



# ST GILES' LECTURES.

*FIRST SERIES—THE SCOTTISH CHURCH.*

## *LECTURE IX.*

### THE CHURCH OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY, 1707 TO 1800 A.D.<sup>1</sup>

By the Very Rev. JOHN TULLOCH, D.D., LL.D., Principal of St Mary's College, St Andrews, and one of Her Majesty's Chaplains.

THE subject assigned me is a large one, requiring an extended canvas. In the short space allotted to me, I can only draw some of its salient features. It is, moreover, a difficult and critical subject, stirring questions of which we have not yet seen the end, and bringing before us for the first time fully developed parties, whose rival influence has modified the whole modern history of the Church of Scotland, and whose conflicts and jealousies survive to the present time. I must therefore not only work upon a reduced canvas, but with a very delicate pencil. Whatever use these St Giles' Lectures may be, one of their main intentions must be to soften, rather than to harden ecclesiastical prejudices, and to make the controversies and

<sup>1</sup> I wish particularly to express my obligations in the preparation of this lecture to Dr Cunningham's *Church History of Scotland*, vol. ii., and Morren's *Annals of the General Assembly from 1739 to 1766*—the more so that I have not given detailed references to either. I need not particularise my obligations otherwise. They appear partly in the course of the lecture, which has been completed with difficulty during illness, and makes no claim to research.

asperities of the past a warning for our better guidance, rather than a stimulus to our unspent feuds. The Lecturer must of course say what he thinks; but he must say it with discrimination, and in charity towards all.

With the cessation of the Scottish Parliament in 1707, Scotland ceased to have a separate political history. It remained in many respects still a distinct kingdom, especially in those social and religious characteristics which are deeper than any Acts of Parliament, which formal legislation may express and ratify, but cannot directly alter. The people themselves were distinct from their kindred across the Border; hardened into an independent nationality by long struggle with influences which they refused to accept, and having their independence rooted in the passionate, if narrow love, which is always lavished on that which has cost us dear. The judicial and administrative system of the country which centred in the Court of Session and its cognate functionaries, was distinct. And of course the Church was distinct, secured by definite statute in 1690, and again and very solemnly in the Act of Union. The Commissioners for the Union had been precluded from treating 'of or concerning any alteration of the worship, discipline, and government of the Church as by law established in Scotland.' Whatever was to be altered, the Presbyterian Church was not to be altered. And so, while the ancient Parliament of the realm disappeared, the Scottish Church not only remained untouched, but was continued, in the emphatic words of the Act of Union, 'without any alteration to the people of this land in all succeeding generations;' and the oath guaranteeing this settlement, as is well known, is the first that is taken by a new monarch on his or her accession to the throne.

Distinct as Scotland remained in national life at the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Church, thus secured by statute and the 'inclinations of the generality of the people, ever since the Reformation,' naturally became the chief organ for the expression of national feeling and activity. Such national diver-

sities as existed were reflected in it, and came to a head in the management of its affairs in the General Assembly. The difficulties described in the previous lecture as to the Episcopal clergy who remained within the Church, were prolonged into this period; and others were added arising out of the Union and the natural influx of English officials which followed it. In the east and the north—in Forfarshire, Kincardineshire, Aberdeenshire, and even the far Ross-shire, where Presbyterianism of an extreme type is now so conspicuously found, Episcopacy possessed many entire parishes. In point of fact, there were parts of the Highlands and Islands where Popery, if not Paganism, still lingered; and to the acknowledgment of this fact the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge owes its origin. It originated in the very year of the Union, was fostered by the Church, and received royal institution and sanction two years later. There are Highland districts even now, as every one knows, where Romanism has its contented and peaceful adherents. But in the beginning of last century, and in the view of a National Presbyterianism clothed with new statutory authority, such facts were naturally fitted to arouse anxiety. The terms of the Church's original establishment called upon it to purge out all such erroneous elements, as savouring of civil no less than of religious disaffection; and the royal letters addressed to the General Assembly emphasised the same duty of planting everywhere vacant churches with sound Protestant ministers. This part of its work, therefore, was expressly laid upon the Church; and it was no mere restlessness of zeal that impelled it to undertake the task of Presbyterian propagandism, in the course of which the visitors or agents of the General Assembly sometimes met with what Wodrow calls 'very inhuman treatment from those disaffected to the Establishment.'<sup>1</sup>

The Church was only doing its duty in planting, so far as it

<sup>1</sup> *Corresp.*, vol. i., p. 216.

was able, Presbyterian ministers in the face of local opposition; but it was undoubtedly wrong in resisting the rights of free worship and toleration to Episcopal clergymen like Greenshields, who desired merely to meet and hold divine service according to the forms of the Church of England. The persecution of Greenshields, from first to last, was a miserable business, reflecting credit neither on the General Assembly nor on the Magistrates of Edinburgh; and the Tory Parliament of Queen Anne, if not to be justified in much that it did, was fully justified in securing by statute that the Episcopal Communion in Scotland should not be disturbed in the exercise of their religious worship. The Toleration Act of 1712 was a statute of freedom, obnoxious as it was to the great body of Presbyterians. It confined the ecclesiastical power to its own sphere; and, while it left the Church its anathemas against schism and 'innovations in the worship of God,' protected all who chose to put themselves voluntarily beyond its pale from all forcible interference. It is melancholy to think that even the Church of Carstares did what it could to oppose such a law, and that it can be said with truth by the modern historian that the Scottish Parliament would never have ventured to pass it.

But the legislature of Queen Anne, unhappily, did not stop with the Act of Toleration. In the very same year it introduced the Act for the Restoration of Patronage, which has proved such a fertile and unhappy cause of division in Scotland. I need hardly say that I am not going to treat this subject in any controversial spirit; but the facts regarding it require to be clearly stated, if for no other purpose than because it forms the centre round which all the later external history of the Church of Scotland revolves. There are features of the Church in the eighteenth century which would no doubt have been the same although lay Patronage had not been restored; but the history of Scottish Presbyterianism would have been entirely different, if the Tory politicians of Queen Anne had only left undisturbed the settlement of the Patronage question

made in 1690 by the same Parliament of William and Mary as re-established the Church. It is true that this settlement did not go so far as some had desired. It did not recognise the right 'of every several congregation to elect their minister,' as formulated in the *First Book of Discipline*, to which—although never sanctioned by law—a certain class of Presbyterians have always looked back as their special charter. Nor did it fall back upon the Parliamentary enactment of 1649, by which Patronage was first legally abolished, and the right of collation was left in the hands of the Church, acting 'on the call and with the consent of the congregation, on whom none was to be intruded against their will.' The Act of 1690 gave the initiative or right of nomination to the heritors and elders or kirk-session of each parish, who were taken bound to pay to the respective patrons a small sum of money, for which they were supposed to renounce their rights for ever. It is needless to ask whether this was a good settlement of the question in itself. It does not seem to have worked smoothly; but then no system could have worked smoothly at such a time when many parishes were still alienated from the dominant Presbyterianism, and disputes as to the succession of ministers were necessarily engendered. The one thing that demands our attention is, that the lay patron had disappeared under solemn statutory enactment. That form of Patronage which the Church, or at least those supposed most entitled to represent it, had always felt as a 'heavy grievance,' had been constitutionally removed. It had been unknown to Scottish Presbyterianism for upwards of sixty years; and it is hardly possible therefore to conceive anything more unwise or unjust than its restitution. Carstares did all he could to prevent it, but in vain. The well-known Act of Queen Anne finally passed both Houses of Parliament by large majorities, and received the royal assent on the 22d April 1712.

It was not immediately that the sad effects of this policy began to appear. The call survived untouched by the new

legislation; and while the initiative was transferred to the lay patrons, the custom of consulting the wishes of the congregation was still maintained in force. It is not till some considerable time afterwards that we hear of special difficulties in the settlement of ministers. In fact, the first form which these difficulties took does not seem to have sprung from the people themselves, but from the rivalry of two parties within the Church, neither of whom in the beginning doubted that something more was required than the mere act of Patronage—something implying the assent of the parish or congregation—to constitute the right of entry to a ministerial charge. Neither party, in short, doubted the necessity of a call. The only question between them was as to the persons in whom the right of call was vested. Was it the congregation itself, or merely the kirk-session and heritors, according to the Act of 1690? It was not till 1732 that this question arose definitely in the Church. The inference to be drawn from this is, that while the restoration of Patronage in 1712 was probably intended as a movement in favour of the reactionary Jacobite policy of the latter part of Queen Anne's reign, such an intention was entirely frustrated by the accession of George I. and the Rebellion following in 1715. The Jacobite influences were effectually crushed for the time by the severities which the Rebellion called forth, and the renewed right of Patronage evidently remained for some time a dead letter, or nearly so.

But gradually with the consolidation of the Hanoverian dynasty, and the increasing attachment of many of the gentry to the Presbyterian Church as representing the established order of things, the Church itself, or at least a section of it, became more reconciled to Patronage and to its exercise within definite bounds. A new race of clergy began to appear—men to whom the troublous times before the Revolution were a dim retrospect, and who were animated, not so much by an enthusiasm for Presbytery, as by what they deemed a sober and enlightened regard to the peace and good of the country both

in Church and State. This change may be said to date definitely from about 1720. The words *popular* and *moderate* party were not heard of as yet. It is at least twenty years later till they come into vogue, and much later before they assume the characteristics by which they are generally distinguished. But the germs of the divisions were perceptible at this earlier time.

Much has been said, and as it appears to me, not very intelligently, as to the growth of what is called Moderatism in the Church of Scotland. The word has unhappily become a by-word—a synonym of evil reproach—in the mouths of those who dislike the cause and the principles which it is understood to represent. I am not its apologist; but I desire this as well as all historical phenomena should be looked at rationally, as a product of natural forces working in the national mind of Scotland in the eighteenth century, and not as a mere combination of evil men for evil purposes, which is not only not a rational, but not an intelligible view of any historical movement. Whatever elements may have entered into the composition of the Moderatism of the eighteenth century, it was so far plainly a direct expression of the spirit of the age and the circumstances of the Church, extending as far back as the close of the first quarter of the century, and destined, as we shall see, to assume very distinct phases with the course of the century. It was impossible that the enthusiasms which had preceded and accompanied the Revolution should last, or that the more settled order of the time should not produce the natural fruits in a more settled temper and a disposition to adapt the machinery of the Church to its changed fortunes. But it is equally certain that a change of this kind would be unacceptable to many in the Church, in whom the old spirit survived—men like Wodrow, Boston, the Erskines, and others, who loved the old enthusiasms for their own sake, and could only see spiritual declension in a less fervent state of the spiritual atmosphere. Wodrow himself, in his lengthened and garrulous *Correspondence*

and *Analecta*, is an unceasing witness to the alteration of feeling and sentiment that was going on around him. The new and the old are mingled in his pages in the most curious manner. He is himself the child of the age that is passing away. The dawn of the new age is unpleasant to him; yet he cannot wholly give his faith to the legends of the one, nor shut his mind against the larger light of the other. The trial of Simson, Professor of Divinity in Glasgow, and the 'Marrow Controversy,' from 1718 to 1722—are on the intellectual and theological side notable illustrations of the same conflict between the new and the old; the spirit of criticism and negation which was beginning to assail the old watchwords of the Faith, and the spirit of extreme Evangelicalism, which was its natural reaction. The 'Marrow Divinity,' although a direct continuation from the seventeenth century, was yet also something of a novelty in Scotland, as Wodrow himself felt. The voice was the voice of the Evangel, but its language was too perilously near to Antinomianism for the good minister of Eastwood—who loved not merely the old ways, but to stand in them in the old manner.

It is evident from all that we have said that the Church was in movement in the years that followed 1720, and that we are to trace back to this time the formation of distinct parties within her. Up to this time she had been so busy in settling her borders, planting vacant churches, and watching against the common enemies of Romanism and Episcopacy, that she had had no time to develop internal divisions.<sup>1</sup> Such divisions as

<sup>1</sup> This is the view of Sir Henry Moncrieff Wellwood, as shewn in the following passage (Appendix, No. I., p. 421) in his *Life of Dr Erskine*: 'An unbiassed reader who dispassionately examines the proceedings of the General Assemblies from 1690 to 1712, cannot but perceive the sincerity with which the great body of the clergy then united to promote the religious interests of the people and the general tranquillity of the country. There were occasional differences of opinion among them. But there do not appear any settled combinations, or indeed any offensive symptoms, either of party spirit or of political intrigue.'

existed had been inherited ; they had come to her with the Revolution settlement which made her ; and no doubt the force of these earlier divisions was perpetuated in the new. The survival of Episcopal curates in the Church may have in this way helped the nascent growth of Moderatism. But facts do not point to any such influence working within the pure leaven of Presbytery. By the year 1720, the Episcopal incumbents within the Church must have been rapidly dying out ; nor is there any reason to believe either that they were likely to adapt themselves specially to the altered law of Patronage, or to become the exponents of a new theology. I cannot think, therefore, that Moderatism can have drawn almost anything of its strength or life from such a source. The truth seems to be simply, that with a new generation, Presbyterianism began to take a new colour. This is true of the popular, no less than of the moderate side of the Church. Even the fervid Evangelicalism which lived on was no longer quite the same. The tone was different, if not the principles. The spirit of the eighteenth century was insensibly moulding all parties within the Church, even those most opposed to it.

The difficulties which sprung up in the Church with the advance of the eighteenth century were partly doctrinal and partly administrative. We have already alluded to the case of Professor Simson. So far as mere prominence is concerned, he is quite a heresiarch in the history of the Scottish Church. He was twice the subject of trial. As early as 1714, his opinions were brought under the notice of the Church courts ; and three years later, after the Presbytery of Glasgow had dealt with him at length, his teaching was formally censured by the General Assembly to the effect that 'he had vented unnecessary opinions and used expressions in a bad and unsound sense, and attributed too much to the powers of natural reason and corrupt human nature.' Ten years later, Simson was again arraigned for heretical tendencies of a quite different character. Formerly, his teaching was found inclined to Pelagianism ;

now, it was Arianism or Semi-Arianism on the borders of which he seemed to hover.

It is difficult to express any definite opinion of Simson's case. On the one hand, he himself fails to interest us—even if we judge him in some degree a victim of persecution. He is throughout a veiled and vacillating figure, seldom appearing except in the background as an argumentative valetudinarian who makes endless explanations without reaching any result satisfactory to his accusers. Wodrow represents him as a man of restless argumentative tendency, who delighted to stir the theological atmosphere around him, without much real depth or reflective thoughtfulness. But his letters, and especially the first letter of date March 2, 1726, give a higher idea of his intelligence and learning, if they are also marked by a strangely querulous spirit. On the other hand, Simson's accusers seem captious and unfair in refusing to acknowledge the apparent honesty of many of his explanations, and especially in submitting the Glasgow students to a process of examination as to any unguarded utterances he may have used in the course of his teaching. The process did not end till 1729, when the General Assembly, heartily tired of it, as their minute implies, brought it to an issue by suspending the Professor permanently from his functions of teaching and preaching. As a whole, the case is highly significant of a certain restlessness of thought in the Church, and at the same time of the very narrow limits within which it was possible for this thought to express itself without incurring censure. Younger minds were beginning to move out of the old dogmatic restraints; but the great majority of the clergy had no idea of relaxing even the old modes of expression, far less the old doctrines.

When Simson's sentence of suspension was finally confirmed in May 1729, there was one minister of the old school who expressed his dissatisfaction and intimated his dissent from the judgment as too lenient. This was Thomas Boston, minister of Ettrick, the apostle of the 'Marrow Divinity,'

and the well-known author of the *Fourfold State*. As the case of Simson marks the advance of a negative line of thought in the Church, the case of the 'Marrow men,' as they were called, represents the survival of the spirit of doctrinal enthusiasm. It was characteristic above all of this spirit, that the power of Divine grace should not only appear in the front of the Gospel system, but should so overlay the whole sphere of Christian life, as to seem to supersede all distinct activity of the human will. The Auchterarder formula, which was connected with the rise of the 'Marrow' movement, brings this out clearly: 'I believe that it is not sound and orthodox to teach that we must forsake sin in order to our coming to Christ.' The zealous Calvinists of the Auchterarder Presbytery required all candidates for the ministry to sign this formula, a proceeding which was properly reprobated by the General Assembly of 1717. There were a few zealous clergy, however, of the old school who approved of the formula, or at least of the faith it was supposed to indicate, and who of course dissented strongly from the sentence of the Assembly.

In the course of his parochial visits while minister of the parish of Simprin, Boston had come across a volume which greatly interested him as a highly interesting embodiment of his special views. The author of this volume was an Oxford gentleman-commoner of Brazenose College—Edward Fisher—who in the first triumphs of Puritan zeal had caught its dogmatic spirit in a very ardent form, and transferred it to his pages in a dialogue 'touching the Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace; and secondly, touching the most plain, pithy, and spiritual exposition of the Ten Commandments.' The dialogue is carried on by such speakers as Evangelista, a minister of the Gospel; Nomista, a Legalist, Antinomista, an Antinomian, and Neophitus, a young Christian; and the object is to explain the relations of the Law and the Gospel. The book, which bears the general title, *The Marrow of Modern Divinity*, is learned and, in a sense, lively,

if no longer very readable. It contains much that is both true and sound in doctrine; but the form of it, as may be easily imagined, suggests paradox and overstatement. Many of its propositions were capable of a dangerous interpretation—such as that ‘the believer was not under the law, and that he does not commit sin.’ Nothing could seem more wildly Antinomian, and yet the intended meaning was probably no more than that Christ is all in all to the believer, and that God looks not upon the sinner himself but on Christ, in whom he is delivered from all sin. Here, as everywhere in theological controversy, if the terms could only be settled beforehand, the controversy might almost cease. The ‘Marrow men’ certainly did not mean to teach, any more, we suppose, than the Auchterarder Presbytery, that a believer is freed from the obligations of the Christian life, however incautiously they may have expressed themselves. It is not to be wondered at, however, that the General Assembly in 1720 condemned the book, and forbade it to be circulated or recommended. Of course the ‘Marrow men’ protested against this decision. They held a meeting at Edinburgh, at which both Ebenezer Erskine and his brother Ralph attended. They made a representation of their views to the General Assembly, and two years later that court so far modified their sentence, but at the same time condemned the representation and petition signed by the Erskines and others as containing ‘injurious and undutiful aspersions cast upon the supreme judicatory of the Church. The General Assembly,’ it is added, ‘had no design to recede from the received doctrine of the Church;’ but those who impugned its judgment had laid themselves open to suspicion that they favoured the Antinomian errors censured in the Act regarding the *Marrow of Modern Divinity*. The ‘Marrow men,’ who had now increased to a band of twelve, including the Erskines, were accordingly rebuked and admonished at the bar of the Assembly.

Much followed this Act of Assembly which we have no time,

however hurriedly, to notice. Of course the 'Marrow men' protested; and the Assembly refusing to receive their protest, there began a system of protest on the one hand, and of rejection and admonition on the other hand, the end of which could hardly have been otherwise than it was. The doctrinal complication was greatly aggravated by the Act of Assembly in 1732 regarding the mode of electing ministers where the patrons had failed to exercise their right of presentation. As we have already mentioned, this Act fell back upon the statute of 1690, and placed the call in such circumstances in the hands of the heritors and elders. This was strongly opposed by Ebenezer Erskine in the General Assembly, and so far on the valid ground that the overture on the subject which had been transmitted to Presbyteries by the preceding Assembly, had really not received the sanction of a majority of the Presbyteries of the Church. But the measure was also obnoxious to him and his friends on general grounds. 'What difference,' he vehemently asked in the course of the debate, 'does a piece of land make between man and man in the affairs of Christ's kingdom? We are told that God hath chosen the poor of this world "rich in faith."'

It is sufficiently plain that the banner of popular election was here raised<sup>1</sup> in the face of the Church; and this too just at the time that the yoke of Patronage, although still felt to be grievous, and declared to be so in successive Acts of the Assembly, was yet beginning to settle upon the Church, and to enter into its constitutional and practical working as it had never hitherto done. The Church in its corporate capacity continued to protest against Patronage, and to profess an

<sup>1</sup> According to Sir Henry Moncrieff Wellwood, this was the first time that the idea of the popular election of ministers *as a divine right* was heard of in the Church after the Revolution. 'There does not appear,' he says (Appendix I. to *Life of Erskine*, p. 434), 'during the whole interval from 1690 to 1712, the least vestige of a doctrine, so much contended for at a later period, which asserted a *divine right* in the people individually or collectively to elect the parish ministers.'

eagerness for legislative redress. It continued to do this even during all the time of Dr Robertson's administration in the heyday of Moderatism, even up to 1784. But long before, and even at the time which we have now reached, the Church had begun to adapt itself to this system. And it was the consciousness of this growing change of feeling, along with what also appeared to them as a decline of zeal for orthodoxy, which lay at the root of the impending schism which the Erskines were about to head.

Hitherto—if we except a small number of Covenanters who had stood aloof in impracticable isolation—the Church had remained unbroken. But now we approach a distinct crisis in its history—the formation of the first secession. The causes of this unfortunate event were obviously not one, but many, and these deeply laid in the Church's life and history. The majority of the clergy were plainly inclined, onwards from the close of the first quarter of the century, to accommodate themselves to the spirit of the age; if not to accept Patronage, yet to make the best of it; to welcome new modes of preaching in conformity with what seemed improved literary canons, more or less at variance with the popular taste; to relax or abandon the old rigorous precision of doctrine; and to indulge in generalities which may have helped to cover the half-doubts of some of them. All this change was in a high degree obnoxious to men like the Erskines, and they were already alienated in feeling from the Church before they came into actual collision with its courts. They saw in it, as they themselves said, 'a defection from Reformed and Covenanting principles.' It was in the interest of such principles, and as representing 'the true Presbyterian Covenanted Church of Scotland,' that they entered upon their struggle; and it was against such laxities, as well as particularly the support given to Patronage, as they said, by the Act of 1732, that they lifted their Testimony when they took their first step of secession and

met under the name of the Associate Presbytery at Gairney Bridge, near Kinross, in December 1733.

It would carry us beyond our bounds to detail the various steps of this first unhappy secession. They have been amply described from different points of view. Ebenezer Erskine followed up his speech and protest in the General Assembly of 1732, by a sermon in the following autumn before the Synod of Perth and Stirling, which gave great offence to the majority of his brethren, who carried a vote of censure against the preacher, which was confirmed by the ensuing General Assembly. Along with three others—William Wilson of Perth, Alexander Moncrieff of Abernethy, and James Fisher of Kinclaven—he protested of course against this sentence. The Assembly retorted by summoning the brethren to appear before the August Commission, express their repentance, and submit to the authority of the Church. Still recusant in August, the Commission of Assembly, according to its instructions, suspended the four ministers from the exercise of their ministerial functions. In the following November, being still disobedient to the voice of authority, they were declared no longer ministers of the Church—a sentence which they met by a still more elaborate protest as to their principles; and in December of the same year the meeting of the Associate Brethren took place at Gairney Bridge, and the secession on their side was virtually complete. The following General Assembly sought to woo them back. The Acts of Assembly which had been specially obnoxious to them were repealed. Their synod was authorised to restore them to their ministerial position—the Presbytery of Stirling even went the length of electing Erskine as their Moderator, and appointing a deputation to urge the office upon him; but all to no effect. The seceding brethren met with a large popular sympathy. They were proud and confident of the position which they had taken up on behalf of what they believed to be the true principles of the Church of Scotland. They issued still another Testimony, known

as their 'Judicial Testimony,' in the end of 1736—still further widening the breach between them and the Church. Finally, in 1738, the Church took the matter once more in hand, and summoned the seceding ministers, now eight in number, to her bar. They appeared—but as a corporate body or Associate Presbytery, with their Moderator at their head—declined the jurisdiction of an 'unfaithful Church,' and departed. In the Assembly of 1740—but not before—they were deposed; and from the side of the Church, the act of separation was completed, which had already long since taken effect on the side of the seceders themselves.

It is of no use, at this time of day, trying to judge the merits of this memorable quarrel on either side. If the Church was precipitate and high-handed, to begin with, in dealing with the scruples of the brethren, it certainly shewed a real wish to welcome their return. But ruptures which are easily made are not easily healed, and especially as in this case, where there are not merely ostensible causes of opposition, but alien principles in movement. The leaders of the first secession from the Church of Scotland were really the representatives of principles, partly popular and partly traditionary, which the Church of the Revolution embodied. But then the Church embodied other principles and tendencies as well of a more moderate and flexible character; and a struggle between the two lines of thought and policy was inevitable. Nothing could have prevented the collision. Whether a higher statesmanship, and a more Christian forbearance on both sides, might not have averted the catastrophe, it is needless now to speculate. But one thing may be said, that the action of the Church in reference to the first seceders, was of a far more generous and conciliatory character than in the case of the subsequent Relief secession twelve years later.

From this time onwards the two parties known as *popular* or *evangelical* and *moderate* rapidly developed themselves, and the history of the Church becomes largely the history of their

rival relations. We can only in the most general way glance at these relations and the leaders on either side.

What is known as Moderatism may be said to divide itself into two epochs, during the first of which, extending to 1751, Dr Patrick Cuming, who was Professor of Church History in the University of Edinburgh, was 'the chief ostensible leader of the Church.' Had space sufficed, it would have been interesting to sketch not only Cuming, but the two Wisharts, along with Professor Leechman of Glasgow, who may be said to be representative of this earlier period, although Leechman survived long into a later time. He and Principal Wishart<sup>1</sup> are not only remarkable figures in themselves, but, as both having been subjects of prosecution for heresy, their names gather around them the events in the history of the Church then most deserving of notice. It is with reluctance that we must omit sketches of these men, with the exception of Leechman, whose position as an accused heretic is significant in the decade following the secession of the Erskines. The accusation against Leechman was founded on a sermon on Prayer, which he had preached while minister of Beith. The sermon deals with the general idea of prayer as a natural impulse of the human heart, rather than with prayer as an act of Christian devotion. On his appointment as Professor of Divinity in Glasgow, in 1744, it was objected to him that he had failed in his exposition to recognise the relation which all prayer ought to have to Jesus Christ, and an inquiry was instituted as to his orthodoxy by the Presbytery of Glasgow. There was plainly something invidious in the movement from the first, as Leechman had no sooner an opportunity of explaining his true object in the sermon, than the charge against him fell to the ground. Before the case was fully considered by the Presbytery, he carried it by complaint to the Synod, which almost unanimously found that the answers he had given to his accusers were satisfactory.

<sup>1</sup> He was Principal of Edinburgh University, as Leechman was ultimately Principal of Glasgow.

The General Assembly confirmed the decision of the Synod without hesitation, and the Moderator in his closing address signalled the felicity with which the Church had met a case of more than ordinary delicacy. 'Have we not seen,' he said, 'the beauty of Christian charity in condescension on the one hand to remove offence, and readiness on the other to embrace satisfaction?' There is no doubt that the Church exercised a wise discretion in this case, as well as that of Principal Wishart, which had been decided six years before, and that while due explanations were demanded, there was no disposition to bear hard upon the accused.

Dr Leechman was evidently a man of very high, if somewhat abstract and philosophical turn of mind, of the most devout religious feeling, and earnestness of purpose. Lord Woodhouselee says that his style, 'with equal purity, had more elegance than Hutcheson's,' and that his theological lectures were 'the fruit of great knowledge, and of a liberal and candid spirit.' 'He was a distinguished preacher,' according to Dr Carlyle. 'His appearance was that of an ascetic, reduced by fasting and prayer; but in aid of fine composition he delivered his sermons with such fervent spirit, and in so persuasive a manner, as captivated every audience.' And to crown these other testimonies, Sir Henry Moncrieff Wellwood says of him, that he was 'a man of primitive and Apostolic manners, equally distinguished by his love of literature and his liberal opinions.' He was a warm friend and ally of Hutcheson, the first and not the least distinguished of our race of eighteenth-century philosophers. Hutcheson took a zealous interest in his appointment to the Chair of Divinity in Glasgow, and at this time made use of the expression which has been often quoted, that Leechman would 'put a new face upon theology in Scotland.' He represented, undoubtedly, a new type of theological thought to that which had been conspicuous in the seventeenth century and was still exhibited by many in the Church. But this is merely to say that he was the product of

his own century. No one can read the account of his life, and especially of the touching close of it, given by Dr James Wodrow, who edited his sermons after his death, without recognising at once his Christian sincerity and his large-mindedness. It is told that a young Oxford student was brought to see him in his last illness. He was only able to speak in a feeble voice, and had not many days to live, he said. 'But you see how I am. It is not tranquillity or confidence alone—it is joy and triumph that inspires me.' His features kindled, his voice rose. 'And whence,' he continued, 'does all this spring from?—from that book ;' pointing to the Bible that lay on a little table by the bedside. Then he added to his young listener: 'You have chosen the Church for your profession. You are of the Church of England ; I am a Presbyterian. The difference between us is not great. If you are faithful in the discharge of your duties, you will find your work a source of the highest enjoyment. Your father was my friend. I have been always interested in your welfare, and I am happy on my death-bed to give you an old man's blessing.'

The epoch itself during which the Church obeyed the leadership of Cuming, was distinguished by a clear acknowledgment of the evil of Patronage. The consciousness that the Act of Queen Anne had been unjustly imposed upon the Church was, if no longer universal, still general. Cuming himself made no attempt to defend it, while feeling it to be his duty to accept it, and so far to work it, as the law of the Church. In one of his addresses to the General Assembly as Moderator in 1749—he was three times Moderator—he says expressly, 'the law of Patronage is a hard law ;' and according to Sir Henry Moncrieff Wellwood, 'the party under his management did not pretend to attempt the abolition of calls in the settlement of ministers ; and always professed to require the call of heritors and elders before they gave effect to a presentation.'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Appendix to *Life of Erskine*, p. 457.

It was part of his system also to appoint committees of the Assembly—'riding committees,' as they were called—to carry out the decisions of the Supreme Court when the local Presbyteries were disinclined to do so. The cessation of these committees, which were plainly 'neither sanctioned by constitutional law, nor justified by any expression of expediency,' marks the close of the earlier Moderatism.

With the turn of the century we emerge upon a new era. Moderatism takes a new and decisive shape in the hands of Robertson, Carlyle, and others. Literature finds a familiar home in the Church. It is, as Dean Stanley has said, the era of literary Churchmen. There had been in the previous part of the century some Churchmen of intellectual distinction like John Maclaurin—author of the famous sermon *Glorying in the Cross of Christ*—and Leechman and Wishart, of whom we have spoken. But it is only from about the middle of the century that literature can be said to have become a feature of the Church of Scotland. Every one is familiar with Dr Carlyle's somewhat glowing description: 'We have men who have successfully enlightened the world on almost every branch of knowledge and of Christian doctrine and morals. Who have written the best histories, ancient and modern? It has been clergymen of this Church. Who has written the clearest delineation of the human understanding and all its powers? A clergyman of this Church. Who wrote a tragedy that has been deemed perfect? A clergyman of this Church? Who was the most profound mathematician of the age he lived in? A clergyman of this Church. Let us not complain of poverty. It is a splendid poverty indeed. It is *paupertas fecunda virorum*.'<sup>1</sup>

This is very high-sounding; but it is not without warrant.

<sup>1</sup> This speech of Carlyle is found in the supplementary chapter to his *Autobiography*, and was made near the close of the century—in 1789—when the proposal for augmenting the livings of the ministers of the Church was under discussion.

Beginning with Dr Robert Wallace, author of a *Dissertation on the Numbers of Mankind in Ancient and Modern Times*, which anticipated Hume's essay on the same subject, and led the way to later Malthusian speculations, there is a perfect galaxy of distinguished authors to be found in the Scottish Church during the next forty years. 'Robert Watson, the historian of Philip II.; Adam Ferguson, the historian of Rome;<sup>1</sup> John Home, the author of the tragedy of *Douglas*; Hugh Blair, the author of the celebrated *Sermons* and of the *Lectures on Rhetoric*; Robert Henry, the philosophic author of the *History of Great Britain*; and lastly and chiefly, William Robertson, the historian of Scotland, of America, and of Charles V.—were all ministers of the Church of Scotland.'<sup>2</sup> Add to these Dr Thomas Reid, the well-known head of the Scottish philosophy; and Dr George Campbell, author of the *Treatise on Miracles*, in reply to Hume, and the *Elements of Rhetoric*, and the intellectual picture is still more striking. It is only, as Dean Stanley says, within 'our own generation that poetry, philosophy, and history have found so natural a home in the clergy of England, as they then did in the clergy of Scotland.' Nor should it be forgotten that there were many clergy of remarkable powers, although they do not stand out prominently in the general field of literature—men like Dr Alexander Webster; Dr Witherspoon, author of the *Ecclesiastical Characteristics*, and finally President of the New College, Jersey; and Dr Robertson's well-known colleague, Dr Erskine, whose life has been amply described to us by Sir Henry Moncrieff Wellwood. Dr Webster was a man of great mental and social vigour, to whom the Church is especially indebted for the institution of the Widows' Fund. Whatever may be true as to his failings,

<sup>1</sup> Adam Ferguson never occupied a parish; but he was licensed as preacher by the General Assembly in special circumstances, and authorised to act as an army chaplain, in which capacity he officiated for many years—from 1744 to 1757.

<sup>2</sup> Dean Stanley's Lectures, p. 124.

Webster was evidently a man of organising and ruling brain, as well as of unusual popular and administrative gifts. Witherspoon's literary power, as displayed in the *Characteristics*, is considerable. His irony is forcible and dramatic, if not very varied or delicate. He was evidently a man of great mental keenness and activity—a force in the General Assembly, as well as in controversial literature, on the popular side. A story is told of Robertson saying to him on one occasion: 'I think you have your men better disciplined than formerly;' to which Witherspoon replied: 'Yes, by urging your politics too far, you have compelled us to beat you with your own weapons.'<sup>1</sup> Erskine is a stainless and noble name, in no respect more so than in the honest and manly tribute of worth which he paid to the character of Robertson after his death—a eulogy without stint and yet without flattery<sup>2</sup>—alike happily conceived and expressed. There were still others, such as Principal Tullidolph of St Andrews, of whose eloquence as a speaker Dr Carlyle gives the most flattering account, comparing it to that of Lord Chatham in all his glory; and Carlyle, who has made himself so familiarly—some are inclined to think too familiarly—known to us in his *Autobiography*.

Much might be said of the deficiencies of Christian character in men like Carlyle and his associates. No one can say that the pictures he has given us of social life and personal manners are in some respects elevating, or in any respects saint-like. They are of the 'earth, earthy;' and we shall not attempt to vindicate for them a character that they do not bear. Carlyle must be judged by his self-drawn portrait; and Home and Webster—whom he has drawn with a specially unfriendly pencil—and others must be estimated in some degree by his statements. The effect is all the more telling that it is off-hand, like the touches which occur in rapid conversation, rather than like any attempt at elaborate or formal description.

<sup>1</sup> Account of Witherspoon's Life, introductory to his Works, 1815.

<sup>2</sup> Stewart's *Life of Robertson*, p. 123.

But just as rapid conversation lends itself easily to exaggeration, and points are thrown in for effect which were never intended to bear all the meaning that may be attributed to them, so Carlyle's sketches must be taken with reserve; and when allowance is made for the comparative coarseness of manners, it may be found that the level of Christian principle and character is not really so low as it sometimes appears. There was possibly much even in a man like Carlyle—strong and free a child of Nature as he was—allied to the higher life of which he says so little. And in men like Dr Robertson, Dr Blair, Dr George Campbell, and others, the religious vision must be very distorted which can see anything but good. Dr Johnson spoke of the former two as both 'wise and good men,' and surely his verdict, in all the circumstances, may be allowed to stand. Lives spent in laborious and fruitful application to higher studies—in the cultivation of literature, the amenities of social intercourse, and the diffusion of a spirit of courtesy, charity, and mutual understanding in the midst of deep-seated intellectual differences—are lives which claim not only honour but Christian respect. Of their special labours as Christian divines, Blair's sermons remain a monument which it is the fashion now to depreciate, but which many would find it hard to emulate; while Campbell's philosophical and theological writings have by no means yet lost their value and significance. A higher specimen of the Christian minister can hardly be conceived than Principal Campbell; or a more noble example of a luminous, thoughtful, and candid intellect, consecrated to the highest objects, without any idea of reward beyond the consciousness of devotion to truth and duty.

But while we desire, upon the whole, to vindicate the character of our Moderate clergy in the latter half of the eighteenth century, we hold no brief for the vindication of their policy. It was a high-handed policy, conceived by Robertson in a statesman-like but eminently arbitrary spirit,

That Robertson possessed many of the powers of a real statesman, it is impossible to deny. All the attributes by which his colleague describes him are more or less of a political order. There can be no doubt also of Robertson's honest intentions to serve the Church and the country. The authority of the supreme judicatory of the Church appeared to him to be in real danger. If the voice of the Assembly was to be disobeyed at will by Presbyteries, and temporary substitutes formed for carrying out its decisions, the whole government of the Church tended to lapse into a chaos fatal to any order or efficiency. And so the idea of a bold and authoritative policy seemed to a mind like his—sagacious yet cold, commanding and firm yet unsympathetic—to be the only means of rescuing the Church from perilous confusion. Younger men, like Carlyle and Home and others, entered into his ideas from a sheer wish to shew their power, and put down what they considered as disorder and fanaticism. The policy was so far successful; but the success was of that nature which is almost worse than defeat. It introduced order within the Church. It crushed the revolt of Presbyteries. It silenced in many cases popular clamour. But it quietly and gradually alienated masses of people from the Establishment.

The deposition of Gillespie in 1752 initiated the new policy, and began a second secession known as the Relief.<sup>1</sup> The Act which led to this disastrous result was far less justifiable than the ultimate deposition of the Erskines and their associates; for Gillespie was chosen as the victim of the General Assembly—when it determined to exercise its authority against the Presbytery of Dunfermline—in a purely arbitrary manner. Out of six recalcitrant presbyters, it was agreed that one should be deposed, and the lot, so to speak, fell upon the minister at Carnock—a sincerely pious and meek-minded man, who would gladly have lived and died a minister of the Church, and who

<sup>1</sup> *Relief* from the burden of Patronage.

advised his people to return to it after his death, and when the secession, which his deposition originated, had fairly taken root and grown into definite shape. But there was no relenting on the part of the Church, notwithstanding Gillespie's conciliatory attitude, and his almost touching willingness to return to its communion. The Assembly took no steps to undo what it had done. The day had gone by for mild expostulations and deference to conscientious scruples; and the new schism, strengthened by the adhesion of Thomas Boston at Jedburgh, a son of Boston at Ettrick, grew and multiplied as the earlier one had done. In the course of a short time, dissent had increased with such rapidity as to attract the notice of the General Assembly. An overture brought before it in the year 1765, states that 'there are now one hundred and twenty meeting-houses erected, to which more than a hundred thousand persons resort, who were formerly of our communion, but have separated themselves from the Church of Scotland;' and that this progress of dissent is most evident 'in the greatest and most populous towns.'

What has grown into the large mass of Presbyterian dissent, was in short now fairly in progress; and it is unnecessary, as it would indeed be impossible, to say how far this unhappy result is to be traced to inevitable causes, such as the love of religious independence and restlessness, so essentially characteristic of the Scottish people; and how far it is to be directly attributed to the Moderate policy which henceforth for about eighty years held the Church within its grip. The historian may indicate lines of influence which have led to great results, but not even the most acute and comprehensive capacity can disentangle all the causes which have produced these results, and assign to each their definite share.

After the triumph of Robertson's policy in the Church, its annals become comparatively unexciting. The weight of Moderate authority lay upon its councils, and the spirit of

Moderation extended throughout its borders. And yet the old spirit of Puritan earnestness was for a long time powerful and active. This is strikingly shewn by the proceedings in connection with the famous performance of the tragedy of *Douglas* in 1756. This tragedy, now so much forgotten, made a great excitement in Edinburgh in the winter of that year. The fact that a minister of the Church should write a tragedy at all—especially 'of the first-rate,' as Carlyle says—was a startling novelty to many; but the performance of the piece at the theatre in Carrubber's Close, and the attendance of Home himself and many of his clerical friends to see the performance, was something still more startling. It was not many years since the strength of Puritan feeling had compelled Allan Ramsay to close this very theatre. A great change, therefore, is represented by the fact that this feeling should have so completely vanished in the minds of ministers of the Church; nothing could more shew the advance of new modes of thought. But, on the other hand, the fact that the Presbytery of Edinburgh and other Presbyteries should not only have prosecuted the offenders, but done this successfully, proves that the old feeling survived in strength, and was backed by a vigorous tide of public opinion. Carlyle's description of the affair is enough to shew this. There appears to have been no hesitation on the part of the Church courts in dealing with theatre-going as an ecclesiastical offence. One of the ministers of the Edinburgh Presbytery was compelled to acknowledge his fault and submit to discipline; Home was eventually driven from his parish; and Carlyle was charged with a libel which, however, only ended in a rebuke. In the face of such facts as these, it cannot be said that the Church had lost its Puritan earnestness in the beginning of the second half of the eighteenth century.

And so throughout the century it is to be borne in mind that much of this earnestness, or at least of the Evangelical enthusiasm associated with it, survived. A great deal no doubt

passed away, or passed into the ranks of dissent, and helped to swell its growing mass ; but Evangelicalism continued living here and there in the Church also. The old and the new were both active ; while there were those like Principal Hill, who were strong supporters of a Moderate policy, and yet Evangelical in the substance of their theology. Hill, it is well known, became the chief exponent of this policy and leader of the party after Robertson's retirement in 1780 ; but his *Theological Lectures* remain a monument of candid orthodoxy, which has commended them to many who have no sympathy with Moderatism. Even at the very end of the century, the old Evangelical life had not died out of the Church, darkened as is the picture drawn by Rowland Hill in the *Journal* of his tour in Scotland in 1798, of the state of religion from an Evangelical point of view. The mere fact that the pulpits of the Establishment were not shut against him or Simeon of Cambridge, any more than they had been against Whitefield at an earlier date, shewed that there were still those within its pale who sympathised with their views. The Church itself certainly gave these Evangelical teachers no countenance ; and an Act passed by the General Assembly in the year of Rowland Hill's first visit, effectually closed its pulpits for many a year to ministers of other Churches, whether Evangelically-minded or otherwise. But the very necessity for passing such an act proves that there was still a certain activity in the Evangelical party within the Church.

Nor are we to suppose that this party, while beaten by Robertson and his coadjutors in their attempts to regulate the policy of the Church, was at all powerless as a force within the General Assembly. On the contrary, they rallied their strength with great effect repeatedly, especially in the great debate on Schism in 1766 ; and again in the exciting discussions which followed Robertson's retirement, when the whole question of Patronage, and its unhappy influence upon the Church, was raised anew. The evils of the system are recognised as forcibly

as ever in these discussions by some who accepted it as the law of the Church, no less than by its impugners. It was a matter of course that men like Henry Erskine should denounce the so-called ancient rights of patrons—‘as old,’ he said, ‘as the Tory ministry of Queen Anne!’ But it was significant that Dr Hardy, who was afterwards associated with Dr Hill in the leadership of the Moderate party, should in a pamphlet published during the controversy in 1782 have proposed the repeal of the Act of 1712. It seemed impossible to him that both ‘this Act and the Church of Scotland should stand together.’ Nothing could well indicate more strongly what an element of disturbance Patronage had been, or how little a vigorous administration of twenty years had really done to settle the disturbance. And yet it was only two years later that the General Assembly instructed its Commission to drop its remonstrance on the subject, and that the difficulty should have gone to comparative rest for nearly fifty years, destined, however, to a more terrible awakening than ever!

But no further space is left to us for even such imperfect notes as these on the later history of the Church of Scotland in the eighteenth century; and we must bring this lecture to a close. Looking back upon the facts presented to us, there is much to criticise, a good deal to deplore, but also a great deal to admire and be proud of.

No shortcomings of the Moderate clergy can ever obscure the literary lustre which they have shed around the Church, nor have we any right to allow the one to dim the other. But the higher clergy of the Church of Scotland in the eighteenth century were not merely distinguished intellectually. They developed in their social life and public career many qualities of admirable manliness, directness, and vigour. What they lacked was depth of Christian sensibility and width of Christian intelligence. It may seem to many absurd to charge them with want of the latter. But the narrowness not only of their sympathy, but of their spiritual knowledge, had much

to do with their mistakes. If they had been more conversant with the movements of Christian thought, they would never have tried to guide the Church by hard and fast rules as they did. If they had known more of the motives of spiritual action, they would never have supposed it possible to restrain enthusiasm by oppression, or ecclesiastical zeal by simply turning a deaf ear to its remonstrances. There can hardly be any doubt, I think, that Robertson was disappointed by the fruits of his twenty years' administration, and retired in some degree disgusted, both with the progress of dissent and the restlessness of many of the younger clergy on his own side.<sup>1</sup>

It is sad, but it is true, that the chief difficulty of Scottish Presbyterianism all through its history has been to combine a cultured and catholic intelligence with enthusiasm, zeal with toleration and Christian appreciation of the motives of others. The Evangelical and rational elements in its corporate life have failed to fuse themselves together so as to brighten into a warm and earnest and yet sweet-tempered piety. The popular and the Moderate clergy of the eighteenth century stand apart. They may know each other well, and even be cordial friends, as Erskine and Robertson were; but their principles never come into union. The fire of the Evangel

<sup>1</sup> Dugald Stewart's *Life of Robertson*, Appendix, p. 195. The passage to which reference is here made has been often quoted. It is a statement made to Robertson's biographer by Sir Henry Moncrieff Wellwood of the probable reasons which suggested Robertson's retirement from the General Assembly after 1780. We cannot quote the passage in full, but it explicitly bears that Robertson was dissatisfied with the restlessness of 'the more violent men of his party, especially in regard to a scheme, into which many of them had entered zealously, for abolishing subscription to the Confession of Faith and Formula'—a scheme which, it is added, 'he declared his resolution to resist in every form.' We have not been able even to allude to the great controversy which occurred on this subject in the years preceding Robertson's retirement. The controversy was not *within* the Church courts, probably owing to the influence of the great Moderate leader; and this fact, with the demands upon our space, has precluded our touching upon it.

does not mingle with the reasonableness of philosophy. They remain apart, suspicious of each other, and judging each other with asperity. This of course is true, more or less, of parties in all Churches; but it is especially true of the two parties known as Evangelical and Moderate in the Scottish Church.

If we turn from the administrative and theological aspect of the Church to its internal character—its worship and discipline—it cannot be said that the spectacle is a pleasing one. What may be called Church life—the feeling which binds the clergy and the Christian people together in bonds of mutual action and sympathy—was very low throughout the whole century. There was not only no missionary enthusiasm, but no comprehension of missionary duty. Even so late as 1796, an overture in favour of Foreign Missions was rejected in the General Assembly. The well-known story of Dr Erskine saying to the Moderator, at the close of a speech against Missions by Mr Hamilton of Gladsmuir: ‘Moderator, rax me that Bible,’ belongs to this debate. It was a striking commentary on the character of the discussion. But there was not only no intelligence of the duty of Foreign Missions, but no thought of making any provision for the growing spiritual wants of the masses at home. This non-appreciation of what we now call Church extension was one of the worst ‘notes’ of the Moderate party, and indeed of the Church generally in the eighteenth century. Churches were not only not extended, but they were disgracefully neglected or abused. It is usual to blame the niggardliness of the Scottish proprietors and heritors for all that is abominable in the Scottish architecture of the eighteenth century; and the blame no doubt largely lay with them. But they merely reflected the general feeling. They refused money to build beautiful churches, and they allowed many old churches to be hopelessly ruined because there was no compulsion upon them in the prevalent opinion of the time to do better. The Scottish people had unhappily lost the sense, from the Reformation downwards, not only of ecclesiastical

beauty, but even of ecclesiastical fitness. They had no thought of making the House of God in itself a house of holy solemnity. This was part of the reaction still unspent against the externalism of Rome, and it may have been associated with so-called spiritual feelings in the minds of some. But to a large extent it was nothing else than coarseness of taste and a want of culture; and its effects were in many ways unfavourable upon the popular habits. The attitude of the worshippers failed in reverence and even respectfulness. Devotion was conducted with a careless indifference of manner, if not of heart. The Scriptures ceased to be read as an integral part of divine service, and the singing was such as it is unnecessary to describe. Discipline for certain offences continued to be publicly administered; and although we cannot be sure that this open severity of a simpler time may not have had deterrent effects that we can now hardly estimate, we know enough to know that the general effect was not good. While little, however, can be said in favour of the devotional life or interest of the service of the Scottish Church during the eighteenth century, there can be no doubt that there was much devout feeling and earnest thoughtfulness surviving among the Scottish peasantry. The *Cottar's Saturday Night* is the touching picture of an imagination which was easily kindled alike by the humour, the pathos, and the solemnity of Scottish life. But it is no mere picture; it was a reality in many a home, no less than in that of Burns's own father, a man of singular clearness and manliness of religious thought, as is shewn by the catechism he prepared for his children. It is to this period also—it deserves to be remembered—that we are indebted for those Paraphrases from Scripture which have continued to be sung in the Scottish Presbyterian service. Much may be forgiven an age which gave us the Paraphrases, the plaintive and measured beauty of many of which, such as the second and thirtieth, and the spiritual felicity and completeness of thought of others, like the sixtieth, have always appeared to me of rare excellence in sacred verse.

The first movement to prepare metrical versions of certain portions of Holy Writ began as early as 1742; but it was not till many years afterwards—in fact, not till 1781—that the Paraphrases were first used in public worship, after having been revised and added to especially by Logan, the well-known minister of South Leith; and Cameron, minister of Kirknewton. The existing collection bears traces everywhere of the tasteful genius of Logan, which admits of no question, whatever may be the truth as to the charges of plagiarism with which his name is unhappily associated.

There was a lack of open vision in the Church of Scotland during the eighteenth century. She failed to realise the greatness of her mission as a National Church. She failed to witness as she ought to have done to the living love of a Divine Saviour. But her spiritual coldness was a feature of the age to which she belonged; no Church was quite exempt from it. And with all her deficiencies, she has claims upon our gratitude and respect. If wanting in zeal, she grew in toleration. If disliking enthusiasms, she cultivated literature. If she had little Church life, she prized freedom and good sense, and wrought no new bonds for the Christian conscience. If her clergy were not adequately inspired by self-denying devotion in dealing with the human soul and reclaiming spiritual wastes, they presented examples of moderation and thoughtfulness and Christian charity. And Scotland would have been a poorer country in many ways, if many of the Moderate clergy had not lived to advance its fame and illustrate the Church to which they belonged.