemur. “Tu es

sacerdos in æternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech." Sancire enim haud dubie voluit caput illud, in quo precipuum salutis nostræ cardinem verti sciebat. Neque enim, ut dictum est, nobis aut precibus nostris ad Deum patet accessus, nisi purgatis inquinamentis nos sacerdos sanctificet, gratiamque nobis obtineat, a qua nos scelerum nostrorum et vitiorum arcet immundities. Ita videmus a morte Christi incipiendum esse, ut ad nos perveniat sacerdotii ejus efficacia et utilitas. Hinc sequitur æternum esse deprecatores, cujus patrocinio favorem consequimur. Unde rursus oritur non modo precandi fiducia, sed etiam tranquillitas piis conscientis; dum in paternam Dei indulgentiam tuto recumbant, certoque persuasæ sunt ei placere quicquid per Mediatorem consecratum est. Quum vero sub Lege victimas ex pecudibus offerri sibi Deus jusserit, diversa et nova in Christo fuit ratio, ut idem esset hostia qui sacerdos, quia nec alia pro peccatis idonea satisfactio reperiri potuerit, nec quisquam tanto honore dignus qui Deo unigenitum filium offerret. Jam sacerdotis personam sustinet Christus, non modo ut æterna reconciliationis lege patrem nobis faventem ac propitium reddat, sed etiam ut nos adsiscat in societatem tanti honoris. Nam qui in nobis polluti sumus, in ipso tamen sacerdotes, offerimus nos et nostra aunia Deo, cœlestumque sanctuarium libere ingredimur, ut grata sint ac boni odoris in conspectu Dei quæ a nobis proveniunt sacrificia precum et laudis. Atque huc usque se extendit illud Christi dictum. "Propter eos sanctifico meipsum;" quia sanctitate ejus perfusi quatenus nos secum Patri dicavit (qui alioqui foetemus us coram eo)

tanquam puri et mundi, imo etiam sacri, placemus. Huc pertinet unctio sanctuarii, cujus mentio fit apud Danielem. Notanda enim est antithesis inter hanc unctionem et illam umbratilem quæ tunc in usu fuerat, acsi diceret Angelus, discussis umbris in Christi persona clarum fore sacerdotium. Quo magis detestabile est eorum commentum qui non contenti Christi sacerdotio, seipsos ad eum mactandum ingerere ausi sunt, quod tentatur quotidie in Papatu, ubi missa censetur immolatio Christi.—Calvini Institutio, ii. 15, 16.

B.

(See page 8.)

“I do not see that sacerdotalism, as connected with the Christian ministry, has the least germ in the New Testament. When the Holy Ghost is setting forth the dignity of Christian ministers by describing their duties, they are spoken of by various figures. For their tenderness, they are called shepherds ; for their vigilance, they are called watchmen ; for their patience, they are called fishermen ; for their diligence, they are called labourers ; for their faithfulness, they are called stewards ; and for their dignity, they are called ambassadors. But they are never in one single instance called priests. The Greek word *ιερευς* is never used. It is never applied to a New Testament pastor. Why, then, is the word not used ? Because it is not wanted ; because the New Testament

pastor has very different duties to perform than to be offering up propitiatory sacrifices. This is very suggestive. St Paul in a single passage puts the priests under the law, and the pastor under the Gospel, in juxtaposition, and says, 'Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple; and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar?' Even so hath the Lord ordained that 'they who preach the Gospel should live upon the Gospel.' St Paul tells us that the priest who 'waited on the altar' had a claim to live on the altar. He was entitled to a maintenance because he waited on the altar. So the Lord hath ordained that the New Testament pastor should have a maintenance for the work that He has given him to do, and that is, to 'preach the Gospel.'—The Christian Ministry. By the Rev. Canon Bardsley, M.A.

"All such priests as pretend to be Christ's successors in making a sacrifice of Him are His most heinous and horrible adversaries."—Cranmer.

"The place of the true minister is to follow John the Baptist, who, as he fulfilled his course, said, Whom think ye that I am? *I am not He.* But behold there cometh one after me, *whose shoes of His feet I am not worthy to loose.*' It is not for nothing that *that saying* of John the Baptist has been *five times reported* in the New Testament, once by every evangelist, and in the Acts too. It was used on three different occasions for certain, by the Baptist; probably (from the words in Acts, xiii. 25, '*he used to say*') it was frequently on his

lips. But has it not a *meaning*? Surely it is not a mere *chance* expression of humility, that has come down from the greatest prophet, except the Lord Jesus, that woman ever bore! In the mouth of an Israelite, the 'loosing of the shoe' *cannot* be without meaning. He who *took his neighbour's shoe* in Israel, *took his right to marry*, or *took his right to redeem*. Who will not see how significant these words are in the mouth of such a one as John the Baptist? He was a *born priest*, of the purest origin; his father, Zacharias, of the house of Abia; his mother, of the daughters of Aaron, her very name identical with that of Aaron's wife. A born priest of purest origin; a born redeemer of Israel. Such was John the Baptist. And where did he spend his life? In the temple? At the altar? In the synagogue? In the place which the Lord had chosen out of all the tribes of Israel to put His name there? No such thing. *We never find him in the temple in the whole course of his life*. No sacrifice of his is recorded, except the sacrifice of his own life. In the wilderness, by the banks of the Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance, pointing to the Bridegroom, to the Lamb of God—this was the place and this the manner of the last great prophet, *the last great priest*, that the old dispensation ever saw. 'Whom think ye that I am? I am not He. I baptise with water; but I am not the Bridegroom; *I cannot redeem*. He that cometh after me is mightier than I, *whose shoes of His feet I am not worthy to loose*.' In John the Baptist the law and the prophets gave up their priesthood to Him who now appeareth within the

vail. 'If He were on earth, even He would not be a priest; and there shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation, while He goeth in, *until He come out,*' we know not how soon. *Now* is our day of atonement. We *have* an altar; but it is the place of the ashes, the place called Golgotha, the hill outside Jerusalem, the standing-place of the cross of Christ. 'Let us go' thither, not only to eat (which of itself will not avail us), but 'that we also may die with Him.' So may we be partakers of His sufferings. So shall we become partakers of His kingdom. And then, 'unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood, and hath made us *kings and priests* unto God and His Father: to Him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.'"—Church Association Tracts, No. VIII.

C.

(See page 9.)

"It is among the most common, and certainly not the least dangerous, of the mistakes of the present day, to identify the Church with the clergy, as though the laity were not to the full as much one of its constituent parts. If you gather the popular opinion from the popular discourse, you must conclude that the Church is regarded as a corporation made up of bishops, priests, and deacons, but including absolutely none who do not bear

one of these titles ! Our common forms of speech both encourage and prove the mistake ; for we speak of a man as designed for the Church when preparing for the clerical profession, and as entering the Church when he takes holy orders ; and if it were a mere verbal inaccuracy, it might be scarcely worth our while to point out and correct it. But there is a vast deal more than impropriety of speech ; for, from talking of the Church as though composed wholly of the clergy, men come practically to forget that it is composed equally of the laity ; and when once this is forgotten, their own duties will be forgotten, and we shall hear of laymen coming forward in support of the Church, just as though they were the generous and chivalrous defenders of a cause which had no claims on their succour, in place of being bound by their own position and their own vows to uphold that of which they are sworn members.

“The thing, therefore, of which we would remind you is, that I did not enter the Church when I took holy orders and the bishop set me solemnly apart to minister in the sanctuary. I entered the Church when my parents and sponsors brought me to the priest, and he baptised me in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost ; and I have never been made more actually a member of the Christian Church than I was then. And though ordination, with its mysterious sacredness, gave me special duties to perform in the Church, on which, otherwise, I could not have entered, yet it *did* not, it *could* not, engraft me more thoroughly into the Church, nor give me a stronger fellowship than I already pos-

sessed. It follows, therefore, that every one of you (if he have duly received Christian baptism) is as actually a member of the Church as myself, who have been appointed to minister in holy things. I am indeed a *minister* of the Church, but not on that account more a *member* of the Church than any of those among whom I officiate. And so soon as you possess yourself of this, the correct, the simple idea of the Church, you must perceive the propriety of designating the Christian community as a 'kingdom of priests,' or a 'royal priesthood.' We are not speaking of what that community may be by *practice*, but only of what it is by *profession*; what it ought to be, and what it would be, if it acted faithfully up to the obligations taken on itself. When settled in Canaan, the Jews were far enough from proving their right to the title. They turned aside to false gods, and dishonoured, in place of magnifying, the name of Jehovah. But supposing them to have been a nation of righteous men, not only outwardly in covenant with God, but consecrated in heart to His service, then it is easy to perceive that they would have stood to all surrounding countries in the very position in which the tribe of Levi stood to themselves; they would have been witnesses for the Almighty to the rest of the world, standing in the midst of the vast temple of the earth, instructing the ignorant in the mysteries of truth. And as the family of Aaron officiated in the presence of the children of Israel, directing and upholding the true worship of God, and delivering intimations of His will, so would the children of Israel as a body have officiated

in the presence of the whole heathen world, and their land would have been as an altar whence pure incense went up in the sight of the other tribes of humankind. Thus would they have been a nation as manifestly set apart and devoted to God as the tribe invested with the Levitical priesthood, discharging to all the inhabitants of the earth the mighty functions of a teacher and a guide. And all we ask of you is, whether, if the Jews had assumed this position—a position for which they were designed by God, and into which He strove to lead them—they would not have been what was promised as the reward of their obedience, ‘a royal priesthood’ or ‘kingdom of priests’?

“But what the Jewish nation might have been, that may the Christian Church be; yea, and that would it be, if its every member acted up to the vows which were made at his baptism. Let a parish of nominal Christians be converted into a parish of real Christians, so that there should not be one within its circuit who did not adorn the doctrines of the Gospel, and what should we have but a parish of priests to the high and living God? We call it a parish of priests, because we know full well that it would be as a kind of little sanctuary in the midst of the country or city, which might elsewhere have been deformed by great ignorance and profligacy. Just as in the midst of this parish itself would rise its church, more sacred than any other structure, so would the parish stand in the midst of surrounding parishes, a holier spot, and fuller of the presence of Deity! There, as fresh lessons in the truths of religion would be con-

tinually delivered to the dwellers in that parish from their own pulpit, by their own priests, so would these dwellers themselves be examples and instructors to all by whom they were encompassed, and thus practically discharge a noble portion of the ministerial office. There would be no trenching upon the functions which belong exclusively to the men who have been ordained to the service of the temple ; but, nevertheless, there would be that full and thorough exhibition of Christianity, which is among the most powerful of preaching, of that noble presentation of every energy to God, which is far above the costliest of sacrifices and burnt-offerings. Without dealing in exaggerated terms, we do not hesitate to declare of a parish thus described, that it would be as an altar, or rather a shrine, from which would issue divine messages to every neighbouring district ; and that every dweller in this parish, seeing that his individual piety contributed to the general demonstration of godliness, might be regarded as standing at a shrine with all the insignia and all the solemnities of a priesthood. Such would be the aspect and bearing of a whole parish of real Christians—of men, that is, who felt (for this is the simple account of the matter) that, as members of the Christian Church, they were bound to be to the rest of mankind exactly what the ministers of Christ were to them.

“ And you will easily see, that in passing from a parish to a nation, we introduce no change into our argument ; we only enlarge its application. For a kingdom is to other kingdoms what a parish is to other parishes. We

cannot tell you what a spectacle it would be in the midst of the earth, if any one people, as a body, acted up to the principles and fulfilled the vows of Christianity ; but we are sure that no better title than that of the text could be given to such a people. You know that, however the influences of Christianity may have been counteracted by the corruptions of the nature with which they have to deal, they are admirably calculated to promote personal happiness, so that if they always had full scope, they would banish all discord and rancour, covering the land with peaceful and contented families. It seems to us impossible that a thoroughly Christian nation should do otherwise than advance with extraordinary speed to the very summit of prosperity : for, having in itself none of those causes of weakness and dissension which must exist where vice pervades great masses of a population, it would concentrate its unbroken energies on every undertaking ; and seeking always the guidance of God, and venturing upon nothing in its own strength, would never be engaged in what might issue disastrously. The prosperity of the kingdom would immediately draw upon it the notice of the whole world, and then would Christianity, the producing cause of its prosperity, become the object of universal attention. The men of other lands would observe with amazement and admiration what a charter of the purest liberty had been framed from the Bible ; what a high-road to all that is stable in civil institutions, splendid in national greatness, beautiful in domestic relations, had been formed by those who walked only by the light of

God's Word. It would therefore come to pass that the nation in question would be as a temple to all surrounding tribes, and that the result would be the same as though from the east and the west, from the north and the south, men flocked to its portals that they might receive instruction from a consecrated priesthood. Neither is it only through the example they would give, and the exhibition they would present, of the beneficial power of Christianity, that the inhabitants of the country would be as priests of the Most High. You cannot doubt that such a nation as we have described would be in the largest sense a missionary nation, and that its ruling desire would be to procure admission for the Gospel into all the districts of the earth. Conscious of the inestimable blessings which Christianity has provided for their own families, and moved by a sense of freely giving what they had freely received, this nation would not send forth a single ship on any enterprise of commerce without making it a vehicle for transmitting the principles of religion. And as the stately thing swept the waters to freight itself with the produce of far-off climes, it would carry the sowers of that seed of life, which is to restore the verdure to a fallen creation!

“We are not aware that we in the least degree overdraw the picture of the conduct of the people among whom godliness should universally prevail. We introduce no feature which would not be brought, as we think, into the sketch of every painter who knows what Christianity is, and who supposes it throned in every household and in every heart. And if you combine

these features, you will find no more appropriate title than that furnished by the text, of the people whose portraiture the combination would give. Oh, we again say of the land in whose every habitation the religion of Jesus had thorough dominion, that it would be as a great temple in the midst of the earth, in whose recesses God visibly dwelt, and from whose altars ascended flames which fixed the gaze of the men of other tribes! If you could occupy that land with the walls of one mighty sanctuary, and crown them with a dome whose space should be that of the overarching sky, and bring within them the mysterious *Shekinah* that hallowed the structure which Solomon reared, it would not be so sublime an edifice, and so manifest an indwelling of Deity, as when the temple is built of all the hearts in a land, and the Most High shrines Himself in the secrecies of every spirit. And what shall we say of the dwellers in such a land?—of those who inhabit that temple which, as it were, they constitute, serving God with all the assiduousness of heartfelt and unwearied devotion, and acting in their every proceeding on the principles of religion? They are as stewards of the mysteries of the kingdom, and dispense the law and publish the proclamation; they are earnest in imparting the privileges they enjoy, and desirous to show their gratitude by enlarging, if possible, the kingdom of the Redeemer. They are as ministers of the faith, and spread far and wide the offer of salvation; and thus they are fulfilling to surrounding nations the very office which is fulfilled to themselves by those whose special business it is to teach

in their churches. They are keeping up a sacred fire on the altar, that those sitting in darkness may see a great light; they are blowing the silver trumpet of the jubilee, that those ready to perish may hear of deliverance; they are offering themselves a living sacrifice to the Almighty, that pagans may learn to cast their idols to the moles and to the bats. And what, then, is to be said of them, but that their practical Christianity has thus turned their country into one magnificent sanctuary, from whose pulpit the Gospel summons goes forth to all the ends of the earth, and whose walls so echo the praises of the Saviour that distant islands are roused by the symphony? What is to be said, but that in them are fulfilled the words of God by the mouth of the apostle, and that they are emphatically 'a royal priesthood,' or a 'kingdom of priests'?"—Rev. Henry Melvill, B.D. ; Sermon on 1 Peter, ii. 9.

D.

(See page 44.)

“But whatever was the constitution under which the Church of Scotland was placed, it is very evident that it was, in the strictest sense of the word, independent. It looked to no foreign Church as entitled to direct the faith of those whom it had received into its communion; and, cut off from much intercourse with the rest of the world,

it long escaped the error into which Christians in other parts of Europe had unhappily fallen.

“From the scanty records to which access can now be obtained, it seems highly probable that it preserved a purity of doctrine and an energy of discipline eminently calculated to secure the great ends for which revelation was given; that, accommodating itself to the varying situation of its members, it earnestly enforced the fundamental principles of morality, endeavoured to check the vices and to soften the manners which too universally prevailed; that, grateful for the protection of Government, for the civil rights which it early obtained, it laboured to cement the social union, to facilitate the administration of justice, and to promote that submission to lawful authority which, before its establishment, had, by discontent or ambition, been so often refused.”—Cook’s Reformation: Introductory Chapter, referring to “Bede, lib. iii.; David Buchanan’s Preface to Knox’s History; Sibbald’s History of Fife.”

E.

(See page 58).

“The Church is said to have anciently possessed one half of the whole property of the kingdom. The real property of Scotland now amounts to upwards of ten millions annually: had the Church’s proportion of this

kept pace in value with the laity's, it would be five millions. Let us reduce our estimate to two millions and a half, and then see how this might have been used for the three great objects contemplated by the Reformers. The stipends of the thousand ministers of the Church of Scotland amount to about £200,000. But the scheme of the Reformers, being national, must embrace all the clergy in the kingdom ; so that we have to support three thousand ministers, with stipends amounting to £600,000. To this must be added a sum sufficient to build and uphold churches, to build and uphold manses, to provide glebes, to reward high services rendered to religion,—so that altogether £1,000,000 would be required for this purpose. The present* assessment for the poor amounts to about £650,000 ; but with such an enormous fund at our disposal we can afford to be liberal, and may therefore set apart £750,000 for the sustenance of our pauper population. An equal sum might be expended on a widely-spread and liberally-endowed system of education. Thus, for £2,500,000 annually, might all our ecclesiastical, educational, and pauper establishments be maintained, and that on a much more munificent footing than at present. We may safely conclude that the property of the ancient Church, if it had been properly preserved, would have amounted to more than this, and that thus the scheme of the authors of the 'Book of Discipline' would have been abundantly carried out, and the community saved from three of the heaviest taxes which now press upon it. The Gospel would be

preached, our children educated, our poor provided for, without cost. No one would lose anything; only some of our great proprietors would never have possessed their extensive domains. Some great lords would be but country gentlemen with small estates, untroubled with dreams about nobility; and others might rejoice in ancient titles, but lack the broad acres which now give them support. Public officers, and not private factors, would be lifting the rents of our ancient monasteries; and yet the present holders could not be said to have lost what, according to our supposition, they never possessed. The community would have reaped, as it ought to have done, the benefit of the Church's accumulated wealth.

“The same agencies which deposited the endowments of the Roman hierarchy are operating still; and if sufficient time be allowed, the accumulation will again become equally great. Men are every now and then dying and leaving money to build a church, to found an hospital, to endow a school. The funds thus devoted must go on increasing—they cannot decrease; and we can contemplate the time when our ecclesiastical, educational, and pauper establishments will be sustained by this source alone, without need of assessments. How sad if the few were again to sweep away the wealth thus slowly accumulated for the benefit of the many!”—Dr Cunningham's *Church History of Scotland*, vol. i. p. 367, 368.

F.

(See page 67).

The following is the number of parishes comprehended in the Church of Scotland, as at 15th February 1875, on which day *three* were added to the list, which is being augmented at the rate of about *fifteen* a-year, under the provisions of the Act 7 & 8 Vict. c. 44.

1. Original parishes (whereof 6 are collegiate charges, having each 2 churches and district congregations—viz., Ayr, Hamilton, Campbelton, Inverary, St Andrews, and Cupar),	924
Parliamentary parishes,	39
New endowed parishes,	211
	<hr/>
Total number of parishes at 15th Feb. 1875,	1174
	<hr/>
2. Number of presbyteries,	84
Presbytery of Glasgow has largest number of parishes—viz.,	54
„ Burray has the smallest—viz.,	4
Seven presbyteries have 6 each—viz., Forres, Nairn, Tongue, Uist, Lewis, Lerwick, and Olnafirth.	
Average number of parishes in a presbytery (very nearly),	14
	<hr/>
3. Number of synods,	16
The largest number of presbyteries in a synod is 8. Two synods,—viz., 1, Glasgow and Ayr; and 2, Aberdeen,—have this number. The smallest number is 3. Five have this number—viz., 1, Galloway; 2, Ross; 3, Sutherland and Caithness; 4, Orkney; and 5, Shetland.	
Average number of presbyteries in a synod,	5

4. Number of chapels connected with Church of Scotland,	172
Number of preaching and mission stations,	71
	243
Add to these, number of parishes as above,	1174
	1417
Parishes, chapels, and preaching and mission stations, at 15th Feb. 1875,	1417

G.

(See page 100.)

“That the working of the Voluntary system is only and uniformly evil, is, of course, not maintained; neither is it meant for a moment to deny that there are many unendowed ministers who are as free from the subserviency and ambition which the system is supposed to cherish as the best of their more favoured brethren. The temptations to these things which the Voluntary system presents, though urgent, are not insurmountable; nor can it reasonably excite surprise, though high Christian principle should enable a man to overcome them, or though auspicious circumstances should intercept him from their influence. Some Dissenting ministers possess private endowments, which isolate them in some measure from the temptations incident to their position; others have bonds for stipends, which place them in a similar situation; a third class are the pastors of old and flourishing congregations, where respect for the minister, and regular payment of seat-rents, have descended as an heir-

loom from generation to generation ; whilst a fourth, who enjoy none of these advantages, possess an ample compensation for them in those commanding powers of mind and eloquence which, in the rare instances in which they are found, are certain to beget in a people an honest pride in the superior talents of their minister, and to protect him from their caprice, by insuring him, at any time, ' a new situation and an adequate stipend.' Altogether, there are many conceivable causes by which the evils of the Voluntary system may, in particular cases, be neutralised or mitigated. And our position, therefore, that it is in the main a system pregnant with vast evil to the clergy and the Church, is in no degree disproved by the fact, which we are most ready and happy to acknowledge, that there are among all sections of Evangelical Dissenters many ministers who not only adorn their sacred profession by their sterling worth and unostentatious usefulness, but live apparently in independent and amicable intercourse with their flocks, grow in the attachment and reverence of their people as they grow old in their service, and are ' followed to the grave by their respectful and fervent regret.'

" Instances of occasional or frequent superiority to the temptations of the system are, however, no proof either of the non-existence or of the impotency of these temptations. And it may still be true, as a matter of history, that its operation on the character of the clergy and the interests of pure religion is substantially and upon the whole unfavourable." — Lectures on Civil Establishments, No. VII., by the Rev. J. M'Culloch, D.D.

H.

(See page 106.)

The facts mentioned as to the migration of chapels in Liverpool sounded so startling to some of those who heard this lecture, that at its close several of them, including a minister who for some years had laboured in Liverpool, waited upon me to express the difficulty they had in believing them, and their anxiety to know whether I had exercised sufficient care in sifting my information respecting them. I was able at once to satisfy them that what I had stated was given on the competent authority of the Rev. A. Hume, LL.D., D.C.L., who, on the 8th October 1869, read an interesting paper on "The Church's Work in large Towns" before the Liverpool Congress, in which these facts were set forth in detail. As the facts are important, and throw a flood of light on the inherent character and tendencies of Voluntaryism, it may be useful and interesting to append here Dr Hume's fuller exposition of the facts as given in his supplementary paper on the "State and Prospects of the Church in Liverpool," published by Mr Holden, Liverpool, 1869.

"IV. MIGRATION OF CHAPELS.

"*Dissenting Chapels migrate.*—In 1852, my attention was called to the fact, by a Nonconformist minister, that the chapels of the various sects in the town had been sold, and reproduced elsewhere. In other words, while

the congregation, as a corporation or public body, remains the same, the place of worship follows the changing residences of the wealthy, and deserts the part which becomes the permanent home of poverty. He quoted four or five examples; and my own observation supplied others. In 1858, in giving evidence before the Bishop of Exeter's Committee of the Lords, I stated the fact as one which deserved to be better known; and in the pamphlet which resulted from that evidence, I instanced nineteen such changes of locality, occurring in seven different religious bodies. Neither of these statements attracted much public attention. But when, in 1859, I mentioned the same facts before the Duke of Marlborough's Committee of the Lords, showing that the Church of England is therefore *missionary* in its character, as well as *ministerial*,—indeed the only religious body that attends to the poor systematically and on principle,—the statement was somewhat angrily called in question.

“25. *Denial of the Facts.*—In May and June 1862, Mr Herbert S. Skeats published a series of papers in the ‘Nonconformist’ newspaper, purporting to be returns from ministers in various towns, to whom he had sent a circular of inquiry. Whether he had purposely selected gentlemen of known want of observation, or whether their non-acquaintance with all such facts was feigned, I cannot say; but the result was that none of them knew of a single case of a Nonconformist ‘church’ having retired from one place to be reproduced in another! He must have been particularly unfortunate in his selection

of his correspondents ; for, only about nine months before, Mr Spurgeon had drawn attention pointedly to the subject, and his sermon had been published. Accordingly, the conclusion of Mr Skeats was that no such facts exist, and that Dr Hume, if really serious, was labouring under some strange mistake.

“ 26. *Detailed Examination and Reply.*—I then entered into a detailed examination of the subject ; ascertaining, among other things, how many chapels had been registered, and corresponding ones removed, from the registrar’s books ; and how many of those, once registered and used, had silently disappeared and left no trace. The result was published in a series of letters to the ‘ Standard ’ in the autumn of 1862 ; and by several corroborative lines of argument, my position was proved conclusively. It was shown to be the case to a greater or less extent in all our large towns ; but, owing to the rapid changes which take place in Liverpool, the law of progress was there more obvious. The letters were afterwards issued in pamphlet form, with a map of Liverpool which showed the sites of about fifty deserted chapels.

“ 27. *Changes in Liverpool.*—Imperfect as this record is, we have here an account of the journeyings of thirty-three congregations, connected with nineteen distinct religious bodies—viz., eighteen kinds of Protestant Dissenters, and the Mormons, or Latter-Day Saints. Like the soldiers of a marching regiment, several of them dropped off by the way ; but so many as fifteen found new homes in the richer and more elevated parts of the

town, whilst eight others passed completely 'over the border,' into the suburban districts of Everton and Edge Hill. Of course, the same class of changes goes forward to the present time; but as my letters were regarded as closing the question in 1862, I have not thought it necessary to record the more modern instances.

"The following facts appear to be particularly deserving of attention:—

"*First.*—So many as thirteen of these points of departure, or deserted sites, are included in a parallelogram, the area of which is only one-sixth of a square mile.

"*Second.*—The new parish of Vauxhall, now very poor, was, when at its fullest extent, the cradle of six congregations connected with as many religious communities; and it was the resting-place of a seventh on its travels. The average distance which each passed over is nearly a mile and three-quarters. Three other religious bodies have also had temporary accommodation within it. Another ecclesiastical district contains seven deserted sites, another five, and others again two or three.

"*Third.*—The thirty-three congregations have occupied one hundred and thirty distinct sites, or an average of more than three each; of these again, eight have occupied forty-five sites, and four out of these have occupied twenty-nine.

"*Fourth.*—The ground travelled over by these thirty-three congregations is more than forty-five miles, or nearly a mile and a half each. The longest journey made in a single effort was within a few yards of two miles

—viz., from Cockspur Street to Sidney Place, Edge Hill. The shortest was about two hundred and fifty yards, or more than a furlong.

“28. *Occupation of the Sites.* — The following churches represent as many Dissenting chapels which were abandoned and sold; and the first four occupy the identical buildings unchanged: (1.) St Stephen’s, Byrom Street; (2.) St Columba’s, Pleasant Street; (3.) St Matthew’s, Scotland Road; (4.) The German Church, Sir Thomas’s Buildings; (5.) St Simon’s; (6.) All Saints; and (7.) All Souls. The following were also deserted chapels: (8.) St Paul’s Schools, Edmund Street, and (9.) St Columba’s Schools, Pleasant Street. Of the other deserted sites, three are yards for the sale of coals, stones, &c., four are warehouses, three are public rooms, three are private houses, one a workshop, two schools, two stables, two merchants’ offices, one a Turkish bath, one a marine store, three are shops, one a public office, one vacant ground, and one a public-house and theatre.”

I.

(See page 116.)

The ‘*Eclectic Review*,’ one of the ablest organs of a former generation of Dissenters, admitted frankly that “pure attachment to Dissenting principles requires to be kept up in certain minds by a *keen hatred* and now and then a *little round abuse of the Church*.” Now

that the new life and vigorous evangelistic efforts which are noticeable in the Church of Scotland make it more difficult to abuse her, except on grounds which all possessed of common discernment see at once to be hollow or calumnious, it has become the fashion of Dissenters to assume a patronising air towards the Church, and to speak as if they, enjoying superior privileges and immunities, were, in their extreme condescending graciousness, willing and anxious to share these with Churchmen. There is an old fable of a fox that, by unwilling if not mistaken martyrdom, had lost his tail, whose wily address to his more fortunate kin is likelier to commend itself to most minds, as furnishing a key to the language and policy of some Dissenters at the present day in Scotland.

K.

(See page 130.)

“From Edinburgh in our General Assemblie, the tent day of Julie 1579.—Now quhē as being cōuenit in one generall assemblie, this holy boke of God callit the Bible, newly imprentit, was brocht before vs be the prenter thereof, Alexander Arbuthnot (a man quha has taken great paines and trauailes worthy to be remembered in this behalfe), and desyrit to be dedicat to zour Hienes, with a conuenient preface in our common Scottis lan-

guage, we cold not omit nor neglect the occasion offrit to do the same.—O quhat difference may be sene betwene thir daies of light, quhen almaist in euerie priuat house the buike of Gods lawe is red and vnderstand in oure vulgaire language, and that age of darkenes quhen scarslie in ane hail cite (without the closters of the monkes and freyres) culde the buike of God anes be founde, and that in ane strange toungue of latine not gud but mixed with barbaritie, used and red be fewe, and almaist vnderstand or exponit be nane. And quhen the false namit clergie of this realme, abusing the gentle nature of zour Hienes maist noble Gudshir of worthy memorie made it an capital crime to be punishit with the fyre to haue or rede the new testament in the vulgare language, zea and to make them to al men mare odius, as gif it had bene the detestable name of a pernicious secte, they were named new testamentares.”—Dedication to the King, quoted by Dr M’Crie in Notes to Life of Melville.

In 1579 it was ordained by Act of Parliament, that every gentleman householder worth three hundred merks of yearly rent, and every yeoman or burgess worth five hundred pounds, should “have a bible and psalm buike in vulgar language in thair hous for the better instruction of thame selfis and yair familijs in the knowledge of God” under the pain of ten pounds; and in 1580, a general searcher was appointed by the king with power to visit the houses and require the sight of a Bible and Psalm-book marked with the names of those above-described, and with strict orders to exact the penalty from

those liable through default.—Act. Parl. Scot., iii. 139 ;
Record of Privy Seal, vol. xlvi. fol. 129.

L.

(See page 135.)

WORDSWORTH ON VOLUNTARYISM.

“The sounder part of the Scottish nation know what good their ancestors derived from their Church, and feel how deeply the living generation is indebted to it. . . . Visionary notions have in all ages been afloat upon the subject of best providing for the clergy ; notions which have been sincerely entertained by good men, with a view to the improvement of that order, and eagerly caught at and dwelt upon by the designing, for its degradation and disparagement. Some are beguiled by what they call the *Voluntary system*, not seeing (what stares one in the face at the very threshold) that they who stand in most need of religious instruction are unconscious of the want, and therefore cannot reasonably be expected to make any sacrifices in order to supply it. Will the licentious, the sensual, and the depraved, take from the means of their gratifications and pursuits, to support a discipline that cannot advance without uprooting the trees that bear the fruit which they devour so greedily ? Will *they* pay the price of that seed whose harvest is to be reaped

in an invisible world? A Voluntary system for the religious exigencies of a people numerous and circumstanced as we are! Not more absurd would it be to expect that a knot of boys should draw upon the pittance of their pocket-money to build schools, or out of the abundance of their discretion be able to select fit masters to teach and keep them in order! Some, who clearly perceive the incompetence and folly of such a scheme for the agricultural part of the people, nevertheless think it feasible in large towns, where the rich might subscribe for the religious instruction of the poor. Alas! they know little of the thick darkness that spreads over the streets and alleys of our large towns. The parish of Lambeth, a few years since, contained not more than one church, and three or four small proprietary chapels, while Dissenting chapels, of every denomination, were still more scantily found there; yet the inhabitants of the parish amounted at that time to upwards of 50,000. Were the parish church and the chapels of the Establishment existing there an *impediment* to the spread of the Gospel among that mass of people? Who shall dare to say so? But if any one, in the face of the fact which has just been stated, and in opposition to authentic reports to the same effect from various other quarters, should still contend that a Voluntary system is sufficient for the spread and maintenance of religion, we would ask, What kind of religion? Wherein would it differ, among the many, from deplorable fanaticism?

“For the preservation of the Church Establishment,

all men, whether they belong to it or not, could they perceive their own interest, would be strenuous; but how inadequate are its provisions for the needs of the country! and how much is it to be regretted that, while its zealous friends yield to alarms on account of the hostility of Dissent, they should so much overrate the danger to be apprehended from that quarter, and almost overlook the fact that hundreds of thousands of our fellow-countrymen, though formally and nominally of the Church of England, never enter her places of worship, neither have they communication with her ministers! This deplorable state of things was partly produced by a decay of zeal among the rich and influential, and partly by a want of due expansive power in the constitution of the Establishment as regulated by law. Private benefactors in their efforts to build and endow churches have been frustrated, or too much impeded, by legal obstacles; these, where they are unreasonable or unfitted for the times, ought to be removed; and, keeping clear of intolerance and injustice, means should be taken to render the presence and powers of the Church commensurate with the wants of a shifting and still increasing population."—Poetical Works of William Wordsworth (Moxon, 1845), p. 606, 607.

M.

(See page 227.)

Speaking of the spirit reviving among the large proprietors and nobles of the land, and amongst our great manufacturers, leading them to aid in extending the Church, and to contribute of their substance to the godly teaching of that population they have been the means of gathering round them, the Rev. J. J. Blunt says: "It is a spirit as wise, even as worldly-wise, as it is holy and good; for we may rest assured that God will eventually assert a right to His own; and that as from the earliest times He has claimed for Himself a portion of our earthly substance—'the land,' says He, 'is mine, for ye are strangers and sojourners with me' (Levit. xxv. 23)—so if that portion is withheld He will exact it in some other shape, and whilst we refuse to scatter as He commands, will make our thrift tend only to poverty. If we will not build churches to God, and maintain ministers of His, it will be so ordered that we shall be compelled to be at greater cost in erecting jails, and supporting constables and an armed police. If we will not establish schools, where good principles may be taught the children, it will be required of us, for the sake of securing our property and lives, at still larger outlay to furnish hulks, penitentiaries, and penal settlements; and after all, by such palliatives, only stay the plague for a season, till crime, merely coerced by vulgar force, not suppressed by the

active substitution of better motives, shall have gathered strength enough to overpower such barriers, and we become alive to our mistake too late, when all is lost, and we are swept away in a torrent of vice and violence. We have been taught from time to time, though happily on a small scale, if we compare our experience with that of foreign nations, what a volcano we are cherishing in our social system, when we allow a multitude of persons to grow up, and congregate, with no early religious principles planted in them to control and restrain them. Is it credible that such disgraceful outbreaks could have occurred, if the districts which have been the scenes of them had been duly kept within the influence of the Church in times past? if they had been organised as they should have been; churches ministers, schools, assigned to them in adequate proportion, and every individual in them brought under the vigilant eye and immediate superintendence of the parochial system? This, however, is a very inferior and subordinate view to take of the virtues that go out of such an ecclesiastical economy. Our Church professes to be, and would be if she had her powers developed, the nursing-mother of England. She is so constructed as to lead her children by the hand from the cradle to the grave, and beyond it."—Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, p. 79.

N.

(See page 232.)

“ What might be the aggregate or ultimate results of such a change as would throw all the churches on the Voluntary principle, we know not ; but, looking merely to human means and probabilities, we should say that one of its effects would probably be the speedy ascendancy of Popery. Even without any legal sanction (which, however, it does not repudiate) it is the most likely to acquire the pre-eminence on the Voluntary plan. It is an old, firmly-rooted, and wealthy Church ; its resources are inexhaustible, and the greater in proportion its superstitions are gross. Hitherto the Established Church has been the great bulwark of Protestantism, against which Popery has for ages tried its strength in vain, and behind which the various smaller bodies of Protestants have rested in peace, as it were, in so many little creeks and bays. That bulwark has become somewhat dilapidated, or has not been duly extended, and the surge is already making head over it ; but instead of reinforcing and strengthening it, the Dissenters are eagerly seeking to remove or destroy that mighty breakwater altogether ! ”
—Prefatory Discourse to Lectures on Civil Establishments, by Rev. Dr James Buchanan.

O.

(See page 234.)

“The tendency of every unendowed Church is to throw the burden of supporting the minister on the congregation, and to blame the minister, if the congregation, through neglect or want of ability, fail to do so. In this manner some of our best ministers feel their position and honour unwarrantably assailed at times. It cannot be denied that ministers are sometimes measured, and weighed, and applauded, in proportion to the pounds, shillings, and pence sent from their congregations to the funds of the Church. If one happens to fall among rich people, he is rewarded and honoured, and held up to admiration, above him who has to labour among the poor, simply for the sake of circumstances over which the one or the other has no control. The minister of a poor charge, with hundreds of souls to attend to, and with scarcely a family in his congregation able to make both ends meet with comfort, has several disadvantages to contend with. He has to face the difficulty of pressing poor people to give liberally out of their poverty; he must have his hand in his pocket continually to relieve the distressed around him; he must take the lead and bear the burden of erecting church buildings and keeping them in repair; he cannot expect any supplement; and he is grieved at the smallness of the amount his congregation can send to the funds of the Church. But, instead of being sympathised with, and encouraged

to persevere in preaching the Gospel to the poor, he is in danger of being abused and stigmatised as one who mistook his calling, because he cannot make his congregation rich enough to send a certain sum per member to the Sustentation Fund. Whereas, a brother who has not so much work to do—who is burdened with presents from his congregation every week—and who has a staff of office-bearers that make his congregation independent of all outside aid, and that relieve him of all secular matters connected with his charge,—is held up as a man worthy of special honour, and distinguished by a special grant, simply because he has six or seven elders in his congregation who give £50 a-year to the Sustentation Fund. In an endowed Church the case would be different. The position of the minister of the poor congregation, other things being equal, would be as good as that of the minister of the rich, and there would be no room for invidious distinctions or insinuations on the ground of the wealth or poverty of congregations. Should every congregation in the country be able to support their respective ministers and do their duty to all Church schemes, it would be unwise and unwarrantable for the Church to throw the endowments away. We know enough of the workings of Voluntary efforts, and we feel enough of the tendency of Voluntary Churches, to make us hesitate to admit that no more is needed for the maintenance of Gospel ordinances than the free-will offerings of the people. We do not believe it, even on Dr Edmunds' authority.

“The Sustentation Fund of the Free Church is the best

substitute for an endowment ever devised; and, in so far as its principle is departed from, some of the most faithful of her ministers feel their position and honour attacked in several ways, and are in danger of being alienated from her communion on account of the change. According to true Presbyterian parity, the minister who does his work, and labours in a large congregation, should it be the poorest in the land, ought to be paid and supported and respected as well and as much as the minister of the wealthiest; his position as a minister ought to be independent of the circumstances of his hearers, whether they are rich or poor. But is this the case? I am sorry to confess it is not, even in our own Free Church—and yet I do not blame any particular individuals for it; the mistake is traceable to that Voluntary system which is encouraged, directly or indirectly, by honest men who do not profess to believe its soundness.

“It is perfectly clear, therefore, that the principle of each congregation supporting its own minister will not meet the case, and that those supplementary schemes that are at variance with Presbyterian parity will not give satisfaction, or protect the position of the ministers of any Church. We have had thirty years of Free-Churchism, and a longer period of pure Voluntaryism, and our experience leads us to the conclusion that there is much need at home and abroad of all the endowments the Churches possess, and of all the liberality their members can show. Under these circumstances, it would be extreme madness on the part of any one of

them to throw away what it has, or to make a gift of its funds to the good landowners of Scotland.”

The pamphlet entitled ‘Disestablishment; or, What shall we do?’ by a Free Church Highland Minister, —from which the foregoing quotation has been made— has just (1875) been published by Mr Maclehose, Glasgow, and is well worthy of careful perusal. Its revelations of the true nature and tendencies of Voluntaryism are very instructive and significant; and the way in which the author demolishes some of the recent arguments for disestablishment and disendowment, proves him, whoever he is, to be a man of clear and vigorous intellect, who writes from the fulness of acute observation and ripe experience.