

Zeitschrift: Revue internationale de théologie = Internationale theologische Zeitschrift = International theological review

Band: 14 (1906)

Heft: 54

Artikel: The relations of church and state : an object lesson

Autor: Farquhar, J.T.F.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-403647>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 20.03.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

THE RELATIONS OF CHURCH AND STATE.

AN OBJECT LESSON.

It is a proverbial truth that blessings come in disguise; it is a solid truth none the less that the saying is often quoted in sarcasm; and its force is nowhere more manifest than in cases in which things spiritual are interwoven with things worldly, the worldly loss being spiritual gain. Of this the history of the Catholic Church will afford us many examples.

It must have seemed a strange and disheartening thing to the Apostles that among their own countrymen, and their Lord's, hardly any were to be found who would acknowledge the risen Jesus to be the Messiah, and yet the experience of time has taught us that it would have been a disastrous thing had their hearts' desire and prayer been granted, human nature being as weak and evil as it is. For we may not only perceive what suspicion might have been thrown upon the evidence for the resurrection itself had it been adopted as a battle cry of the Pharisees, but we may tremble also to think what Judaism, what ecclesiastical tyranny over act and over conscience would have held the Church in hard subjection, had a partial and transient spiritual revival delivered Jerusalem from destruction, had the city that slew the Lord been left standing to go on triumphantly to build His sepulchre.

Which evils, though they must always threaten, do not now overwhelm us, as they would have done had Jerusalem anticipated Rome.

So by God's providence it often happens not only that blessings come in disguise, but also that God is able to use men's very weaknesses in their own defence; in this way, that

by a less evil result a greater is kept out. Weak human nature by stumbling on the road at the outset, is preserved from falling over a precipice later. No argument this however for wilful stumbling, for being content with evil, because they who are strong enough to receive a good in its reality will doubtless be able to resist the consequent temptation.

The example of these principles which is here put forward is found in the history of the Scottish Church and is none other than the ruin that followed the Revolution of 1688.

Speaking as Christians in the more comprehensive sense of the term, we must acknowledge that this terrible catastrophe was due in large measure to the weaknesses of Scottish Christianity and seems on the surface to have been fraught with nothing but evil for our country. Or if we take a narrower horizon to bound our view, and look only at the Church Episcopal itself, we must with equal readiness acknowledge that her own sons at least helped to bring on the disaster, and that the disaster seems on the surface to have been, and to be, little short of complete ruin.

It is my design to show, not comprehensively indeed, but along one line of thought that this great disaster has prevented worse evils, and has even largely remedied the very evil from which itself arose. It has proved to be a great blessing, and may yet prove to be a greater, to Scotland, in particular to our Church, then also to the whole Anglican communion, the Churches of the Anglo-Celtic races, and shall I say therefore to the whole world.

But it is of course with our own country and with our own Church that we shall chiefly concern ourselves.

Scotland then in 1688 was wholly given over to the twin errors of erastianism and papalism. The first part of my task must be to exhibit what this statement means, to prove its truth from our history, and at the same time to show how largely the fact was responsible for the miserable cataclysm of which I have spoken.

By erastianism I mean the regarding of the Church in every visible and organised particular as a mere department of the State, and as such able to move only by the authority of the King, Minister, or Parliament according to the political constitution of the land.

And by papalism I mean the claim of any man, or of any body of men, in the name of Christ to employ at their own discretion the power or the methods of the secular arm in carrying out their own purposes, the claim in the name of Christ whether to a right of ingerence in State affairs or to absolute supremacy over State authorities.

Externally these two errors are opposed extremes provoking each other by reaction; fundamentally they are one thing, so that the same man will today act in the one sense and to morrow in the other as his own passions and interests may sway him. The fundamental error is of course the failure to recognise the full force of the fact that the Church, though composed of mortal men, is still a spiritual association, that it is though in the world yet not of the world¹).

Erastianism and papalism are evil things, very evil, but let us not be blind to the elements they contain of strength and beauty. The former, where it is not based on mere tyranny, takes for granted, and the latter speciously promises to bring about the fulfilment of the words that the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of the Lord and of His Anointed. Thus they have a great fascination for those well-meaning Christians who, weary of the strife and division, which nevertheless Christ came on earth to bring, weary of

¹) Let me say in passing that if any one will suggest to me better names by which to call the two tendencies which we are considering I will gladly adopt them, more especially as it may be open to criticism to speak of papalism as the characteristic of those who are utterly antagonistic to the Roman Pope, but if in the meanwhile I make myself intelligible, let that suffice. (Cf. Syllabus, Art. 15.)

That in any case the name is wholly gratuitous will hardly be maintained by anybody. If otherwise let me refer the objector to the *Treatise of Church Law* published in 1901 by Professor De Luca of the Gregoriana (the Papal University in Rome), and neither indexed nor reprovod.

We read there that "the Church has instituted various penalties against heretics. As to the death penalty it is to be remarked (1) The secular authority ought on the order and in the name of the Church to put the heretic to death. When the Church has handed over such a one the secular authority cannot grant a pardon".

Or let us glance at the Syllabus of Pius IX. (I quote only from a summary). Art. XV teaches that man is not free to adopt the religion he believes to be true, and Art. XIX that the civil power has no right to determine the limits of the Church's action in State affairs.

the long delay in His coming, are able in the glitter of paraded authority to be blind to the truth of things. The politician will incline to erastianism, the ecclesiastic to papalism, and each will have not a little to say for himself. But yet let us clearly realise, and firmly hold, that the essential constitutions of Church and of State, and their spheres of work are so different that though both one and the other may fall into error and evil courses, it will only make confusion worse confounded to give one such authority over the other as to destroy its essential independence; and that though there may be outlying fields that either or both may occupy it is likewise evil for one in any way to interfere with or set itself up in rivalry to the other in the exercise of its own peculiar functions.

Let us come closer to the concrete.

We find the great English divine, the judicious Hooker, declaring without reservation that "there is not any man of the Church of England but the same man is also a member of the Commonwealth, nor any member of the Commonwealth which is not also of the Church of England" and this absolute identity of membership is so obvious to him that he takes it as the uncontroverted and incontrovertible basis of an argument.

This saying gathers up our root error of confusion as to the spiritual character of the Church and brings it right into the field of action.

In form of course it is a mere statement of fact, and as such has nothing to do with erastianism or papalism one way or another. But such an assertion, though not always so manifestly at variance with fact and possibility as it is today, was never really sound. It was rendered possible to men of discernment only by the spiritual and intellectual torpor of the masses, by a too great stress laid upon a merely formal membership in the Church, and finally by that facility whereby man in general and even of the keenest vision becomes blind to things that do not correspond to his own preconceptions.

Given this world as it is the belief that Church and State could ever be more than accidentally and transiently commensurate in more than name, or even that they could be effectively treated as such, is surely due to an error somewhere. Such a belief forms in any case a very vicious base for the

action of the legislator, and while honesty of mind may relieve him who legislates according to it from the charge of evil intention and even from that of culpable foolishness, it will not free his erastian or papal acts from their own evil consequences. And conversely when we strongly condemn a man's actions of that nature, as we may have occasion to do, we must remember that apart from the root error it is in his action merely and not in his whole moral and intellectual status that we condemn himself.

Let us see the practical and logical outcome. Even Sir Francis Bacon, in an essay wherein much is set forth in favour of the inviolability of conscience is able to write, "It is most necessary that Princes by their Sword doe Damne and send to Hell for ever those Facts and Opinions tending to the Support of the Same" (p. 13).

Opinions I take it are to be reached by the Prince's sword only through those who hold them. These ultimately are the "facts that tend to the support of the same."

I do not say that Bacon deduces this sentiment directly from Hooker's assertion but it is in any case an illustration of its practical application. Is it not so?

If the Nation and the Church are to be identical, it is the King's duty to see that they are so. Those whose view of spiritual truth allows them to grant the premise under present human conditions will not be slow to grant the deduction.

But now comes a difficulty, a *reductio ad absurdum* that of itself is enough to show that the ground is mistaken. It brings us also to the dividing line between papalism and erastianism.

Who is to choose the constitution and even the creed of this State Church? The King, or other responsible secular authority, has an opinion of truth and a conscience, and he cannot in his most solemn function do other than what he believes to be right. It is he then that must choose the national religion and bend all other to his will. On the other hand the Catholic Church had its creed and its constitution long before any modern nation was heard of, and existed for centuries in defiance of the secular Authorities then existing. It cannot betray its trust at the bidding of a King, it cannot even come before him for acceptance as one among several claimants, for he is certainly

fallible and possibly prejudiced; and, besides, the Authority that chooses can afterwards reject. The King then must obediently have an infallible instinct to recognise and a humble will to accept the Church; and he must see that his subjects do the same.

If Church and State are to be identical there is no escape from this dilemma. We must impale ourselves on the one horn or on the other. We must be either papalist or erastian.

It is this that is the explanation of much that would otherwise be inexplicable in the things done by many good men, and if we forget it our judgments all round will be shallow.

Let us now turn to the historical example which we have put before us. Of course, even then, in the days of the later Stuarts, some men saw more clearly than others, some men struggled to have things better ordered than they were. But in vain, for let any one in either camp recommend moderation or concession, straight-way he would be accused by his own side of sympathising with the extreme abuses of the other, and by that other he would be trampled on and taken advantage of as a weakling. There was more danger in giving, than eagerness in accepting, wise counsel.

At such a time when political, personal, und religious motives were driving men hither and thither we need not imagine that parties were grouped very distinctly round well thought out and consistently held principles, but undoubtedly erastianism was the taint of the Church. She was held in thrall by the State partly for the general reasons just stated; partly through sheer usurpation on the part of the King; partly through the evil worldly ambitions and timidities of her own leaders; and partly also through a natural fear lest any disagreements should lead to serious trouble and the triumph of the Covenanters.

This name was at that time applicable to the whole Presbyterian party, and on them also we must turn our eyes, if we would obtain a complete view of Scottish Christianity. For though they had declared war to the death against the Church as grouped round the apostolic ministry, they did so in reaction against State intrusion, and even claimed in some strangely illogical fashion to possess Christ's commission in

outward validity. In any case, from their earnest if somewhat narrow and misguided zeal and from their triumphs, they form an important part of our subject.

To understand them thoroughly we should have to study the Covenant both in its political and its ecclesiastical bearing; we should have to study it also in the acts of its chief supporters in the days of their earlier triumphs; but it will be enough for our purpose to look at what they did after Charles II came to the throne. We shall see that if the Church Episcopal was tainted with erastianism the Covenanters were wholly papalist.

At the Restoration then the more moderate party among them, the Resolutioners as they were called, sent James Sharp up to London to represent to the King by all prudent and lawful means the "sinfulness and offensiveness of the toleration then established". Of this sinful and offensive toleration granted by Cromwell I confess I can find no trace further than that laymen of known episcopal sympathies were allowed to live in peace provided they made no attempt to worship God through the Prayer Book.

As to the manner of the inquisitorial persecution, which the moderate Covenanters now wished Charles to enter upon, we are fortunately left to our own imagination. We know however that it was not for want of will that they did not as formerly dictate, instead of prudently represent, to the King what they wanted to be done, for they bewail in private the fact that many in Scotland were cold to the Covenant, and that it was hopeless even to attempt to extirpate prelacy from England.

The extreme party likewise on the same occasion drew up an address to the King still more in keeping with Covenanting precedent. It spoke of the great danger which threatened his Majesty's dominions from the remnant of the prelatial party, and besought him to obtain uniformity in the three kingdoms by introducing one Confession, one form of Church government, one Directory of worship, and by extirpating popery, prelacy and schism. If this be not erastianism then it is papalism, and papalism of the purest water.

Charles as we know adopted though in softened fashion the principles thus urged upon him; he liked the sance, but,

as it happened, he substituted the presbyterian goose for the episcopalian gander. But the spasmodic vacillating manner in which he applied these principles served only to infuriate the Covenanters, while they on their part by open rebellion and declared sympathy with hideous murder continually awakened the secular power when it began to slumber. But so far were they from abandoning their own principles by blaming the *methods* of their oppressors, that they called on them to act more fiercely still against the Romanists and the Quakers.

It is not then among the Covenanters that we can look for a healthy spirit of discernment as to the true status and methods of the Church corporate and least of all for tolerance of difference in religion. It was not from them that we should ever have learned to do aught else but change, and change for the worse, the form of our own errors in these respects.

Turning now more closely to the dealings between the State and the Church herself, let us remember beforehand that it is not political unconstitutionality that is the question before us, but the intrusion of political authorities as such into the internal affairs of the Church. Hence we need not pause to discriminate nicely between the arbitrary doings of the King and the Privy Council on the one hand and such laws on the other hand as were regularly enacted by Parliament. Not that the difference is unimportant, but it is not the main point and time forbids us entering upon it.

If in the actions and principles of the Covenanters we have found little for the Church to imitate, our survey of the Church will be as disappointing; it will give us much to deplore, and little ground for believing that things would ever have righted themselves under that peculiar kind of outward peace and prosperity granted by the later Stuarts.

In the first place the reestablishment of episcopacy was begun by royal decree and consummated by act of Parliament. Well and good if they had merely been choosing an *official* religion. But this, as I have already explained was not the point of view, and the State authorities were choosing a religion which all were bound to adopt and at the same time assuming supreme authority in the ordering of Church affairs. They were frankly making their own the erastian solution of the dilemma created by the vicious fundamental theory of the

day, at least so far as concerned the outward framework of the Church. The Act of Parliament set forth in the preamble that the ordering of the external polity of the Church belonged to His Majesty as an inherent right of the Crown, and by virtue of his supremacy in "causes ecclesiastical"¹⁾.

Thus, though the ancientness and sacredness of the episcopal office was given as the reason moving the King to restore it, the claim is unambiguously made that the ministry of the Church is a matter that lies within the jurisdiction of the secular authority. This claim goes, leads, much farther than was perhaps realised at first by the King, and though his intention was to honour rather than slight regular Church order, as appears from the language of the preamble and from the care taken to have the new bishops duly ordained, yet the fatal reality was there destined to bear evil fruit in the day of development. The restored Church had made a bad start, and as it had begun so it continued.

The bishops were appointed under the "congé d'élire", a system by which the State authorities not only usurp the right of election from the faithful laity, but also at the same time, as a necessary result, *force* from the bishops the bestowal of the apostolic sanction and so reduce the episcopal office to little better than a mockery. In the days of the Stuarts, of course, the King and the Parliament were at least in theory members of the Church and so might in some sense have claimed to represent the laity, but this is far from obliterating the scandal inherent in the "congé d'élire", and its actual working in those days was sometimes shameless.

One inevitable result was that the bishops tended to become, and were universally regarded, not as apostolic guides of the Church, but as mere emanations from royalty.

It was by Act of Parliament that the General Assembly, or National Synod, was remodelled, or shall I say eviscerated. It was to meet only at the King's command, which in fact never was issued. When met it was to discuss only such points of doctrine, government, worship, or discipline as the King might

¹⁾ There is in this phrase a curious Nemesis on the claim made by the Church in former ages that clerics should not be amenable to the jurisdiction of the lay courts, for this I take it is the true original scope of the term "causes ecclesiastical".

submit; and to arrive only at such conclusions as he might approve of. Thus at the very outset the Church as a body corporate was deprived of all effective life, and no one as yet dared or cared to utter a word of protest.

We pass by briefly the restoration of the Court of High Commission. Its constitution was as monstrous from the secular as it was from the ecclesiastical point of view, but that is outside our scope, and the whole thing is a question simply of what particular instrument should be used in oppressing the individual and the Church.

The next thing to claim our notice is the Indulgence of 1669, an order of the Privy Council that all Presbyterian ministers formerly in possession of benefices might return to them and enjoy as it seems not merely their old stipends but even the full ecclesiastical status of the regular clergy, on the sole condition that they would accept presentation from the patron and collation from the bishop, patron and bishop being allowed no option in the matter.

Now let me say that for myself such study as I have been able to bestow on the conduct of the primitive Church has convinced me that whatever objections in detail might lie in any or in every case, there is a priori no essential bar to a man obtaining the full status of a presbyter through the bestowal and acceptance of the episcopal sanction quite apart from the regular ordination ceremony¹). But such is not the opinion of all; and that the question of principle should be decided, and then that the status should be conferred, by the secular power with no further recognition of the bishop than to extort from him a more or less reluctant and formal deed of collation is about as violent a usurpation of ecclesiastical functions by unfit persons as it is possible to conceive.

Glasgow was the diocese most affected by this measure, and gives us another good example of the actual working of the erastian principle in those days. The Synod ventured to draw up a remonstrance against the Indulgence, to which the Privy Council replied by ordering the suppression of the remonstrance, by expelling the Archbishop of Glasgow from

¹) At the Restoration Bishop Mitchell of Aberdeen alone insisted on the acceptance of regular ordination by Presbyterian clergy remaining in possession of their parishes.

Parliament, and a little later by declaring his see vacant and ordering him to resign quietly under threat of punishment. To this Dr Burnet submitted, but we must not put his act down wholly to personal timidity, for as we have stated the times were sorely out of joint, all issues were confused, and there was no coherence in the Church itself. The covenanting papalism of James Sharp, once the Resolutioner emissary and now the Primate, had in perfect consonance with fundamental realities transformed itself in an instant into thoroughgoing erastianism, but at this juncture he was moved to the one sound act and utterance of his life. Preaching before the Estates he declared that there were three pretenders to ecclesiastical supremacy, the Pope, the King, and the Presbyterian General Assembly. But, and I trust I am not wronging the man, the one fundamental principle on which he really acted was to sail with the wind. In any case a large part of his subsequent public life was spent in eating his valiant declaration.

Nor had he long to wait before beginning to do so, for a bill was immediately brought before the Estates setting forth the complete ecclesiastical supremacy of the King in stronger terms than ever; it was of course passed by Parliament, but surely the Primate need not have voted for it had he been really a man, had his sermon been anything else than the endeavour of vanity to rush to the front of an expected popular movement which never came off. Several of the bishops stayed away from the vote, but all who were present followed the lead of the Primate; even Leighton allowed his objections to be overruled, ever ready, ever ready good man that he was, to make concessions in the hope of peace.

It was in the strength of this Act that the King followed up the proceedings against Burnet and expelled him from his see.

We need not however examine in detail all the vexatious interferences with ecclesiastical matters indulged in by the Crown at this time, but passing on to 1674 we find an effort being made by certain of the bishops to obtain the calling of a National Synod in the hope of fostering a little life in the Church. Burnet, now restored to Glasgow, though he may not have ventured to do much in active promotion of the movement was certainly favourable to it; but Government was hostile, and even apart from that Sharp objected to it, having found

that he could play the great man much more effectively as a tool of the King's arbitrary power than he could ever hope to do as a faithful bishop of a living and struggling Church.

At a meeting of the bishops of the Province of S^t Andrew's the Bishop of Dunblane, Ramsay, spoke strongly in favour of the reforms proposed, whereupon Sharp, who of course was presiding as Primate, attacked him so fiercely that Ramsay retired from the meeting. It must also have been on Sharp's representations that a royal letter was immediately procured by which Ramsay was suspended from office. He made some sort of apology two years later on being restored to his functions, but whether a regrettable retraction, or an unobjectionable form to save the face of the Government, we are not told.

In the doings of 1680 and 1681 we are reminded that it was not only the Church in her corporate capacity but also the Christian as an individual that was held in thrall. In the former year the Council gives permission to use the Book of Common Prayer in family worship, and in the latter the Test Act was passed whereby all persons holding any public office civil or ecclesiastical were compelled to swear amongst other things that they professed the true Protestant religion and acknowledged in the fullest manner the King's ecclesiastical supremacy. There can be no doubt but that it was the latter of these two provisions that formed the kernel of the measure, and little but that already part of the ultimate design was the introduction of Romanism. By a special clause the King's brothers and sons were exempted from its scope.

But this does not concern us just now.

Many laymen now resigned their offices, and in the Diocesan Synods, especially in that of Aberdeen where Bishop Scougal took a leading part, much opposition was manifested, and we may infer from their proceedings that the clergy had not hitherto been compelled individually to acknowledge the extravagant claims of the Crown.

The worm was turning; and the Privy Council took alarm.

An explanation of the Test was set forth declaring that by it no invasion or encroachment was made or intended on the intrinsic spiritual power of the Church, or the power of the keys as it was exercised by the Apostles and the most

pure and primitive Church of the first three centuries, during which be it observed that Christianity was in open opposition to State law. The oath and test were also declared to be without any prejudice to the episcopal government of the Church. The Test and the explanation being thus in flat contradiction to each other, the clergy for the major part found themselves able to submit to the explained Test and to take the explained oath, and on the whole I think it will be felt that this time the victory lay with them. And if we must recognise that they regained for the Church none of her lost liberties, still they had resisted a fresh encroachment, they had freed the Church from any participation in the formal profession of error, and they had shown that if the bishops previously had given a good lead they would have been well supported and in all probability successful. Sharp's famous sermon proves that he had some idea of this, but whereas concerted action and something of the martyr's spirit would have been necessary, Sharp as Primate rendered the former condition impossible, and of the latter he at least had not one visible spark.

That this failure on the part of the bishops was deeply felt even among convinced Episcopalians we may see from the case of Gordon, Parson of Banchory Devenick. In his book, *The Reformed Bishop*, the title of which is very suggestive, he allowed himself to wax wroth in such pointed language, and with such unmistakeable application to the Primate and to Paterson, Bishop of Edinburgh, that an episcopal synod deprived him of his benefice. It was a tyrannical act, but in defence of the majority of the bishops it must be remembered that Gordon's personal vehemence was indefensible, and as he quietly submitted to the sentence so he was soon afterwards restored to his post. In a sermon attributed to him on convincing grounds, preached in King's College in 1692, we find practically admitted as part cause of the deficiencies of the Church before the Revolution, a general contempt of their clergy on the part of the bishops, and a too great trust to the secular arm as a rampart and homologation to their powers.

In 1686, James being now King, we find two good examples of the working of the royal supremacy.

An act for the toleration of Romanists was introduced into Parliament, but meeting with considerable opposition was with-

drawn. This withdrawal was explained soon after by the issue of a royal letter in which the King announced that it was his pleasure that his Roman Catholic subjects should be allowed the free private exercise of their religion, and that he had provided a chapel for the purpose in the palace of Holyrood. The question between King and Parliament we are leaving on one side, and possibly by an effort some of us may be able to imagine that the King's measure was in the interests of real toleration and therefore good in substance. But the edifying point is that at the same time he had the see of Dunkeld arbitrarily declared vacant, Bishop Bruce having been one of those who had been prominent in opposing his wishes in Parliament.

The post was offered to the Bishop of Brechin, but he refused saying nobly that he recognised no vacancy. The King then found a man named Hamilton, and put his name in the *congé d'élire* sent to Dunkeld. Him the chapter at first refused to accept, but finally gave way when threatened by one of their own number with a charge of treason. This illustrates for us in the bygoing the meaning of the *congé d'élire*.

The second case to which I have referred is that of Dr James Canaries of Selkirk, then in the Diocese of Glasgow. He preached a sermon in St Giles's Edinburgh in which he condemned the Roman errors, and the chancellor at once ordered the Archbishop of Glasgow to suspend him. After a few weak efforts at evasion the Archbishop actually obeyed, not however saving himself thereby, for the King thinking that he had not been prompt enough, and taking no account of renewed protestations of subserviency had him also deprived. He was succeeded by Bishop Paterson of Edinburgh, a willing and altogether suitable tool as it would seem for any purpose the King might entertain.

In the following year (1687) by a royal decree the Test Act, which had been remodelled some little time before, was now abrogated, and at the same time something not far short of absolute toleration of all dissenting religions was introduced¹⁾.

¹⁾ Indeed the laws existing today grant a toleration less wide and frank than did the decree of James VII., and if we ourselves were to alter our doctrinal standards and our services in some respects, we should be liable

The substance of this royal edict was excellent, it established in theory true toleration and was a formal abandonment of the disastrous fiction that the whole nation were and must be members of the National Church.

Its motive indeed was less deserving of praise, being nothing else apparently, than a conviction on the part of the King, or rather of his Jesuit advisers, that the open violence in favour of Rome was overreaching itself, and that even bare toleration for themselves was to be purchased by an unwelcome, though only temporary concession to other people. But the occasional futility of coercion is to be thanked for a good deal of the toleration practised in this world, and had this been all that was amiss, the substance of the King's decree might have caused it to outlive his own unstable motive. Ultimately even some semblance of the freedom allowed to the dissenting bodies might have been extended to the enslaved Church. But again it might not, and of real life and real liberty for her I can see no shred or prospect in the measure, which in providing a safety valve for malcontents would have only made easier the forcible Romanisation of the Establishment by an exercise of the Royal supremacy. But further speculation in the point would be idle; in the next year the flood came, and swept Church, and King, and Toleration Act clean away.

It is this cataclysm, with the evil days that followed, that is the blessing in disguise to which the opening passages of this article point.

But it will require another lecture to work out the thought; to show the chief details of the disguise; to point out the slow emergence of the blessing, hindered as it was by our persistent clinging not merely to the house of Stuart, for that was honourable and tended only to make the discipline of adversity more effective, but also to the root evil of erastianism.

to all manner of penalties if ever we ventured to meet together for worship. As to James's own sentiments, Barclay of Ury the Quaker who knew him pretty well believed him to have been really inclined to toleration, and he certainly was true to his own conscience in ecclesiastical matters. But then we must all the more regret that he did not retain his conscience in his own keeping in all matters, and act up to it with courage and discrimination. (Jaffray's Diary, ch. XV.)

Just now we have seen at least Scottish Christianity infected root and branch with a grievous error; we have seen this error bearing to the utmost its own bad fruit; we have seen in the case of the Church of Catholic order, with which the real future of Christianity is bound up, that a great catastrophe resulted, to which its own wrongdoing had largely contributed; and we have seen a dawn, or rather a seed, of brighter things, for this very catastrophe took away from us, and in the end compelled us to cease hankering after, the broken and poisonous reed that the spiritual finds the secular to be when she takes it as a proper weapon or a close support.

Aberdeen.

Rev. J. T. F. FARQUHAR.
