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Thesis Abstract

James Cooper and the Scoto-Catholic Party: Tractarian Reform in the Church of Scotland, 1882-1918

Brian A. Rees

In Scotland, no less than in England, the late Victorian era was one of transition. Industrialisation and urbanisation created new social problems, while other forces - most importantly the railway - worked to undermine the national comprehensiveness of Scotland. Even Scottish religion, until now protected both by distance and the different polity entertained, fell under the sway of English influence.

This thesis considers one particular aspect of English influence upon the Church of Scotland - Tractarianism. There is clear evidence to prove that in liturgical and architectural expression, in church furnishings and arrangement, in ritual and in doctrine, and even in the development of a library of historical research, there was manifest by some a deliberate attempt to reform the Church of Scotland through a thorough-going application of Tractarian definitions, ideals, and symbolic expressions.

In particular the thesis investigates the personal influence of the Reverend Professor James Cooper in this endeavour, for he was one of the principal figures in changing the face of the Kirk. He was a medievalist, tinctured with Jacobitism. Although there were some in the Church with more profound learning, and others with a broader vision of the social and ecclesiastical requirements of the new age, Cooper combined within himself many of the aims, the ideals, and the foibles commonly associated with Victorians. As the representative spokesman for the Scoto-Catholic party, he held a unique place in the life of the Scottish Church, for the Scoto-Catholics, though always few in number, were not without significant influence. It was they in particular who perpetrated the "Tractarian" reform in the Church of Scotland.

In the introduction the historical background to the Scottish Church in 1882 is sketched. Part I provides a background survey of the Oxford Movement in England and Scotland. Part II considers the Broad Church attempt at reform, and the liturgical developments associated with the Church Service Society. Part III deals with the
emergence of Scoto-Catholicism, and Part IV with Ecclesiological and Ritualistic movements. Part V looks at the attempt to defend and advance Catholic doctrine - the programme of the Scottish Church Society, and also traces Cooper's influence on the "Articles Declaratory" of the constitution of the Church of Scotland. Part VI investigates the attempt to defend and advance Catholic authority in the Scottish Church through a restatement of the Tractarian doctrine of Apostolic Succession. Of necessity it also considers the matters of ordination and "valid Orders". It is shown that by means of a "historiological mythos" the Scoto-Catholic position in this, as in other matters, was advanced. There are several appendices, the first of which traces a connection between the Catholic Apostolic Church - which itself was not without significant liturgical and doctrinal effect upon the Church of Scotland - and the Oxford Movement.
PREFACE

Many of the things we take for granted within the liturgical setting in Scotland today are recently revived. We find a permanent Communion Table, for example, quite unremarkable. So too, we see nothing particularly extraordinary about finding a font, or stained glass, or the towering pipes of a large organ, within a Church of Scotland. We should be rather surprised if a congregation did not stand and sing hymns. Although seen less frequently, we are not shocked to find a Church of Scotland with a structural chancel, fitted with choir stalls, guarded at its entrance by a short flight of steps and flanked on either side by a pulpit and lectern - these may even carry an antependium and markers in the proper seasonal colour. And beyond, and in the furthermost recess of the chancel, the Holy Table, looking very chaste and beautiful, surrounded by chairs or stalls for the elders and clergy. There might even be prayer-desks for the ministers; maybe a cross on the Communion Table; maybe candelabra standing vigil. We are not greatly troubled to find that former cathedrals and abbey churches have been restored to their medieval shape and arrangement, and are used in this form for Presbyterian worship.

All of these features were revolutionary a hundred years ago: indeed, some might still be actively resisted. All of them, initially at least, were met with suspicion; some with open hostility. It is a position which we today might fail to appreciate unless we remember that even that most basic of ecclesiastical furniture (to most minds) - the Communion Table, is itself not a required permanent fixture. In fact, in the Reformed system it is even inappropriate to speak of it as the Communion Table: it is really but a part of the table which extends to wherever the Communicants sit to receive the Sacrament.

The desire for such furnishings and arrangement was seen to be subversive to Presbyterianism; it was clear evidence of the resurfacing of man’s base and superstitious nature. Nor was this interpretation unique to Presbyterian Scotland. In Episcopal England too, though on a slightly more advanced level, such developments were treated with disdain. The placement of lighted candles on the Communion Table, the use of coloured frontals, even a cross on the Communion Table were interdicted; in fact, almost everything we associate with the English Church as we know it today, was declared illegal at some point last century—sometimes by the bishops, often by the Privy Council.
In Scotland, the principal figure in changing the face of the Kirk was the Reverend Professor James Cooper. He was one of the more interesting personalities in the Church of Scotland as it entered this century. He was a medievalist, tinctured with Jacobitism. Although there were some in the Church with more profound learning, and others with a broader vision of the social and ecclesiastical requirements of the new age, Cooper combined within himself many of the aims, the ideals, and the foibles which we commonly associate with the late Victorian era. As the representative spokesman for the "Scoto-Catholic" party (a group of High Church Presbyterians with an Anglo-Catholic doctrinal bias), he held a quite unique place in the life of the Scottish Church, for the Scoto-Catholics, though always few in number, were not without significant influence.

In the introduction I have sketched the background to the Church of Scotland in 1882. In Part I I have considered briefly the Oxford Movement in England and Scotland, and the development of Anglo-Catholicism. This survey is not intended to be a definitive statement either historically or doctrinally, but is to serve as a reminder of how significantly the face of the Anglican Church has changed in the past century - because of the Tractarian influence primarily. It will also facilitate consideration of the practical link between Scoto-Catholicism and Oxfordism. In the subsequent parts I have traced the development of the Scoto-Catholic programme from its Broad Church aesthetic infancy through to its doctrinal development and its practical extensions.

In the preparation of the material I have received valuable advice and criticism; and kindly support and helpful suggestions from my supervisors, the Very Reverend Principal James A. Whyte, Professor of the Department of Practical Theology and Christian Ethics in the Faculty of Divinity, St. Mary's College, and his colleague, the Reverend Professor James K. Cameron of the Department of Church History. My debt to many others is here readily acknowledged: to the Archivist of Aberdeen University Library, who helped me through the countless volumes of James Cooper's diaries; to the Archivist of Dundee University Library; to Mr. R. N. Smart of the manuscript department of the University Library of St. Andrews; to the staffs of the New College Library, Edinburgh University, of the University Library of St. Andrews, of the D. Hay Fleming Reference Library, St. Andrews, and of the Scottish Record Office, Edinburgh; and to Mr. R. G. Cant, formerly Reader in Scottish History in St. Andrews, who has given me much first-hand information about Dr. ("Daddy") Cooper, who, in his words, was "a saint". More especially, I freely acknowledge my debt to my parents, to my sympathetic
Father in Christ - the Rev. Dr. R. J. Berlis, to my sister-in-law, Valerie, for her care in proof-reading the text, and to my dear wife, Susan, who has so cheerfully borne the thankless task of transforming a most illegible draft into typescript.

Whitsuntide,  
June, 1980,  
St. Mary's College,  
ST. ANDREWS

Brian A. Rees
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INTRODUCTION

By 1882 the Act of Union that had merged the Parliaments of England and Scotland in 1707 was an irreversible fact. While she retained some traditional national characteristics and to a certain extent her national consciousness, Scotland was almost wholly assimilated to England. Few substantial differences were discernible between the two nations. Scotland retained her Presbyterian style of religion and her corpus of Scots law, she maintained her own theory of education; but at a deeper level, in the realm of the formative influences of political, scientific, social, economic, and philosophical thought, the national boundary between Scotland and England remained visible only on an Atlas. Railways and steamships, the telegraph and the penny-post, national newspapers and journals, broke down all local barriers. The extending dominions and possessions overseas gave the word "Britain" new significance; it involved a sense of a united goal, a unified purpose and direction. The fairly complete railroad network within Scotland made it a relatively small and compact country; but the network extended freely beyond the artificial national boundary. Glasgow and Edinburgh were now close to Oban and Inverness and Aberdeen; but they were just as close to Durham and Newcastle and London. The centre of all trade and commerce, of all industrial and colonial development, naturally was London - the great
terminus of the United Kingdom. London dominated all aspects of life in both nations, and was indiscriminate in its domination.

The same forces were at work in both Scotland and England—industrialisation and urbanisation, and with these came new social problems. Whereas Scotland in 1850 had been largely agricultural, by 1882 she was a town-oriented nation: two-thirds of her three-and-a-half million people were clustered about the industries and mines of the Scottish midlands. Almost one-third of her population lived in four cities: Glasgow, Edinburgh, Dundee, and Aberdeen. The cities had not been designed for such numbers or such rapid growth. Social problems which had always existed took on a new plague-like appearance. Poverty, squalor, disease, alcoholism, the breakdown of the family unit—these were but some of the more readily apparent social complications of industrial urbanisation. Glasgow alone had half a million inhabitants, and many of these were poor Irish immigrants with large families and no prospect of work or social relief. Traditionally the parish church had been responsible for the care and welfare of the poor and needy: the funds necessary came almost wholly from voluntary offerings. In the burgeoning cities such funding was impracticable; the parish churches of the industrial cities had neither the manpower nor the resources to cope with the new situation. As it was, the "Disruption" of 1843 had seriously weakened the parish church’s effectiveness, and the industrial boom served merely to compound the
confused religious situation. If the "Disruption" had not occurred, the State might have been able to use the existing parish structures to effect the necessary social welfare; but after 1843 feelings were running so high that it would have been political suicide for any government to work through the agency of the National Church. The "Disruption" of 1843, though it had not even considered the matter, dealt a death-blow to Chalmers' programme of poor relief through the Church. In the Poor Law of 1845 the State assumed full responsibility for social welfare.

Within thirty years of relieving the Church of her social responsibilities, the State also relieved her of her other traditional role - education. In 1852 the University Tests were abolished, except for those teaching in the divinity faculties. The Education Act of 1872 formally secularised education, in the sense that the State assumed full control. The curriculum was not greatly altered, however, and the fact that most teachers were still actively involved in the Church and had been trained in the Confessional Standards, ensured the continuance of a religious involvement in the educational structure. The compulsory education clause was of little effect in Scotland, for the standard of literacy was generally higher than in England - because of training in the Scriptures and Standards of the Church primarily. What the Education Act failed to do, which was of great importance in the Scottish situation, was to provide for a systematic progression in education at the secondary level. There was a serious gap
in the Scottish system between primary schools and the Universities. There were moves afoot privately, however, more especially by the Merchant Companies of Edinburgh, to redress this situation.

Politically, Scotland was not significantly different to England. The politicians, generally, were still of the old aristocracy or the new monied class of industrialists and merchants; few had any grasp of the social complications of the age. Liberalism was still the dominant political theory, as it had been since the first Reform Parliament. Socialism was just beginning, having had its birth in Disraeli's legislation granting new status and recognition to the Trade Unions. The peculiar national requirements of Scotland received little sympathy in the Gothic halls of Westminster; "North Britain" was but the political appendage of England. More especially was this the case where ecclesiastical legislation was involved, for Parliament generally, and the English prelates especially, had little understanding of Scottish religion.

In the literary realm, too, there was nothing peculiarly national about Scottish literature. The success in England of the highly influential Edinburgh Review (founded 1802) and Blackwood's Magazine (founded 1812), ensured the respectability of Edinburgh literary personalities, and their acceptance into polite English society. And many of Scotland's brightest lights chose to live in that milieu: England was the home of Thomas Carlyle, Mrs. Oliphant, and Andrew Lang, a few of the more notable
representatives. It was the episcopal palaces of England that were often the setting, and their inhabitants and guests the subjects, of many of the popular articles from the pen of that most chatty of "Country Parsons" - A. K. H. Boyd of St. Andrews.

The philosophical theory with most influence on both sides of the border was German "Idealism", and it is of some interest that it was the Scottish Calvinist-trained Thomas Carlyle who was its most notable exponent in England. The utilitarian scientific mind of the late nineteenth century did not naturally accord with such idealism, however; it had little interest in such speculative theories as "the earth as a living organism". Evolution, the new and exciting pseudo-religion of the age, appeared to be grounded upon observable facts, and this captured the imagination not only of the academics and scientists, but also of the popular consciousness. The crude naturalism of the early advocates of the theory had given way to a broader base, and the evolutionary methodology was extended from its initial application to organic life, to a consideration of every aspect of society, history, and even religion. The conflict of science and religion that grew out of this application of evolutionary theory was inevitable; what was perhaps unexpected was the way it was picked up by the less educated ranks of society, who followed the ensuing debate with great interest. Everyone seemed interested in knowing if the Bible could stand up to the test of scientific investigation.
Linked broadly with these other developments was the emergence of the new religious phenomenon—Doubt. In Scotland, no less than in England, the growth of Agnosticism became a force to be reckoned with. Suddenly the questions that had caused unending divisions in Scotland—the Standards, Patronage, Christology—were left for consideration of a far more basic question: "Can the mind ever have knowledge of God?" The response to this questioning in some quarters was a defiant reassertion of the Biblical fundamentals of religion; Doubt was assailed by a reactionary evangelicalism. It is hardly surprising that this was the age of the Moody and Sankey revivalist mission which brought a new emotional element into the proclamation of the Gospel—something which the Fathers of the Kirk had traditionally resisted. The emotionalism was appreciated by the socially oppressed, however, and within that setting it was effective, and the Kirk accepted that fact.

The Church of Scotland in 1882 was caught in the rough seas of social, intellectual, scientific, and—of all most fearsome—religious ferment. Earlier in the century there had been several attempts to soften the harsh Calvinistic orthodoxy of another age. Thomas Erskine, John McLeod Campbell, and Edward Irving had worked to prepare the Church of Scotland for reform. Although each of them was disciplined by the Church, their teaching had sunk deep. Erskine (1788-1870), for example, taught the unconditional freeness of the Gospel; he rejected the doctrines of Limited Atonement and Eternal Punishment, and the substitutionary theory of
the Atonement. He laid great stress on the "Fatherhood" of God, and taught that all divine punishment is remedial. In this he helped to inspire social reform, and to make the old type of preaching on sin and hell unfashionable. McLeod Campbell (1800-1872) was not dissimilar to Erskine in his basic thrust: he was interested in the spiritual experience of God's love. He challenged the Confession of Faith, for he thought that it was stopping the Church's growth in light and knowledge. His most important insight, however, was that the teaching on the universality of the Atonement had not been accompanied by a spiritual understanding of its nature - something which he thought was the key to spiritual revitalisation. His book, The Nature of the Atonement (1856), was arguably the most important Scottish contribution to theology in the nineteenth century.

Edward Irving (1792-1834) may have been the decisive influence upon McLeod Campbell, for it was his teaching as regards Christ's humanity that set McLeod Campbell thinking. Although Irving became involved with the neo-Pentecostal Catholic Apostolic Church [APPENDIX A], he remained an important influence upon many of the leading Churchmen in Scotland, more especially through his teaching on the Incarnation and the Ascension, and the Church and the Sacraments. Irving, not unlike McLeod Campbell, wanted to challenge the authority of the Westminster Confession, partially because he thought that the Church should be free from the impediment of polity and dogma to
follow the leading of the Holy Spirit, but more especially because he thought it represented a Puritan perversion of the faith and practice of the Scottish Church.

With the development of the intrusion controversy, and the power struggle between the Moderates and the Evangelicals which resulted in the "Disruption", consideration of these other matters was forgotten for a season. The requirements of stabilising and rebuilding the remnant into an important national institution once again, occupied everyone's attention. The competition afforded by the Free Church and the United Presbyterians made these new beginnings difficult, but by the 1880s, even in the face of a vicious disestablishment and disendowment campaign, the Church of Scotland had not only recovered from the "Disruption", but was making significant gains. It was now in a position to entertain consideration of matters other than "Church Defence".

The new social and intellectual pressures demanded attention, for they were working against the whole religious situation in Scotland. The Churches were forced to stop fighting their old battles so that they might more effectively counter the daughter of Liberalism - "Modernism". Biblical Criticism was making the Scriptures less credible as an infallible authority; Idealism was undermining all credal foundations; Agnosticism was challenging all religious systems; Science was advancing the gospel of utilitarianism. The Churches had to consider whether it be possible to agree and reunite in the higher cause.
Within the Church of Scotland, but also in the other Presbyterian Churches, there was a movement toward reform which encouraged these thoughts of reunion. There was an attempt to broaden the base of Calvinistic orthodoxy; to loosen the Confessional tie. The new age of Liberal thought in the Church was being slowly and quietly ratified. In 1880, for example, a group of Churchmen with Broad sympathies produced a volume of sermons in the "new style" of preaching. It was entitled simply, "Scotch Sermons". The authors were all Liberal Churchmen, and some were highly reputable. The volume was "considered" by the General Assembly, but neither formally approved nor censured. Other moves too, while not receiving formal approval, were accepted. In particular, the attempt to correct the "sad state" of worship occupied the thoughts and talents of many of the Church's most able men. Again, this attempt cut across all denominational lines. This is not to suggest that there was no controversy involved. The trial of Robertson Smith in the Free Church, for example, occasioned by his advanced Liberal writings, was an attempt to reassert the more traditional standards. But the age had changed the minds of most people; there was an enlightenment which could not be arrested merely by declaring against it.

Another factor which encouraged thoughts of Presbyterian reunion was the gradual realisation that Presbyterians were not alone on the Scottish religious scene. The Scottish Episcopal Church was showing signs of continuing growth - especially among the upper classes and
landed gentry. The Roman Catholic Church, strengthened through Irish immigration, was boasting — even through the internal conflict between the natives and the newcomers — a revitalised strength. There were also Congregationalists, and Methodists, and Baptists — all eager to welcome the Presbyterian losses. The chapels of Dissent, thanks to the economic prosperity of Britain, were now quite affordable and often highly prized.

In none of these developments was Scotland in isolation. Almost invariably the movements and the conflicts were anticipated in England. Liberalism, Erastianism, Higher Criticism, Idealism, Agnosticism — everything, in fact, which faced the Scottish Church, had already been considered by the English Church. The "Disruption" had meant that some of these movements were arrested in their development in Scotland; the Church had not the time to consider them fully. But now the time had come when these factors demanded consideration. It was only natural that the Scottish Church should consider the English developments with particular interest.

Initially it was a group of churchmen with Liberal sympathies who found inspiration in the Church of England, in the broad and comprehensive character of the Establishment. But it was almost inevitable that there should be another group develop, a High Church group, who considered that the English Church had been saved by the Tractarians; who saw in the Oxford Movement the preservation and continuation of the indefectible deposit of faith, the
rediscovery of the Catholic principles of worship, and
the reassertion of the essentials of the Christian reli-
gion as fixed in the Catholic Creeds. It was to be
expected that they should try to rescue the Scottish
Church by a thorough-going application of those same
principles which had proved so effective in freeing
English religion from the forces of an incipient
Liberalism, and had confirmed her in the Catholic Faith.
The Scottish High Churchmen and Liberal Churchmen were
both well acquainted with the principles basic to the
Oxford Movement, and with the history of its development
to their day. Both groups acknowledged the power of its
programme to capture the imagination and stir the heart.
Both groups used this awareness - by way of either
inspiration or reaction - to help shape their own thinking
on the pressing matter of Church reform.

This thesis considers the Tractarian programme of
reform, its principles, its ideals and its development,
and how it was that the Church of Scotland was brought to
assume many features peculiar to the integrity of the
Oxford Movement. In particular, it considers the part
played in this "Tractarian" reform of the Scottish Church
by James Cooper, and the "Scoto-Catholic" party with
which he was popularly identified. The period covered by
the thesis is 1882 to 1918, a dating suggested by the
emergence of "Scoto-Catholicism", and the final stages of
the Great War in which Victorian romanticism perished.
PART I - BACKGROUND

THE OXFORD MOVEMENT - ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND
In October, 1882, The Church Quarterly provided this retrospect on the year:

Without any doubt the most important ecclesiastical incident of late months has been the silent session of the great Commission which is revising our ecclesiastical judicature.  

It indicated the lull that had befallen the English Church after almost fifty years of controversy. It was as though everything was on "simmer", for while issues of past or potential disagreement remained - the position and prospects of Christian mission throughout the world, the Bradlaugh Question, the Temperance Question, the Salvation Army, the Lord's Day, resurgent Popery, the "Deceased Wife's Sister Bill", Ritualism, ceremonialism, Anglo-Catholicism, . . . - there was an intuitive awareness of stalemate. The deaths in the year of Professor E. B. Pusey (born 1800) and Archbishop Tait (Canterbury, born 1811), people who in themselves had shaped in large measure the passing age, were indicative of the changed situation. Pusey had said of himself: "My life has been spent in a succession of insulated efforts, bearing indeed upon one great end - the growth of Catholic truth and piety among us."  

His sole aim after his intellectual conversion to High Church principles was "to spread among
churchmen the conviction that on the doctrines of the Fathers and early Anglican divines alone could religion be based". Tait had passed a very trying fourteen years at Lambeth Palace, and even on his death-bed was found working to secure the peace of the Church. It was said that at the close of his career he was both more of the Broad Churchman and the High Churchman, and less of the Evangelical. During the earlier years of his episcopate his public policy no doubt was riskful and mistaken in various details; but he learned from his experience, and by the unexpected and unwonted strength which he infused into the Primacy of All England, he put the mark of inexpediency upon the favourite design of Victorian statesmen - a weak Archbishop of Canterbury. Tait's administration of the Archbishopric not only greatly increased its importance at home, but also converted the office from that of a Primate of All England to something like a patriarchate of the whole Anglican Communion.

The judicial stalemate (which resulted in the various Royal Commission inquiries) was in a sense the vindication of the Oxford Movement within the Church of England. Although there were still those who saw the matter as being simply one of flagrant disobedience and lawlessness in the Church, there were others - the majority, one would assume - who realised that the State no longer had the right to legislate in spiritual matters. They may not have been concerned for the integrity of the Church, for ensuring her claim to be a "true national branch" of the
Church Catholic, or even for her welfare and continuity; but they realised that the State could not continue to claim sovereignty in the ecclesiastical realm; that the Royal Supremacy extended only to the temporal, not to the spiritual.

By the turn of the twentieth century there was still no definitive solution to the problem of ecclesiastical judicature. The only thing that was clear was that (in the Bishop of Birmingham's words to the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, 1906): "The Church has become only one of many religious bodies in the State... and in consequence the legislative and judicial authorities of the State have ceased to be in any real sense... capable of claiming the allegiance of churchmen in spiritual matters." It was plain that consent to Parliament's sovereignty, on which was based their power to act in ecclesiastical matters, had been withdrawn by Churchmen. What failed to be noticed by many, however, was that it was not the recent revocation by the dissident and defiant Ritualists that was definitive: clerical consent had been withdrawn as early as 1830 on principle.

The Collapse of the Commonwealth-Church Condition

The year 1830 marked a great turning point. It was a fateful year for the whole of Europe. In France a revolution had replaced the priestly dominated Bourbons...
(Charles X) with the "Voltairean bourgeoisie Orleanists" (Louis Philippe), and in the process the Church establishment was abolished. This was bound to have repercussions elsewhere, especially in England. Already there was widespread confusion in the English public mind. The death of George IV in June precipitated events. It was a year of renewed economic distress. It was a year of liberal aggression: the political reform issue was being raised in public meetings throughout the land. It was a year when calls for the disestablishment of the Church of England reached a new peak. It was a year when Ireland was perched on the brink of civil war - a war the Government could not afford militarily. It was a year when the tottering Tories finally fell. Liberalism was now in the ascendant: the age of the Reform Parliament had come. All Tory-identified institutions were under concerted attack; the United Church of England and Ireland more especially.

The passage of the Liberal Government's Irish Church Temporalities Bill (1833) ended the speculation that they planned to effect a reform of the Church also. The Bill was concerned exclusively with the Church of Ireland, but it was anticipated by most Churchmen that this was but the beginning, and that the Church of England would be the next target of Liberal legislation. At Oxford, the ominous implications of the Bill were seen immediately. It was clear that High Churchmen had to react to this latest act of Liberal aggression. But the reaction could not be confined to this particular measure: it had to consider the
whole matter of Church-State relations as they had developed in England over three hundred years.

It was the contention of those who held a "High" view of the Church in England,\(^1\) that the State, because of the recent changes in legislation, had revoked its rights to intrude upon the Church: it had cancelled (in the words of R. H. Froude) "the conditions on which it [the House of Commons] had been allowed to interfere in matters spiritual".\(^2\) If the Government, after centuries of supporting a National Religion, was now to become indifferent to the Church because of the religious divisions of Ireland; if it was going to effect changes to the episcopate, and re-allocate (or even appropriate) Church endowments without even consulting the Church; if it was going to succumb to the pressure of non-Anglican Parliamentarians - then it was time to reassert the Divine Headship and institution of the Church; to state emphatically that the Church was not the creation of the State, that it was neither endowment nor establishment that constituted the Church; to state that the Church of England was the Church because she taught Catholic truth and therefore was "the true branch of the Catholic Church in England".

The politicians, not surprisingly, were puzzled and offended by this reaction. None of the Parliamentary decisions taken in the years 1828-1833 had altered - in their minds - the way in which they were to legislate for the Church. Their position was still that of a decade previous: "The House . . . must be well aware that there
was no precise authority in Scriptures for any particular establishment; it was altogether a civil institution, the creation of the law; and by every rule of reason, the same authority that created could alter, nay! could even annul it altogether." Parliamentarians were unable, or unwilling, to understand the changed situation in Church-State relations. They failed to see that which Oxford did: the Church Establishment rested upon a Church and State "Commonwealth", and that "Commonwealth" condition was now dead. Hooker had indeed contended against the Calvinists who "make a necessary separation perpetual and personal between the Church and the Commonwealth", and over and against them had stated that "if the Commonwealth be Christian, if the people which are of it do publicly embrace the true religion, this very thing doth make it the Church". But this "Commonwealth" concept carried with it that excommunication necessarily and logically involved the loss of civil rights. This was the case in England until 1813, and after. It was quite opposed to the concept of "Commonwealth-Church" to in any way recognise Nonconformity.

The repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, and the Roman Catholic Relief Act, removed the civil disabilities affecting non-Anglicans, and undermined the "Commonwealth-Church" condition by putting Dissenters and Roman Catholics on an equal footing with Established Churchmen. To those - like Thomas Arnold - who were distressed by the proliferation of Protestant sects, and who
desired the strengthening of Commonwealth to allow of a vague and generalised Christianity as the best of citizenship, where the principle of unity was to be found in the State (the Church being the State in its religious aspect), and where secular identity counted as nothing, this was still an acceptable arrangement. To them the Anglican formularies were to be comprehensive enough to—as Dean Stanley held—include any who did not exclude themselves. The Oxford High Churchmen utterly rejected any such compromise of comprehensiveness.

**Tractarianism**

It was the tabling of the Irish Church Bill that occasioned the famous Assize Sermon by John Keble. Preached at Oxford on the anniversary of the taking of the Bastille, it inaugurated the Oxford Movement (14 July, 1833). His words were potent:

Under the guise of charity and toleration we are come almost to this pass, that no difference, in matters of faith, is to disqualify for our approbation and confidence, whether in public or domestic life. Can we conceal it from ourselves, that every year the practice is becoming more common, of trusting men unreservedly in the most delicate and important matters, without one serious inquiry, whether they do not hold principles which make it impossible for them to be loyal to their Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier?23

Keble considered the Liberal legislation in this new light. He developed his theme of toleration and the "fashionable
liberty" of the age in terms of "apostasy"; an apostasy recognisable in the State's "intrusion on the sacrificial office", in its "infringement on apostolical rights", in its "persecuting the true Church". The sermon's strong, "should it ever happen that the apostolical Church should be forsaken, degraded, nay trampled on and despoiled by the state and people of England, . . . " set the tone for the Oxford (or "Tractarian") Movement.

Within a month of the sermon's delivery, John Keble, R. H. Froude, William Palmer, and John Henry Newman, all men associated with Oxford, agreed to a set of principles on which to base a religious movement within the Church of England. The principles involved a re-affirmation of traditional English High Church doctrines, especially that of Apostolic Succession; a declaration of the sinful nature of interference by non-Anglicans in matters spiritual; a commitment to making the Church of England more popular; and a platform defending the Church-State connection, but preparing for the eventuality of disestablishment. The movement so proposed was to be a remedial measure: it was to be a response to both the imminent political threat and resurgent Popery. More importantly, it was to be an antidote to what they considered to be the deeper problem, the real disease of the age - "Liberalism".

Samuel Wilberforce gave this "Christian gentleman's" definition of Liberalism:
It is the Devil's creed: a heartless steam-engine, unChristian, low, sensual, utilitarian creed which would put away all that is really great and high and noble; all old remembrances and customs; merely to set up what is low, and multiply such miserable comforts as going very fast through the air on a rail-road - and for this purpose it would overturn the Church that is Christianity; and worship the very Devil if his horns were gold and his tail were a steam-engine. I hate the breaking down the character of the old English country gentlemen, I think it one of the finest characters in the world . . . doing more good than all the vile bushels of USEFUL KNOWLEDGE which have turned the heads of all the half-learned tinkers in the Universe.  

As applied to religion, Liberalism meant quite simply that a man's religious convictions were but a matter of personal taste; that he had "no duty to believe anything in particular, and that in moral questions he had no duty to conform himself either to revelation or to Reason".  

Newman called Liberalism the "Anti-Dogmatic Principle"; it was

the mistake of subjecting to human judgment those revealed doctrines which are in their nature beyond and independent of it, and of claiming to determine on intrinsic grounds the truth and value of propositions which rest for their reception simply on the external authority of the Divine Word.  

Liberalism was disguised in many forms: revolution in politics; rationalism in religion; Erastianism and Latitudinarianism in the Church. It was these very forces which were - to the Tractarian mind - actively committing the Church to heresy. Erastianism, "the parent, or if not the parent, the serviceable and sufficient tool of liberalism" (according to Newman), had to be halted. To save the Church two things were necessary: to invest it with divine
authority and all rights flowing from that unique authority; and to set it strong in that authority over and against the apostate State on the one hand, and Reason on the other. Such was the programme entertained in the Tracts for the Times.28

Should the government and the country so far forget God as to cast off the Church, to deprive it of its temporal honours and substance, on what will you rest the claim of respect and attention which you make upon your flocks? . . . on what are we to rest our authority when the state deserts us?

The questions are those of Newman as posed in the first of the Tracts for the Times; a tract on the "Ministerial Commission" and addressed specifically to the clergy. It was published (along with two others) on September 9, 1833. This first and most famous of the early "Tracts" also gave a definitive answer: ". . . the real ground on which our authority is built [is] OUR APOTSTOLICAL DESCENT".

For Newman the doctrine of Apostolic Authority was fundamental to the claim of spiritual independence for the Church; it was the first line of defence against both Erastianism and Liberalism. Devotion to this doctrine was the outcome of his change of stance regarding the nature of Christian authority: a change from the Protestant Evangelical authority of sola fides and personal salvation, to an understanding of salvation in the Church which exists as a "substantive body or corporation". It was part of
the belief he had acquired at Oxford\textsuperscript{29} - that we are meant to receive the rudiments of the Faith from Tradition rather than Scripture; that the Church should teach, and the Scriptures prove, the doctrines of Christianity; that, "if we would learn doctrine, we must have recourse to the formularies of the Church; . . . to the Catechism and to the Creeds".\textsuperscript{30}

The "Tracts" presented a "via media" position between contemporary Romanism and popular Protestantism. Near the end of 1834 the first forty-six were collected and re-published. They dealt with the essential nature of the Christian Church, the corruptions of her various branches throughout the world, the current objections to the Establishment, her position as part of the Catholic Church, her liturgy that had retained so many Catholic features. The Tractarian interpretation of many of these issues was supported with extracts from the writings of seventeenth century "Anglo-Catholic" divines, and early Church Fathers. It was a bold attempt to make seventeenth century High Church principles applicable to an age of liberalising reform. The "Advertisement" or "Preface" to the edition of 1834 was indicative of the position assumed. It read:

Methodism and Popery are in different ways the refuge of those to whom the Church stints the gift of grace: they are the foster-mothers of abandoned children. The neglect of the daily service, the desecration of festivals, the Eucharist scantily administered, insubordination permitted in all ranks of the Church, orders and offices imperfectly developed, the want of societies for particular religious objects, and the like deficiencies, lead the fevered mind, desirous of a vent to its feelings, and a stricter rule of life, to the
smaller religious communities, to prayer and Bible meetings, and ill-advised institutions and societies on the one hand - on the other to the solemn and captivating services by which Popery gains its proselytes.

In 1834 Pusey became officially involved in the Tractarian Movement by writing Tract XVIII. It changed the whole tone of the Movement and ushered in a new phase in its development, for he brought not only his influence and respectability to what had been a relatively small - though not ignored - university-centred Movement, but a scholarly and more disciplined approach to the "Tracts", which became longer, more serious, and of far greater significance.

The subsequent two years showed tremendous growth in the Movement, and those outside of Oxford slowly became alive to the force of it, even though it remained rather unintelligible to them. The rapidity of expansion can only be explained in terms of its filling a deep spiritual need. Before the end of 1837 the Movement was looked upon as a new party in the Church; a force to be taken seriously. Newman and Pusey had begun editing what was to become the Library of the Fathers (a translation into English of Patristic writings). Since the Movement held that the measure of Christian truth had to be based on the consensus of the Fathers, such an endeavour was of signal importance. Newman also assumed editorship of the British Critic, which became the journal of Tractarian influence.
It was Newman's sermons at St. Mary's however, that were the true source of the Tractarian appeal. Principal Shairp (St. Andrews) records this picture:

Here was no vehemence, no declaration, no show of elaborated argument, so that one who came to hear a great intellectual effort was almost sure to go away disappointed. Indeed, I believe that if he had preached one of his St. Mary's sermons before a Scotch town congregation, they would have thought the preacher 'a silly body'. . . . Those who never heard him might fancy that his sermons would generally be about apostolic succession or rights of the Church or against Dissenters. Nothing of the kind. You might hear him preach for weeks without an allusion to these things. What there was of High Church teaching was implied rather than enforced. The local, the temporary and the modern were ennobled by the presence of the catholic truth belonging to all ages that pervaded the whole. His power showed itself chiefly in the new and unlooked-for way in which he touched into life old truths, moral or spiritual, which all Christians acknowledge, but most have ceased to feel.33

In one of the sermons, Newman gave this statement of his preaching:

Here I will not shrink from uttering my firm conviction, that it would be gain to this country, were it vastly more superstitious, more bigoted, more gloomy, more fierce in its religion, than at present it shows itself to be. Not, of course, that I think the tempers of mind herein implied desirable, which would be an evident absurdity; but I think them infinitely more desirable and more promising than a heathen obduracy, and a cold self-sufficient, self-wise tranquility.

The theological basis of the Movement was presented in the lectures Newman gave prior to the University service. The most important of these were published in 1837 under the title The Prophetic Office of the Church viewed relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism.34
As set forth in these lectures, the "via media" programme maintained that Scripture, Antiquity, and Catholicity cannot really contradict one another; that when the Moral Sense or Reason contradicts Scripture, we must follow Scripture; that when the sense given Scripture by Reason is contrary to the sense given it by Catholic Antiquity, we must follow the latter; that when Antiquity runs counter to the Church in essential matters, we must follow Antiquity; that when the Church speaks contrary to private judgment, and Antiquity is silent, we must sacrifice our opinions to those of the Church; that if we differ from the Church, in spite of our efforts to agree with her, then we must avoid causing any controversy, remembering that the Church, not the individual, "has authority in controversies of faith".35

Of this appeal to Antiquity, Newman said that whatever doctrine was unanimously held — whether by consent of the Fathers, or by Councils, or by events of history, or by controversies, it was to be received as coming from the Apostles. "Catholicity, Antiquity, and the consent of the Fathers", said Newman, "is the proper evidence of the fidelity or apostolicity of a professed Tradition."36

Newman defined those doctrines which "the Church Catholic will teach indefectibly", which "she must enforce as a condition of Communion", which "she must rescue from the scrutiny of private judgment", as being simply those of the Creed:
If the Church Catholic is to be indefectible in faith, we have but to enquire what the common faith is which she now holds everywhere as the original deposit, and we shall have ascertained what we seek. If we adopt this course, we shall find what is commonly called the Creed, to be that in which all branches of the Church agree; and therefore that the fundamental or essential doctrines are those which are contained in the Creed.37

The Creed for Newman had sacramental implications; it was "an outward form of a[n] heavenly truth". He said that when a candidate for Baptism repeated the words of the Creed, he was confessing "something incomprehensible in its depth, and indefinite in its extent". As in the Church's Ordinances, said Newman, so in her Creed "there is something supernatural and beyond us". It is part of faith; he said, another property of which is to desire "to conceive rightly of sacred doctrine", and further to look toward the Church for the guidance necessary to fulfil this desire. "This is faith", said Newman, "submission of the reason and will towards God, wistful and loving meditation upon His message, childlike reliance on the guide which is ordained by Him to be the interpreter of it. The Catholic Church is our Mother", he continued; "... She puts before them [her children], first of all, as the elements of her teaching, nothing but the original Creed. ..."38

The "Tracts" were published with a certain notoriety and increasing circulation until 1837, when, with the
publication of Tract LXXX ("Reserve in Religious Teaching", by Isaac Williams), the Evangelicals as a body protested against the Movement. The second Evangelical assault on the Movement, followed upon the publication of Froude's Remains in March 1838, two years after his death. The harsh anti-Protestant tone, and the bold statements against the Reformation, appeared to be endorsed by Newman and Keble, the joint editors. This brought all the anti-Papist forces together against the Tractarians, who were now openly accused of being Romanisers.

In March, 1841, The Times commented on the impression the "Tracts" had made:

 Their teaching has now sunk deep into the heart of the Church of England; it has acquired not merely a numerical but a moral power and influence . . . the younger clergy are said to be generally of this school; it has no want of advocates among their seniors; it has penetrated into both Houses of Parliament . . . "41

The last "Tract" (as it turned out) had been published a month before this article appeared; it was Tract XC and it inaugurated the final phase of Tractarianism. The direct motive for its publication was the prevention of W. G. Ward's and Frederick Oakeley's conversion to the Church of Rome. They were dissatisfied with a Church that imposed on its adherents such Protestant formularies as the Thirty-Nine Articles. The publication of Froude's Remains had left them with serious doubts about the Catholicity of the sixteenth century Reformers, and - by
extension - about the Catholicity of the Church whose principal formularies they had prepared. In Tract XC Newman argued that the Thirty-Nine Articles, in spite of their Protestant language, could be subscribed to in a Catholic sense. He contended that while they censured popular corruptions in the Roman Church, they did not deny the Catholic doctrines of which they were corruptions. The "Tract" caused an immediate storm of protest and denunciation. At Oxford it was protested as "evasion", not "explanation", by four tutors, and it was condemned by the Heads of Houses. The only reason it escaped official condemnation by the Bishop of Oxford was his agreement with Newman that there should be no more "Tracts" in the series. Nevertheless, stinging charges by other bishops continued.

It was these charges that were one of three reasons given by Newman for withdrawing from the Movement, and for his later secession from the Establishment altogether. The very foundation of his position as a Tractarian had been the assertion of Apostolic Authority - of the bishop as the "esse" of the Church, the guardian and guarantee of the Catholic "deposit of faith". Here was that authority now being used against him, and - as he thought - against Catholic Truth. He thought that the Church of England would no longer entertain Catholic doctrine, and this meant that she could no longer demand allegiance as the authorised teacher of Truth in England; she could no longer claim to be a "true branch" of the Catholic Church.
Newman resigned St. Mary's on 18th September, 1843, and was received into the Roman Communion on 9th October, 1845. It was but the logical extension of his doctrinal position.

Pusey was left at Oxford, the discreet leader of a shattered school of thought. As early as 1840, however, he had spoken of "Puseyism" (as it was more popularly known) not in terms of a party, or of peculiar doctrines, but as a "temper of mind". He had listed these features as describing it:

High thoughts of the two Sacraments. High estimate of the Episcopacy as God's ordinance. High estimate of the visible Church as the Body wherein we are made and continue to be members of Christ. Regard for ordinances, as directing our devotions and disciplining us, such as daily public prayers, fast and feast, etc. Regard for the visible part of devotion, such as decoration of the house of God, which acts insensibly on the mind. Reverence for and deference to the ancient Church, of which our own Church is looked upon as the representative to us, and by whose views and doctrines we interpret our own Church when her meaning is questioned or doubtful; in a word, reference to the ancient Church, instead of the Reformers, as the ultimate expounder of the meaning of our Church.

Newman's secession (to quote Gladstone) "left wrecks on every shore". It did not destroy, however, that "temper of mind" which had been developing. The ideal remained, as did the belief in the Church of England as the Catholic teacher of truth. The "Tracts" had ceased, and were not revived; but the Tractarian purpose of restoring forgotten or neglected aspects of the Catholic Faith continued, partially in the doctrinal advance of Pusey,
Charles Marriott, J. B. Mozley, R. W. Church, and ultimately H. P. Liddon. It also continued in "Ecclesiology" and "Ritualism", which supplied a continuing practical expression to the original Oxford Movement principles.

**Erastianism and the problem of Ecclesiastical Authority**

It is almost too easy to abstract the revived principles of the Oxford Movement from their proper ground: the Liberalising movement; the growth of agnosticism; fear for the integrity of the Church; the unprecedented scale of State intrusion into ecclesiastical affairs. Newman's poetic plea, "Lead, kindly Light, amid the encircling gloom", well summarises the Tractarian reading of the situation.

The Tractarians had detected that the root of their present troubles lay in the Reformation; in the Protestant principle of "private judgement". The Reformation had been the triumph of the sovereignty of the State over the inherent Divine Authority of the Church; it had replaced the Medieval Church with an abstraction of truth - individual responsibility. In turn, this individualism had prepared the ground for the dissemination and growth of Latitudinarian and Liberal ideas. These ideas had to be stopped; the medieval authority of the Church had to be restated. The only ground of authority had to be the
Catholic Church - the possessor of "the Keys". The only refuge possible to the Tractarian mind was the ancient faith of the Catholic Church - as evidenced most fully and most recently in the Church of Charles I and the Nonjurors.

The whole thrust of the "via media" programme was towards this end. It rested on the platform of a Catholic Antiquity which, as the acceptable interpreter of Scripture, would become authoritative. The bishop, as the guardian and guarantee of this Catholic Authority, would be responsible for his clergy; the clergy would control the laity. Exclusiveness, that is, the power of excommunication, would have to be restored to provide the discipline necessary to this end. The Church would be sovereign and absolute in spiritual affairs.

According to J. B. Fleming, the Tractarian position was based on a defective reading of English History. He stated:

[The] historic High Church School, represented by Laud, had never ventured to make [a claim for the Church's independence]. . . . To find authority for a claim of sovereignty in their own sphere, Newman and his friends had to go back to the medieval and primitive Church. Anglicanism yielded them not an inch of foothold on which to stand. . . . The Oxford claim was associated with a revolt from Protestant doctrine. 48

This revolt was implicit in Keble's "Assize Sermon", for it was - by extension at least - not merely a plea for the separation of Church and State; it was an appeal for a medieval type of ecclesiastical supremacy. Newman, too,
followed this pattern. "Remind them", said Newman, "that you take the National Church, but only you do not take it from the Reformation. In order to kindle love of the National Church and yet to inculcate a Catholic tone, nothing else is necessary but to take our Church in the Middle Ages." 49

The Tractarians claimed an inherent authority for the Church, but they failed repeatedly at definition. They had received from earlier generations the confusion implicit in accepting the Catholic concept of authority in the bishop, the Protestant concept of the supremacy of private judgment, and the English idea of Royal Supremacy. Because of this legacy their contemporary problem was acute: bishops seemed to be acting inconsistently; private judgment appeared to be tending toward Socinianism and Agnosticism; the Courts seemed to be pushing the Church into heresy. The question posed in the first of the "Tracts" remained unresolved: "On what are we to rest our authority . . . ?"

The defeat of Oxford's almost unanimous protest in the matter of the Hampden appointment to the Oxford chair of Divinity (1836) proved that the authority for deciding the issue was not Oxford's. 50 Hampden had just reasserted that "he looked upon creeds, and all doctrines which embodied the traditional doctrine, and collective thought of the Church, as invested by ignorance and prejudice with an
authority which was without foundation, and which was misleading and mischievous". In 1847, Lord John Russell compounded the problem by appointing Hampden to the see of Hereford. Pusey wrote: "A protest is essential else we connive at heresy. This has been unsettling people, and I suppose did unsettle poor Newman more than anything, 'a strong principle of heresy living and energising in the Church'." In a further letter he wrote: "I am not disturbed, because I never attached any weight to the Bishops. It was perhaps the difference between Newman and me: he threw himself on the Bishops and they failed him; I threw myself on the English Church and the Fathers as, under God, her support. . . ." "It is certainly humbling enough", he wrote, "... if there is no help whatever, if any person, however unfit, whether on moral or doctrinal grounds, be chosen by the Minister of the day for a Bishop, except in resistance to the law." 

In 1838, resistance to the State's intrusion had made another advance when Bishop Phillpotts (Exeter), an old style High Churchman, protested against the Church Discipline Bill of that year. He held that ecclesiastical authority was quite independent of civil sanctions. The practical assertion of his position led to the Gorham judgment of 1850. As the voice of Oxford had been proved non-authoritative in the Hampden affairs, so now the Tractarian location of authority in the "successors to the Apostles", the bishops, was determined by the secular courts to be misplaced. It was (to quote Gladstone) a
"stupendous issue", and may be said to represent the end of the Oxford Movement in-so-far as the working out of the 1833 principles is concerned.

Briefly stated, Gorham, the vicar of a parish in the diocese of Exeter (St. Justin-in-Penwith) was presented to another parish (Brampford-Speke) within the same diocese, in 1847. Bishop Phillpotts, after lengthy examination, refused to institute him because of his erroneous (to the Bishop's eyes) rejection of Baptismal Regeneration. Gorham appealed from the Bishop to the Court of Arches. The Court of Arches found with the Bishop (2 August, 1849). Gorham appealed to the Crown through the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and in March, 1850, this Court, while disclaiming any right or power to determine the doctrine of the Church of England, found that on the facts given, Gorham's views did not contradict any of the formularies of the Church as approved by law in their "literal and grammatical sense". It therefore reversed the previous judgment, and ordered the Bishop to institute Gorham. The Bishop refused, and the Archbishop of Canterbury (as Metropolitan) instituted him.

A protest was drawn up by the High Churchmen against the right of the Privy Council "practically to exercise in spiritual matters a jurisdiction for which they are utterly incompetent, and which never has been and never can be confided to them by the Church". Pusey wrote a long tract to prove that ecclesiastical authority alone
can decide doctrine, and stated that a priest who appealed to a lay court from his bishop's decision was degrading his office. Keble stated that "either the governing power in the State must allow the objectionable decision to be reviewed by proper authority and the usurpation to be abated for the future, or the governing power in the Church must at all hazards demur to the State's interference and disregard its enactments". 57 He even hinted again at disestablishment as the only solution, in terms both of his 1833 Assize Sermon and the basic Tractarian principles. But he urged his party not to be forced into another Nonjuring movement. J. M. Neale protested: "If the decisions of the Judicial Committee be the voice of the English Church, she is actively committed to heresy." 58 Archdeacon Manning said: "The Church of England, then being thus an integral whole, possesses within itself the fountain of doctrine and discipline, and has no need to go beyond itself for succession, orders, mission, jurisdiction and the office to declare to its own members in matters of faith, the intention of the Catholic Church." 59 To his sister he explained: "My contest now is with the State and the world, with secular churchmen, and those who of a divine would make it a human society, or at the best a Protestant Communion." 60 He urged R. I. Wilberforce to witness "against the whole Reformation schism, which is a national and corporate private judgment". 61 Some forty years later Manning wrote of the Gorham affair: "The violation of the doctrine of Baptism was of less
gravity to me than the violation of the divine office of the Church by the supremacy of the Crown in council."  

For those, like Manning, who identified Catholicity and Apostolicity with the "Divine Office" of bishop, the usurpation of 1850 was decisive: the Church of England could no longer claim to be a true branch of the "One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church". Most maintained their faith in the English Church, but many of them denied (and ignored) the Royal Supremacy. It is possibly the case that the Gorham judgment gave new life to the English Church. It is undoubtedly the case that from this judgment derives (what Dr. Cockshut has called) "the persistent, continuing contempt of high churchmen for authority both civil and ecclesiastical in matters of faith".  

In the various reactions to the Gorham judgment are found emerging the dominant features of later Anglo-Catholicism: its lawlessness, and its implicit trust in Antiquity. There were some, like Archdeacon Manning, R. I. Wilberforce, and James Hope-Scott, who saw no way out of this dilemma. In Hope-Scott's words: "I suppose we are all agreed that if the Church of England does not undo this, we must join the Church of Rome." To them this judgment represented a clear test of the Catholic claims of the Church of England; it was the definitive statement as to whether the Church of England still adhered to the original deposit of faith. Their secession to Rome was
inevitable; it was consistent with their definition of Catholicity in terms of bishops as the "esse" of the Church. For those who remained, Catholicity had to rest upon "the Church" differently conceived. Keble's position was one such variation: "If the Church of England were to fail", he said, "it would be found in my parish." Pusey's position represented another. Having accepted that the Church of England historically was a true branch of the Church Catholic, he held that it was impossible for her ever to deny the faith; no one could commit her to heresy, for beyond her the Church Catholic always remained primary. Since the Church universal was now in disunion, no one could formulate doctrine with final authority: the definitive statements remained those of the Councils of the first six centuries.

The Tractarians who remained within the Church of England put their trust in Antiquity: in Apostolic Tradition and in a simple restatement of the Credal definitions. The Gorham decision of 1850 polarised their thinking on these matters. The decision was a judicial milestone, for it had the unwonted and unexpected effect of legitimising a position in which a decision, of whatever authority - ecclesiastical or secular - was not held to be binding by those who opposed it. It was originally a tentative solution to an impossible problem of conflicting jurisdictions, but it proved to be far more stable than anyone could possibly have foreseen. It became the fundamental principle of all subsequent Church-State relations, and has
been called (not unreasonably) the "uneasy equilibrium". The State, with or without the bishops' approval, enacts ecclesiastical legislation; those who oppose it, do not question the competence of the Courts to effect the legislation, they simply refuse to obey; the opposition and disobedience is itself ignored by the State. It did not answer the question posed in the first "Tract", but neither did it necessitate an English "disruption", or induce a new Nonjuring movement. Men of conscience could remain within the Church of England as by law established without thereby owning any secular supremacy in matters spiritual.

**Ecclesiology and Ritualism**

The movement toward changing the architecture and furnishings of English Churches did not initially look to the Oxford Movement for inspiration. It derived from a group of antiquarians and church "restorers" at Cambridge known until 1845 as the Cambridge Camden Society, and thereafter as The Ecclesiological Society. Founded in 1839, it was most often associated with the name John Mason Neale, an undergraduate of the University, whose particular romantic religious quest took him in the direction of ecclesiastical architecture and decoration. Its whole thrust was to correct the sad state of contemporary Anglican churches and worship.
From 1841 to 1868 the Society's major publication, *The Ecclesiologist*, was the agent through which it expressed its opinions and judgments. The Society also issued pamphlets, handbooks and reports for concerned clergy and laity. Along with Neale, the other leaders of the Society, A. J. Beresford Hope and Benjamin Webb, published independently of the Society doctrinal pamphlets of a semi-official character. The two chief aims of the Society were to correct corrupt practices common in church ceremonies, and, growing directly out of this, to salvage England's Gothic heritage. It more often appeared to be the other way round, however, for their study of Gothic architecture in particular, often led them to ceremonial reform.

A prime example of this was the return to structural chancels, which required by their very presence changes in the ceremonial. *The Ecclesiologist* had reported:

Our arguments for Chancels have been briefly these: the unvarying use of the Catholic Church until the sixteenth century; the necessity of such arrangement for the symbolism of the holy building; their universal existence in our old churches; their designed retention when the Church was reformed; the evidence afforded by Visitation Articles of the care with which our great Bishops of the seventeenth century regarded them; their occurrence in the few churches built prior to the Revolution; and above all the Rubrick, - unrepealed through successive revisions, nay restored after a temporary domination of Calvinian influence - THE CHANCELS SHALL REMAIN AS THEY HAVE DONE IN TIMES PAST.69

Again, a few months later, the argument in favour was strengthened:
We have the command of the Rubrick distinctly on our side, and by this alone we may be content to stand or fall. It must ever be borne in mind that the Chancel is, after all, the great and marked feature of a church, as differing from a conventicle or any other building, which may be erected in the same style. Now if we give up our Chancels, how can we hope to maintain the dignity of ecclesiastical architecture? How shall we succeed in making more square apartments much better than preaching houses? Again, it is the omission, not the retention, of Chancels, which is an Innovation, and in these times sympathy and association with ancient forms conveys to the mind of the multitude a degree of reverence, which, it is to be feared, will hardly be imparted . . . by the bare fact of a building being consecrated and used as a church.  

It is hardly surprising that by September, 1844, a reader of *The Ecclesiologist*, typical of those who had been converted to this point of view, was found inquiring:

> What shall I do with my Chancel? You have convinced me by many and sound reasons that a long and spacious Chancel is an indispensable part of a church. I have such a Chancel: how shall I treat it?  

The treatment suggested became Anglican usage within a generation. Chancels were almost universally returned to – even by Evangelicals; pulpits were removed to a side pillar; stone fonts, which had in former days been relegated to the squire's or vicar's garden as floral fixtures or bird baths, were returned to their "proper position" near the west door of the church; "pues" and "pens" were discarded; lectors, often in brass and eagle-shaped, everywhere replaced the reader's desk; galleries were uncereemoniously removed. Churches were made to conform to the medieval arrangement (for which the majority of them had been originally designed).
The age of church building and restoration (which found itself most enamoured with the revived Gothic style) hailed the Society as a centre for research and authoritative information. Within three years of its founding, the Society boasted a patronage or membership of over three hundred, as well as two archbishops, sixteen bishops, twenty-one archdeacons and rural deans, thirty-one peers or Members of Parliament, and sixteen architects. 72

It was in that year, 1842, that the Society announced its official choice of "Decorated" Gothic as the English ideal in a pamphlet entitled A Few Words to Church Builders. It stated:

We are not now called on to prove that Gothic is the only Christian architecture. We believe that after a well-fought battle, this point has been conceded, and that though second-rate architects may for a few years yet, employ Romanesque or revived Pagan, those who are at the head of their profession will be guilty of such errors no longer. . . . We wish however to restrict the choice of style still further than this. No one can sensibly employ Norman, and perhaps not judiciously even Perpendicular, when free to choose another style. Early English, though it must perhaps be allowed occasionally should be used very sparingly. The Decorated or Edwardian style, that employed we mean between the years 1260 and 1360, is that to which only, except from some very peculiar circumstances, we ought to return. The reason for this is plain. During the so-called Norman era, the Catholic Church was forming her architectural language; in the Tudor period she was unlearning it. 73

Architecture, for the Society, was essentially a petrification of religion; it had to represent, therefore, a purified religion. Hence the care taken with regard to principles, and further, with regard to the faith of the
architect entrusted with church design. Their hope for the building's influence was clear: they "knew" that "Catholick ethics" give rise to "Catholick architecture"; they dared to hope that, by a kind of reversed process, association with "Catholick architecture" would give rise to Catholic ethics.

It was in the introduction to a translation of Durandus' Rationale Divinorum Officiorum (published in 1843)\(^7\) that Neale and Webb enunciated the contrast between the "spiritual pride, the luxury, the self-sufficiency, the bigotry of too many a pew-rented Episcopal Chapel" and the ideal of the beauty and symbolism of the religious art and ceremony of the past. This criticism of the present by comparison with the past was in the tradition that could encompass Sir Walter Scott, A. W. Pugin, and Thomas Carlyle. It was characteristic of the Victorian medieval spirit that Durandus, a late thirteenth century writer, should become the ideal exponent of the symbolic content of Gothic:

\[\ldots\] the Church consisteth of four walls, that is, is built on the doctrine of the Four Evangelists; and hath length, breadth, and height: the height representeth courage, the length fortitude, which patiently endureth till it attaineth its heavenly home; the breadth is charity, which, with long suffering, loveth its friends in God, and its foes for God; and again, its height is the hope of future retribution, which despiseth prosperity and adversity, hoping 'to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living'.\(^7\)
Pusey thought that the Camden novelties were undesirable and improper; thought they would detract from what should be the primary consideration of Churchmen - Catholic doctrine and faith; thought they would consume vital energy in a controversy over trivialities. He believed that the plainness of the Anglican service well represented the penitential sense that should characterise the Church in her divided state. Keble and Newman liked the Cambridge Movement no better; it was characteristic of their primary concern for doctrine. The Tractarians were "fearless and uncompromising in principle, cautious and restrained in act". Neale was highly critical of this Tractarian attitude: in his view it failed to realise the importance of "the religious impressiveness of aestheticism".

While at first the two Movements were quite distinct, yet (as Professor Chadwick has noted) "there was something in the thought of the Oxford Movement which cohered easily with this revival, came in part to dominate and guide it, and finally was itself part dominated and transformed by it, . . .". Both Movements were part of the nineteenth century Romantic Revival, part of that almost universal turning from cold reason to feelings; both were concerned with historical enquiry, especially as related to the Prayer Book; both looked to the medieval expression of religion; both had an exaggerated view of an historic ecclesiastical authority; both eschewed the utilitarian Liberalism of the new age.
The Oxford Movement sought to revive the Catholic inheritance of the English Church: it looked to the primitive and undivided Church for a pure tradition; it examined the Prayer Book carefully for an authoritative definition on disputed points of doctrine. The Tractarians discovered that the Prayer Book, rightly understood (i.e., seen in its historical context), not only taught Baptismal Regeneration and Christ's Real Presence in the Eucharist, but also required daily service, frequent Communions, and allowed of vestments and ornaments. The Camden Society appropriated these findings, and used them to justify their own ecclesiological undertakings: building or restoring chancels and out-fitting them fully; placing candles on the altar; advocating seasonal frontals, eucharistic vestments, stained glass, a cross on the altar, etc. They found that current convention was seriously deficient when compared to the rubrics outlined in the Prayer Book; that it was narrow where the Prayer Book was deliberately comprehensive. As the Tractarians had thrown themselves upon Catholicity, Antiquity, and the seventeenth century: Laudian Divines for their sure defence, so the Cambridge Camden Society appealed from present custom to past authority; a past authority that was ambiguous, but generally in their favour. As it was, there was no means in the Church of enforcing the rubric, nor any agent for changing it - for the reformed Parliament after 1832 had neither the confidence nor the power to revise the authorised forms of worship.
It did not take long before the doctrinal concerns of the Oxford Movement and the ecclesiological concerns of the Cambridge Movement developed into a movement for revived ceremonial and ritual. The Ritualistic Movement was a reflection of an almost evangelical-oriented belief that revived ceremonial was a means of reaching the working man, of pulling him out of his dreary slum environment, and teaching him the Catholic truths by sight and sound. It was an expression of the growing awareness that geographical parishes were disintegrating and that personal preference was now the deciding factor in Church affiliation. It has been said that "Ritualism in nineteenth century England was a Mission with candles and eucharistic vestments". Of significance is that both the Oxford and Ritualistic Movements were responsive to the spirit of the age: both reflected the mid-nineteenth century Anglican desire to pay due obedience to an undefined authority; both wanted to make the Church more popular; both were involved in the quest for a pietistic holiness.

The learned Tract-writers had concerned themselves with the revival of doctrines held in common by the Fathers of the early Church. They had seen in Rome some of these teachings jealously guarded, but had seen also their additions to the original deposit. The majority of their would-be disciples were neither so learned nor so discriminating. They wanted an easily appropriated Catholicism and turned to Rome as the treasure-house of ritual and dogma. For
simple priests in the working areas there was no recourse to ancient libraries, and even if there had been, there was no time to do the research necessary. Close at hand was a complete package: the Roman breviary and missal; the Roman ritual; the Roman books on auricular confession; the Roman books of piety and devotion. It is not surprising that the Ritualist Movement was often at variance not only with the contemporary Anglican expression of religion, but also with its official formularies and doctrine.

The early ritualist cases were dealt with by the relative bishops, but eventually they involved judicial decisions of the State courts, ending often in reference to the Privy Council. It was probably the State decisions regarding Sacramental doctrine that ultimately allied the two Movements, for by the time of the first ritual case, the Liddell Case (1857), there had already been two famous decisions relating to Sacramental principles: the Gorham Case (1850), and the Denison Case (1853).

The whole subject of the Ornaments Rubric was debated in Convocation from 1866 onwards, and the only decision ever reached was that the Prayer Book should remain unaltered. Repeatedly the Archbishop of Canterbury (Tait) was frustrated in his attempts to have the ritual innovations - especially the use of eucharistic vestments - condemned. An attempt at resolve was the Royal Commission on Ritual (begun in 1867), but it soon found itself torn on the issue, and the recommendations of its first report...
(simply that usage should conform to the custom of the past three hundred years) was itself opposed by a minority of one-third of its members. Its second report (1868) condemned the use of lighted candles on the altar at Communion, and also the use of incense; the third (1870) concerned the reading of lessons in Church; and the fourth (1870) recommended that the Ornaments Rubric be left unaltered. The Queen intervened directly$^{83}$ and commanded revision of the Rubrics to arrest the growth of Ritualism; but in 1875 the House of Priests (the Lower House of Convocation) resolved to leave the Rubrics unaltered, each side fearing loss of their respective positions in any revision. In 1874 Archbishop Tait, at the command of the Queen, introduced a Bill into Parliament that was aimed at suppressing the ritual revival. It was passed as the Public Worship Regulation Act. It merely served to increase the problems of the Church of England, however, for suddenly priests were thrown into jail and became martyrs for the cause.$^{84}$

It is of note that the matter of Ritualism was aggravated by the fact that throughout this period bishops remained remote from their clergy. This was mainly due to the method of episcopal appointments. It was the Prime Minister who had the right of appointment (at least officially), but the Queen had to approve it, and throughout her long reign she continually opposed the elevation to vacant sees of both Tractarians and Evangelicals. It was only when Gladstone became Prime Minister that things
began to change, for he, a mild Tractarian himself, and keenly interested in religious matters, was resolved to appoint Tractarians in spite of the Queen. He was even willing to risk a constitutional crisis to this end.  

It was Gladstone's appointment of the ritualist, Edward King, to the see of Lincoln (1885) that inaugurated a new phase in the ritual controversies, for the charges were now laid against a bishop. In 1888 the Archbishop of Canterbury was petitioned to institute proceedings against Bishop King for his ritual offences — offences he readily admitted. They involved the Eastward position at the Consecration; lighted candles on the altar; the use of a mixed chalice; the recitation of Agnus Dei after the Consecration; the "sign of the cross" at the absolution and the blessing; and the ceremonial ablution during the service.

The case was eventually heard by the Archbishop in a revived personal court, and his decision was careful to respect the ancient undivided Church, and also to avoid the Privy Council decisions. It was substantially in favour of the Bishop, although the mixing of the chalice during the service, the "sign of the cross", and the Eastward position during the manual acts of the Consecration were forbidden. The Church Association appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, but Bishop King — in the by then expected tradition of the Anglo-Catholics —
denied the competence of the secular court in ecclesiastical matters, and refused to recognise the appeal, or present his case. In 1892 the appeal was finally dismissed, the Privy Council accepting all of the judgments of the Archbishop except the use of lighted candles on the altar. The "uneasy equilibrium" had been invoked; the problem of authority remained unresolved; the nature of "the Church" had come no further towards definition.

It is of significance that nearly all the cases, whether for doctrine or ritual, related to the Sacraments. So too, it is important to note that the High Church appeal to the lawful Church authority was everywhere invoked, but nowhere defined. By the end of the King affair, the principles and ritual of the Oxford Movement were seen to be within the tradition of the Anglican Church. The "Tracts", Newman's sermons, the Camden Society, the public controversy over Ritualism, and the Church-extension needs of the times, had conspired together to increase the number of churches with advanced ceremonial.

**Liberal Catholicism**

Newman's secession in 1845 had left Keble and Pusey to defend the Tractarian theological position against both evangelical Protestantism and resurgent Roman Catholicism. They maintained the early Tractarian claim of the intrinsic Catholicity of the Church of England; they continued to
look to the New Testament and the Patristic writings for the pattern and ideal of the Church; they declined to enter through the uncertain door Newman had opened on Development. Their appeal was necessarily historical: Scripture, Antiquity, and Tradition, remained the foundation of their position. Pusey, the leader of the fragmented movement after 1845, had early in his training been exposed to German rationalist thought, but he refused to accept it and consistently rejected all concessions to Liberalism in religion. Under the pressure of an increasing number of Liberal publications such as Essays and Reviews (1860), Renen's Leben Jesu (1863), and J. R. Seeley's Ecce Homo (1865), the remaining Tractarians under Pusey retreated to what they considered to be an impregnable Catholic fortress: the infallible Scripture, and the inerrant Creeds of the primitive and undivided Church. It was a position that could only be maintained by denying the fact that these walls had already crumbled; by denying the advance of modern scientific scholarship; by holding to a narrow concept of Biblical interpretation and dogmatic belief.

In the 1880s retreat into traditional Tractarian orthodoxy was impossible - at least in the academic sphere. The advance of Biblical literary and historical criticism, and the Bible's comparison to other examples of ancient literature, required abandonment of the position of infallible Scripture. The demonstrated - and now popularised - conclusions of the natural and human sciences, undermined
both Scriptural inerrancy and infallible Tradition. The replacement of the accepted categories and language of philosophy by Immanentism, Positivism, and Empiricism, removed the common framework upon which theological ideas could be easily discussed. There was an ever widening gap between Christian doctrine, and the beliefs that were possible to, or held by, men of learning. The older Tractarians refused to recognise the impossibility of defending their "fundamentalist" position.

Lux Mundi, a collection of essays edited by Charles Gore, was published in November, 1889. It was an attempt at interpreting the Catholic Faith in such a way as to be intelligible to modern scientific man. It sought to have the Church stand firm in the truth it has received, but at the same time have it appreciate the new social and intellectual movements of the age. In the Preface of the volume it was stated that the essays were an attempt to put Catholic Faith into its right relation with modern intellectual and moral problems, not an attempt to fit contemporary knowledge into traditional dogmatic schemes. It demanded "fervour without narrowness", "orthodoxy without obscurantism", "form without formalism". The basic tenets the volume portrayed were those of the first and second generations of Tractarian scholars, but it built upon these a radical redirection of thought.
Instead of ignoring or rejecting the earlier Tractarian platform, *Lux Mundi* widened it to accommodate Liberal thought; it attempted to fuse Liberal scholarship and Catholic dogma. It modified the earlier Tractarian position by accepting the methodology and findings of "higher criticism"; by using the evolutionary concepts of the natural sciences to develop a Christian understanding of development, especially as regards the Incarnation and the historic mission to the world; by adapting for religious use philosophical idealism; by adopting the liberalised political and social concepts for Church use; by emphasizing the Incarnation rather than the Atonement as the key to the dogmatic system.

Liddon, the last of those who represented the earlier Tractarian position, regarded *Lux Mundi* as a radical departure from the original integrity of the Tracts; as the betrayal of everything for which Pusey and the Oxford Movement had striven. Of Gore's essay, "Inspiration", he said it was "nothing less than an abandonment of the ground won by the Oxford Movement in favour of Church authority against private or merely literary criticism". His approach to the new age of Scientism was a defiant reassertion of the infallibility of Christ, and, by extension, the infallibility of the Bible - in particular, the Old Testament. His death in 1890 marked the end of this particular tradition's unity of religious principles, outlook, and interpretation.
Lux Mundi reached its tenth edition within the first year of its publication. It served to rescue Anglo-Catholicism from an intellectually indefensible position; it served to centre High Church doctrine upon the Incarnation; it provided a solution to the problem of static Credal belief. Each of the essays in the volume reflected a common view of Christian doctrine founded upon the fact of the Incarnation, and each looked at its subject in the light of that Incarnation. This centrality of the Incarnation at once afforded their dogmatic assertions a grounding in history - giving strength to the appeal to history in authenticating dogma - and it provided a system for a total world view. Interestingly, it derived from Newman's lectures on Justification (1838).101

This Liberal Catholic endeavour, however, was of significance only within the university setting, and it was only there that a real difference between the "Liberals" and the older Tractarians was apparent. In the parish setting, both groups were indistinguishable. The old Tractarians and the Lux Mundi group arrived at the same practical assertions by different intellectual routes. That the Lux Mundi group under Gore accepted a looser idea of Biblical inspiration (looking to the Bible not as the Word of God, but in which to find the Word of God), or rejected the belief in an inerrant primitive and undivided Church (while continuing to hold it authoritative), or had abandoned many of Pusey's notions on the authority of Tradition (while still believing that there was a transmission of the
early Christian faith through the generations to the present time) - was of little consequence to the priest in the slum parish. A solution to the problems of Genesis and of Jonah's whale was of significance to him, but only in so far as it allowed him to more easily focus attention on key issues in the economy of salvation. What was of practical importance was the Creed, the Sacramental means of grace, and an authoritative structure in which to minister.

Résumé

The Oxford Movement was not original in the sense that its ideas were new, its methods advanced, its leaders revolutionary. It was part of a more general movement; part of that "great swing of opinion against Reason as the Age of Reason had understood it and used it". It took its rise from the Acts of the Reform Parliament. It took its sensitivity and its evocative literary style from the Romantic Revival, from a re-evaluation of historical tradition. It took its concern for a "vital religion" and many of its methods for advancing a penitential sense from the Evangelicalism of the previous age. It took its primary doctrinal statement from the traditional twofold High Anglican assertion of Apostolic Authority: Apostolic Succession (the historic episcopate), and Apostolic Tradition (the Catholic Faith as found in the Creeds of the
primitive and undivided Church). Doctrine generally it saw through the eyes of the seventeenth century Caroline Divines who spoke of Catholicity in terms of faithfulness to the Creeds, the Sacraments, and the historic episcopate. It looked continually to the Catholic doctrines retained in the Prayer Book: such doctrines as Apostolic Succession, the priesthood, the sacramental system, the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. The Oxford men rejoiced in being the *via media*, the "golden mediocrity"\(^{105}\) between Rome and Geneva. They claimed England for the Church of England. They reaffirmed the High Church tradition within Anglicanism. But the Oxford Movement was not content to align itself with the High Church "remnant". It learnt much from the Evangelical Movement. The Romantic Revival - the quest for the medieval, the poetry of Wordsworth and the historical novels of Sir Walter Scott - had made a certain type of "enthusiasm" acceptable, and certainly this was to be preferred to shallowness.\(^{106}\)

There are those who have considered that the Oxford Movement proper came to an end with the secession of Newman and the fragmentation of the Oxford core of Tractarians; others that it ended with the Gorham judgment and Manning's withdrawal to Rome.\(^{107}\) In either case, it proves that the critics of Tractarianism were right in their main contention. The critics made obvious errors of tact and judgment, and their theological learning in some cases was - to say the
least - uninformed; but all the same, they were proved right in maintaining that Tractarian principles were or might be subversive of Anglican loyalty - too many Tractarian notables left for Rome to ever refute this position. Decline in the academic milieu, however, coincided with revival in the parishes, and this was part of the programme that critics failed to foresee. They failed to discern that there was more than one set of Tractarian principles; that Newman's sermons in St. Mary's had been the real mainspring of the Movement.

The undergraduates of Oxford who had fallen under the influence of Newman in the years to 1839,108 had removed to parishes, and had carried the genius of the Movement - the quest for holiness - with them. The Oxford Movement, therefore, became primarily a movement of the heart, not the head. "The driving force of the Movement came not from the novelty of the doctrines which were taught, but from the novelty of holiness in the lives of the men who taught them."109 This is not to suggest that it was concerned with religion and not with doctrine; on the contrary, it was earnestly dogmatic. What is significant, however, is that the Movement failed as a doctrinal movement in that it did not seriously alter the religious belief of nineteenth century Englishmen; it survived as a movement concerned with religion. The success of Keble's The Christian Year (published 1826)110 in reawakening a sense of Catholic devotion and in preparing the ground for a revival of piety has to be seen not
only as primary to, but also as representative of, the Movement. 111

The Oxford Movement changed the face and spirit of the Anglican Church. It helped to recover long-forgotten aspects of spiritual discipline; it nurtured the revival of the "religious life" as a route toward Christian perfection; its "ritual" continuation transformed Anglican Sacramental worship; its "ecclesiological" accompaniment changed the face of English religion. The Oxford Movement prepared the way for ecumenical encounter by looking continually to other Communions for inspiration - more especially to the Roman and the Orthodox Churches. The Oxford Movement was of profound religious significance, especially in its vision of Christ's ongoing work in the world; and in its twofold apprehension of the truth of the Incarnation - that is, that man's salvation is from God alone, and that God's saving action at once penetrates and transforms the world and man.

It was this renewed awareness of the Incarnation that was "the deepest motive of the Tractarian concern for the integrity of the Church". 112 It explains the Oxford Movement's ecclesiastical orientation; it explains its "objective supernaturalism". Eugene Fairweather has written:
The Tractarians saw the Incarnation, the Church, and the Sacraments as contiguous and inseparable elements in God's redemptive economy. For the Tractarians, as for all orthodox Christians, the heart of Christianity was the story of God's own saving and self-revealing action, which culminated in the hypostatic union of humanity with deity in the person of the Mediator. But they did not stop here. To their minds it was no less clearly a part of the Christian message that the saving person and work of the Mediator were effectually "re-presented" in the Church by means of certain sacramental "extensions of the Incarnation".113

The great paradox of the Oxford Movement was that in attempting to rescue the Anglican Church from the liberalising forces by means of her historic Standards, it actually transformed the Church's accepted patterns of thought and practice. This was primarily in the religious sphere, however, in the realm of architecture and worship and piety and devotion. Theologically, and doctrinally, until the appearance of Lux Mundi and the new thought, it was less than successful.114 This failure doctrinally was to be expected, and had really nothing to do with its relative truth or its ability to captivate the vision of the faithful; rather it had to do with the appearance of new intellectual forces - Science, Darwin, Biblical and Historical Criticism, Doubt!
CHAPTER II

THE RESURGENCE OF THE SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH

The nineteenth century growth and advance of the Scottish Episcopal Church was something quite unexpected and exceptional. It entered that century in a very sad state; it was insignificant in terms both of active communicants and social influence. Sir Walter Scott had spoken of it as "the ancient but poor and suffering Episcopal Church". Its disestablishment in 1689, its fanatical loyalty to the Stuart kings, its part in the uprisings of 1715 and 1745, its persecution under penal law until 1792, its clergy debarred by statute from serving the Church of England, combined to make the Episcopalian remnant in Scotland "a mere shadow of a shade" (again Sir Walter Scott's memorable words). Seen through its own eyes, in the space of the century previous, it had been reduced from fourteen bishops and archbishops, and a thousand priests, to four bishops and only forty-two priests. Its architecture, at the turn of the century, was austere, its worship simple. There was little to distinguish it from the local parish church. It rarely boasted a steeple or chancel; the pulpit was generally of the two or three-deckered type, centred on the south wall with a window on each side, and railed round to form a square enclosure; the "altar", usually a small wooden table,
was plain and unadorned, covered with only a large linen
cloth for the celebration of Holy Communion; the clergy
wore the black gown and white bands traditional to
Scotland (the surplice not being reassumed until some
time after 1811); the service was usually mattins and
sermon.  

Even with only some forty-five to fifty clergy, there
was a serious internal division. The division was almost
devolvedly specific between the South, where the
clergy were English-oriented, mostly being in English or
Irish Orders; and those North of the Tay, who were far
more historically oriented, being part of the Jacobite
and Nonjuring remnant.

In doctrine, the northern Episcopalians were High
Churchmen before the Tractarian movement had begun in
England, as evidenced in the writings of Bishop Thomas
Rattray (Dunkeld - early eighteenth century), and in
Bishop Jolly's catechism of 1829 and his writings on the
Christian sacrifice in the Eucharist (1831). In these are
portrayed the traditional Catholic teaching on the Divine
origin of the Church, Apostolic Succession, Baptismal
Regeneration, the Real Presence, the Godward offering of
the Eucharist, prayers for the departed, and the Reserved
Sacrament. Tractarianism could be received in the North
only as a confirmation of their traditional Catholic
teaching.

The southern Scottish Episcopalians, those of Glasgow
and Edinburgh, had little in common with this position.
They made much of their connection with the English Establishment and were most anxious not to obtrude any points of difference between the two Churches. Their services were as "low" as those of the English Church, their doctrine considered as "Protestant", their Prayer Book simply that of the Church of England. In every way they saw themselves as the "English Church" in Scotland.

In certain respects this English conformity was part of a conscious decision taken to entice dissident Presbyterians: those wearied by the dour Calvinism of interminable sermons; those disillusioned with the continuous arguments and secessions over doctrinal matters (but more particularly over the practical matter of Patronage); those attracted by the simplicity and beauty of *The Book of Common Prayer*; those who had been educated in English public schools and found the Anglican expression of religion more comfortable; those who considered the English rite more "genteel" and fashionable. In most cases these Presbyterians moved into the Episcopal system without any understanding of the doctrinal difference between the two; without meaning thereby renunciation or repudiation of Presbyterian dogma; assured only of the Protestant character of the English Establishment. The Scottish Disruption of 1843 had made even the most stalwart of Church of Scotland clergy consider crossing the border to partake of the relative calm and stability of the Church of England.³ It is little wonder that the Episcopal Church became dangerously popular with disillusioned
Presbyterian laymen of no doctrinal subtlety; those who, unlike their clergy, were required neither to renounce their Presbyterial ordination nor to consider seriously the fact of the Scottish Establishment; those who had no understanding of the traditional "Divine Right" dogma of Scottish Episcopacy.

The division between the Nonjuring, or "Scottish Party", and the Hanoverian qualified "English Party", was seen primarily in the allegiance they owed to the relative orders for the administration of Holy Communion. The mid-century decline of the old northern dioceses and the growth of the southern English dioceses was reflected in the change from the 1838 ascendency of the Scottish Rite, to the decision by the bishops in 1863, to depose it as the primary authority, and to phase out its use. In so doing it was hoped that the uneasy peace that had brought the English chapels in Scotland under the control of the Scottish bishops would be stabilised, and a formal union with the Church of England made feasible. The Scottish party, however, was anxious to protect and even extend the use of the Scottish service, and the "Usages"; that is, the traditional liturgical practices of mixing water with the wine at the Offertory, commendation of the faithful departed, and the use of express prayers of invocation and oblation (all of which had received explicit sanction in the 1637 liturgy). The publication of Bishop Torry's Prayer Book in 1850, the project of Alexander Lendrum and George Hay Forbes, represented practically this drive.
The outstanding feature of the resurgence of Scottish Episcopacy in the nineteenth century was its determined approximation to the Church of England. The acceptance of the Thirty-Nine Articles at the Laurencekirk Convocation in 1804, the increase of clergymen in English Orders in Scotland, the movement towards union with the qualified English chapels, the introduction of the surplice, the extending use of the English Book of Common Prayer, and the removal in 1864 of the disabilities on those in Scottish Orders seeking English preferment, were part of this developing English orientation. With the Tractarian advance in England, however, matters took an unexpected turn, and those of the old Nonjuring tradition in Scotland took heart. "The Oxford Movement brought encouragement to Scottish churchmen and inspired new visions and fresh zeal." It was the Oxford influence that pervaded the Scottish Episcopal Church's advance in the second half of the century.

It was in the 1840s, when Disruption fever was at its height, that English Tractarianism made initial indirect advances into Scotland. The first Scottish congregation to be so affected was Old St. Paul's, Edinburgh, where the Scottish Liturgy, the choral service, and daily prayers, were "restored" under the Rev. John Alexander, ordained to the charge in 1842. Serious opposition soon arose, however, and the congregation divided, many going out with
Mr. Alexander to found a new church on Oxford principles - St. Columba's.

The building constructed to house this new congregation was designed by Mr. John Henderson of Edinburgh (a member of the Scottish Episcopal Church) and completed in 1846. It was reported in The Ecclesiologist of 1848 as "the first in which Catholic arrangements have been revived in our Communion in the Scotch capital". The design - a chancel and nave without aisles, separated by an oak roodscreen surmounted by a cross - was highly commended, as was the stone altar with its rich vestings. But its construction in First-pointed style was regretted, as was the use of a prayer-desk just outside of the chancel, facing north-south, for morning and evening prayer. Other features, such as the eagle lectern, the stone pulpit and the font positioned against the south pillar of the west arcade, were reported merely as proper and desirable.

Although such features reflect an obvious approximation to Camden ideals, it was the erection of a church in Jedburgh by the Marchioness of Lothian to conform explicitly to the principles and ideals of the Oxford Movement that marked the beginning of direct Tractarian involvement in Scotland. Begun in 1841 to the design of William Butterfield, it was completed and consecrated in 1843, with four leading Tractarians (including Keble) taking part. The sermons preached on the occasion represented highly advanced Tractarian doctrine, and in published form gave great offence to the Scottish Establishment.
It was in 1841 also, that there was a move to establish a public school in Scotland on the English model, and this rested upon the initiative of laymen with Tractarian sympathies - W. E. Gladstone, and James Hope-Scott. The idea of such a school was first mentioned in an 1840 letter from Gladstone to Archdeacon Manning, where he spoke of founding "a college akin in structure to the Roman seminaries in England; that is to say, partly for training the clergy, partly for affording an education to children of the gentry, who now go chiefly to the Presbyterian schools or are attended at home by Presbyterian tutors". In 1846 the Rev. Charles Wordsworth (a distinguished graduate of Christ Church, Oxford) was appointed Warden of this new school - Trinity College, Glenalmond. An English Establishment man steeped in the public school tradition, he was given the mandate of training both future clergy of the Church, and boys, in a liberal education, based upon church principles in a religious atmosphere.

The school opened in 1847 with fourteen boys, and four masters - all from Oxford colleges. With its Tractarian origins, it is hardly surprising that it was built in the revived Gothic style. It also was to the design of John Henderson, and in 1859 The Ecclesiologist reported its impression: "The rich red sandstone of which the pile is built warms the landscape: otherwise there is little to remark in the architecture, which is of a sort of conventional Gothic, not exactly Middle or Third-Pointed, with heavy labels, and other features likely
to occur in the building of a second-rate architect of that epoch."¹⁷

The secession of Newman in 1845, and the growing unrest over Romanism, caused the Scottish Bishops to look for ways to protect Glenalmond from an internal Anglo-Catholic bias, and from an external anti-Catholic abuse. Hence their attempt to exclude the use of the Scottish Liturgy from the College. Gladstone's strong opposition to this measure resulted in the compromise that saw English and Scottish rites used alternate Sundays. The bishops' fear of Tractarian inroads at Glenalmond continued, however, as evidenced by the dismissal of William Bright in 1859 for his definite High Church principles.¹⁸

The Tractarian advance in Episcopal Scotland continued in the cathedral building efforts of Lord Forbes and G. F. Boyle, both young Scots, but Oxford men infected with English High Church ideals. Their first effort (in league with Alexander Lendrum) resulted in St. Ninian's Cathedral, Perth. The completed sections were consecrated in 1850 by Bishop Forbes (Brechin); the sermon being preached by the famous Camden scholar, J. M. Neale, who was offered a senior position on the Cathedral staff. Of significance is that - with cunning - the Scottish Liturgy was "restored", and under Camden influence an advanced ritual was adopted for the Cathedral. This included the eastward position, lights, vestments, unleavened bread, and incense. With the election of the Warden of Glenalmond, Charles Wordsworth (on his own casting vote), to the see in
1852, trouble began, for he neither appreciated the advanced principles of the Oxford Movement nor sympa-thised with its ritual expression. In 1856, after a protracted dispute with its clergy and canons, he placed the cathedral under censure, and the period 1856-85 was known locally as the "thirty years war". 19 So troubled, in fact, were his first seven years as bishop, that Wordsworth considered returning to England, and even entertained the hope of being appointed Principal of St. Andrews University in 1859. 20 His unceasing efforts in the cause of reunion with the Church of Scotland, and the tracts, sermons, charges, and pamphlets by the dozen that he produced, may have won the ear of the Scottish public, but his narrow resolution on the essentiality of the Episcopate and episcopally derived Orders, made his position unacceptable to Presbyterians.

The second effort by Boyle was the founding of a collegiate church on the Island of Cumbrae in 1850; a church which became the Cathedral of the Isles in 1874. It was established to combine the features of a church, a college, and a retirement home for clergy; to be a sort of monastery. The aim was that it should be a new Iona: a point from which sound teaching and missionary enterprise would radiate into the Highlands and Islands - a most necessary venture in view of the devastation wrought there by the "Disruption". Cumbrae followed Tractarian teaching, and was generally seen as the unofficial rival to the Bishops' college at Glenalmond. This development was
obviously not welcomed by the Bishops, who, under Wordsworth, continually treated the Cumbrae college with open displeasure and suspicion. Nor was Cumbrae better treated when it became the Cathedral, for the Broad Church Bishop of the Isles, Alexander Ewing, detested the narrow sectarian spirit of the Oxford Movement.\textsuperscript{21}

Certain Scottish bishops did sympathise with the Oxford Movement. Indeed, the person of signal importance in bringing the fulness of Tractarian teaching to Scotland was Alexander P. Forbes (1817-1875).\textsuperscript{22} He had been a student at Oxford after 1839, and was, therefore, a disciple not of Newman, but of Pusey. The two had become intimate friends, and in 1847 Pusey invited Forbes to his Church in Leeds - St. Saviour's. Poor health, however, required that Forbes resign this living within months, and he accepted a smaller post in the Scottish Episcopal Church. On the recommendation of Gladstone, he was nominated for, and duly elected Bishop of Brechin in 1847 at the age of thirty, an election that proved to be highly determinative of subsequent developments in Episcopal Scotland. The impoverished state of episcopal Scotland required that the Bishop also be the incumbent of St. Paul's, Dundee, and this dual office he held throughout the twenty-five years of his episcopate. With the congregation's move to their newly completed building in 1853, Forbes introduced no advanced ritual, concentrating rather on a purified
Catholic faith and the physical needs of his working-class parishioners. His biographer has said that "the Bishop deemed it more catholic to obey the Prayer Book by celebrating the Holy Eucharist every Sunday and Holy Day and by reciting Mattins and Evensong every day than to introduce symbols of the faith for which at that time the people were unprepared". In this the Bishop was at one with the original Tractarians. In his doctrinal writings, too, the Tractarian position was clearly defined.

The Denison Case in England (1853-1858) concerning the Real Presence and the Eucharistic sacrifice, had resulted in Archbishop Sumner (Canterbury), and his commission of five Low Churchmen, condemning the Tractarian position. The shock of the Archbishop's decision was felt keenly by English and Scottish High Churchmen, and Tractarian theologians were quick to publish their position: Robert Wilberforce, The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist (1853); Pusey, The Real Presence (1855); Keble, On Eucharistic Adoration (1857). Forbes, too, entered the conflict, and on August 5, 1857 delivered a Charge (published in 1858) which upheld High Eucharistic doctrine (intended mainly by the Bishop as a contribution to Anglican-Roman reunion talks). The Charge was not well received. Even the Bishop's brother, George Hay Forbes (the more traditional "Scottish" High Churchman, and - not unlike the Bishop - also a learned divine), detected that the Bishop had followed the tendency of certain English Tractarians to misrepresent or undervalue the sacrificial
aspect - the offering of the Eucharist, by emphasising the doctrine of the Real Presence - consecrating the Eucharist, and that to the subversion of the historic Scottish position as taught in the Scottish Liturgy. Forbes' Charge was seen by the other Scottish Bishops as a direct refutation of the Archbishop of Canterbury, to whom they were at pains to defer. Three of them wrote against Forbes. Not content with this, further proceedings were instigated, and this resulted in Forbes' being tried for erroneous teaching in 1859. He was never alone, however, for Keble not only wrote on his behalf, but also came in person to be with him throughout the trial. The matter proved to be so diffuse and volatile that the eventual verdict became no more than "a declaration of censure and admonition". The chief concern of Forbes throughout his episcopate, however, was the poor and needy of his parish, and it is not surprising that another significant aspect of the Oxford Movement - the revival of the religious life as an acceptable pathway toward Christian perfection - found expression in his ministry. As early as 1855 he instituted a women's society under vows of poverty, chastity and obedience, a society to carry on the practical side of the ministry in visiting and nursing among the poor. The pattern so begun, was soon followed elsewhere, and in 1858 another sisterhood was opened in Edinburgh, and later still, one in Aberdeen.
Next to Forbes, the figure of most importance in furthering the Tractarian advance in Scotland was Wordsworth's successor in the see of St. Andrews, George H. Wilkinson. Wilkinson was "the most prominent figure among the 'Catholic Evangelicals' of the second generation of the Oxford Movement". He was a life-long friend of Gladstone, and had been a prominent minister in London (having served St. Peter's, Eaton Square). He was elected Bishop of Truro in 1883, and of St. Andrews in 1893.

Wilkinson combined an evangelical zeal for conversion with the traditional objective means of grace, and had as the basis for his theological programme Justification by Faith, Conversion, and Baptismal Regeneration. He used "Mission Weeks" to rekindle the religious awareness of his people, announcing them as "a solemn appeal to all who are ignoring the blessings of their Baptism, and living for the world instead of devoting their lives to the Saviour who died to redeem them". In the face of traditional Protestant Anglicanism, Wilkinson introduced extempore prayer and the Sacramental life - the Church open daily for prayer meetings, Communion celebrated each morning, the Prayer Book strictly adhered to. Wilkinson's churchmanship was Tractarian-affected chiefly through his confessor, T. T. Carter (a leading theologian of the Oxford Movement after Newman's secession), but also through the writings of E. M. Goulbourn and R. I. Wilberforce. He was also a minor exponent of advanced ritual and ceremonial, and
was himself instrumental in further extending Perth Cathedral: additions which were dedicated in the presence of Archbishop Frederick Temple in 1901 (something which is most intriguing in view of the Archbishop's deprecation of the use of incense and lights, and his declaration against the Reserved Sacrament).

In his dealings with the Nonconformists of England, and with members of the Church of Scotland (whom he treated as Nonconformists in spite of the Scottish Establishment), Wilkinson was "as sympathetic as he was uncompromising". He "saw the Anglican Church as a branch of the Church Catholic, as the Free Churches and the Presbyterians were not - although he would not question the validity of non-episcopal ordination". He was always active in reunion negotiations, but saw as a barrier between Anglicans and Presbyterians the teaching about Confirmation, the Eucharist, and the episcopal office.

It is interesting to note that Wordsworth had been happiest with "Broad Churchmen" of the Establishment, like A. K. H. Boyd, Principal Story, and Principal Tulloch. He was often a guest in Church of Scotland pulpits, and continually advocated a "moderate episcopacy" as the key to a comprehensive national reunion. He was even willing to concede that Presbyterian orders might be valid, "but irregular", where there had been "no conscious departure from the Catholic Faith". Wilkinson, on the other hand, was an old Oxford friend of Donald Macleod, and maintained
close personal friendships with James Cooper and Professor Milligan. Speaking of Milligan, shortly after his death, Wilkinson betrayed at once his own personal warmth and wistful ecclesiastical rigidity: "that great and holy theologian who has now passed out of this life into the more immediate Presence of the Divine Redeemer, without having been able to kneel at our side when we received the Holy Communion, and offered the great Memorial of the One Redeemer".\textsuperscript{34}

Wilkinson, though active with Cooper in Church reunion talks, would neither preach himself nor allow his clergy to preach in Church of Scotland pulpits. In defence of his position he stated:

\textit{... We cannot separate ourselves from the thousands now within the veil, who in bygone ages, at the cost of their life-blood, have kept undefiled the faith once delivered to the saints. We must not in our yearning for unity, raise new barriers between the Scottish Church and the world-wide Anglican Communion. We dare not, as in the sight of God, through our love for our brethren who differ from us at home, do anything which may for ever quench the hope of reunion with other branches of the Catholic Church. ... And yet we long in our innermost heart to have a more living place in the national life of Scotland.}\textsuperscript{35

As distinct from the Church of Scotland, he stated:

The Episcopal Church attaches great importance to the gift which is conveyed to the baptised and believing Christian by the laying on of hands. It attaches great importance to the Godward aspect of Holy Communion, to that view which describes it as a Memorial Service. It believes that in the Ideal of our Lord for His Kingdom, the Episcopate has a real and important place.\textsuperscript{36}
These bishops - Wordsworth, Forbes, and Wilkinson - though different in theological perspective, were part of the changing fortune of Scottish Episcopacy.

Throughout the nineteenth century, and after, Scottish Episcopacy showed signs of rapid progress and expansion. In 1838, for example, there were only seventy-three congregations and seventy-eight clergy. Even in 1847, Bishop Ewing had had only six congregations in his diocese, and 487 communicants. But by 1858 the number of Scottish Episcopal congregations had more than doubled to 150, and the clergy totalled 163. By 1870 there were 169 churches, eight bishops, 183 clergy, and a membership estimated at 62,000; by 1900 this had grown to 116,000, and by 1921 to 147,000.

This growth was matched - if not surpassed - by building efforts. In particular, the awakening of the "episcopal consciousness" by the Oxford Movement resulted in every diocese being equipped with a cathedral; these usually to the design of prominent English architects. St. Ninian's, Perth, and Cumbrae, have already been mentioned. In 1866 the foundation stone for Inverness Cathedral was laid by the Archbishop of Canterbury (Longley). In 1879, St. Mary's Cathedral was consecrated - the largest built in Scotland since the Reformation, made possible by a bequest of £230,000 from two former United Presbyterians. Other buildings which
had been the "bishop's church", such as St. Paul's, Dundee, St. Mary's, Glasgow, and St. Andrew's, Aberdeen, were upgraded to the status of cathedral.

The building efforts, of which these cathedrals were representative, were part of that new self-image which overtook the Scottish Episcopal communion. They were "a tribute not merely to the increased membership and prosperity of the Episcopal Church in Scotland but to the increased self-confidence given to it by the Oxford Movement".42 The problem was that whereas the Church of England had been affected by the Oxford Movement and had been kept comprehensive through the agency of the Establishment, Episcopal Scotland had no such delimiting device. In Scotland Oxford's definition of "Catholicity" acquired a narrow, rigid, and sectarian interpretation.

In 1871, for example, excessive abuse was poured on the Archbishop of York (William Thompson) and the Bishop of Winchester (Samuel Wilberforce) by many leading Scottish Episcopalians, because they had preached on successive Sundays in Glengarry Parish Church. The Bishops pled "mission" as the defence and justification for their action, but this excuse was not generally accepted. As a direct result of the affair the Bishop of Glasgow inhibited Bishop Ewing from officiating at a Glasgow University service. Of this action Ewing, in a letter to his friend McLeod Campbell, said:
I cannot say how much it has impressed me with the feeling that those apparently innocent things, apostolic succession and high views (as they are called) of the Christian Sacraments, are really ANTI-CHRISTIAN in their operation. When they take shape in actual life, they reveal their meaning to be a doctrine of election, which is just so much worse than the common one that it is EXTERNAL and official, and which, moreover, renders the sacraments themselves uncertain in their efficacy, by demanding the co-operation of the will of the minister, if the reception of them is to be savingly beneficial. How destructive this doctrine must be of all simple and immediate fellowship between man and man, and between man and God, I need not say. And yet it is a growing thing in the Church of England.43

Further anger was evidenced by Scottish Episcopalians over Dean Stanley's celebrated lectures, "The History of the Church of Scotland", delivered in Edinburgh in January 1872. Not only did Stanley defend blatant Erastianism and the eighteenth century Moderates, but he spoke of Scottish Episcopacy not in terms of the "Divine Right" Church, but as an English supplement to the National Church, which kept alive "English art, English toleration, and English literature".44

In addressing Stanley on the matter of these lectures, Bishop Ewing made a curious but important observation, which has generally been overlooked by those speaking of the growth of Scottish Episcopacy after the "Disruption" era. Ewing wrote:

I would mention, if you would excuse me, that you have omitted an act which, if injurious and discreditable to the Establishment, is yet the hinge on which most of its recent history turns - the deposition of Dr. [McLeod] Campbell. To that is mainly owing the influx into the Episcopal Church of a valuable portion of the Establishment, and their desertion so weakened the latter, that at the disruption the Calvinistic party carried the day.
Now, however, Dr. Campbell is the boast of the Establishment. At a dinner given him on the occasion of his being made D.D. by the University of Glasgow, ... I asked the chairman, Norman Macleod, if they would now turn him out? He replied, 'We owe much to Luther, but the theology of our day owes a far greater debt to Dr. Campbell. It was our glory to have brought him up', and - I whispered - 'to turn him out'.

It is clear that even before the "Disruption" there was a movement to the Episcopal Church by an influential section of the Scottish Establishment.

The educated lay movement to the Scottish Episcopal communion did not stop in 1843 when the evangelicals removed from the Establishment; rather this new situation of Establishment and Free Church Presbyterians competing to be accounted the true successor to the historic Church of Scotland lent unwitting support to the Episcopal movement. Those who, for various reasons, found the "English Church" more attractive, no longer felt bound by the Scottish Establishment. Although the great secession of 1843 had not effected the desired disruption of Church and State, it had formalised the disruption of a comprehensive national recognition of religion in Scotland: the various classes were no longer to be seen as members of the same church. In 1885 it was the quip that Episcopalians, though three percent of the population, held two-thirds of the land, and it was this realisation which greatly troubled the Establishment.

The nervousness of the Church of Scotland at this time is seen in their sending Norman Macleod to see the
Queen after Archbishop Longley had presumed to lay the foundation stone of Inverness Cathedral in 1866. The Queen immediately sought the advice of Dean Wellesley as to whether she should write to the Archbishop or summon him for a meeting. She wrote:

When the Archbishop himself came to Scotland, and permits the Bishops to speak of 'the Church'—implying as they do, that the SCOTCH establishment is NO Church, and her Sacraments not to be considered as such, which they openly do— the case becomes VERY GRAVE. Now the Queen takes a solemn engagement, on her accession, to maintain the Established Church of Scotland... and she will maintain it. But, quite apart from this, the Queen considers this movement as MOST mischiefous... The Queen will NOT stand the attempts made to destroy the simple and truly Protestant faith of the Church of Scotland.

Increasingly, the Episcopal communion saw herself as THE Church in Scotland, guaranteed as such by her Divine Commission in Apostolic Authority and Succession. Her close approximation and attachment to the English Church was to be seen in her growing use of English priests and her increasing use of the English Prayer Book. This general orientation was given material expression in her buildings, which were often made to look like English parish churches. This objective identification was aided by the fact that G. E. Street, Gilbert Scott, William Butterfield, and many other leading English architects, were active in the service of Scottish Episcopacy.
A letter from a Scottish Episcopalian to The Ecclesiologist in 1849, is instructive in seeing how far the ideals of Oxford and Cambridge had even then penetrated into the communion of the Nonjuring remnant. The writer spoke of the "stirring among the dry bones" that was being (to quote him):

made manifest in the externals, and the less momentous accidents of religion and the notes of a Church, . . . for the bolder and stricter assertion of Church principles among the comparatively few and scattered members who, by God's blessing, are included within the safe fold of Holy Church.

He went on to say that this manifestation was to be seen first and most clearly, by more accurate observance of ritual propriety, and a more becoming sense of decency, order, and even beauty, in the material temples dedicated to the immediate service of Almighty God; - or in other words, Ecclesiology, in its highest and widest sense, is gradually becoming in this diocese [Aberdeen] the firm, unmistakable exponent and bulwark of Church principles.

The buildings to which he then referred were those of All Saints', Woodhead, Fyvie (1849), to the design of John Henderson, and St. Drostan's, Deer (1851) and St. John the Evangelist, Aberdeen (1850) which - to his great embarrassment - were to the design of Messrs. MacKenzie and Matthews of Elgin and Aberdeen. Most interestingly, the Church of St. John the Evangelist, in particular, was (in the words of Peter Anson):
furnished with a Tractarian correctness not
surpassed by St. Barnabas', Pimlico, or St. Paul's,
Brighton. The noble east window of five lights was
filled with rich stained glass. The seats were low
and open. Both the altar and the pulpit were of
stone... The walls of the chancel were decorated
in rich polychrome paintings, and the sanctuary was
paved with encaustic tiles.48

With such Tractarian accuracy then, why should the
correspondent to The Ecclesiologist be embarrassed about
its report? The reason is clear - the Camden ideal
rested not only on the accuracy of the design, but also
on the purity of the architect. The plans for the two
churches mentioned above, and also that of St. Ternan's,
Banchory (1851), were by the firm Messrs. MacKenzie and
Matthews, of Aberdeen and Elgin. In the words addressed
to The Ecclesiologist:

The latter of these gentlemen is resident in Aberdeen,
and was for some years I believe, a pupil of Mr. Scott's.
I regret to have to add that Mr. Matthews is a
Presbyterian, and one, therefore, to whom it cannot
be satisfactory to intrust the preparation of designs
for an ecclesiastical edifice. This is the more to be
deplored, for he certainly has architectural talents
and readiness, and is possessed with a strong love and
enthusiasm even for his art. As, however, he appears
to be endowed with a reverential feeling for things
sacred, and, as ecclesiastical architecture is
evidently his favourite branch of study, I cannot help
hoping that, by God's help, he will not for long remain
an alien from the Church.

It is needless to dwell on the implications of such
a position. Of importance is the relatively early date of
such decided opinions. The extreme church consciousness,
the un-churching of all non-episcopalian, the aggressive
self-assurance, that boasted Divine Commission and
Apostolic Authority, ... were all part of that mystique which either attracted or enfuriated Church of Scotland people. Even at so early a date those "apparently innocent things", as Bishop Ewing termed Apostolic Succession and High views of the Sacraments, were at work revealing a definite doctrine of election, and it was this which determined - to a large extent - the nature of the resurgent Scottish Episcopal Church.
PART II

BROAD CHURCH REFORM IN THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND
Almost forty years before Scoto-Catholicism emerged in 1882, there were signs indicating that Scotland was experiencing movements not dissimilar to those affecting England. "I apprehend", said one Scottish correspondent in 1845, "that we are approaching great changes in the relations of Church and State, and in all ecclesiastical affairs. The relations of the clergy to the people, the power of the Church Courts, and the relation of the Church to the government of Christian countries, are all unsatisfactory."

The letter in which this passage occurs could have been speaking to either the English situation following on Newman's secession, or the Scottish situation following on the great secession of 1843. It was, in fact, written in Edinburgh by the Reverend Robert Lee, and addressed the situation in which he found himself.¹ The matter as posed by Dr. Lee, however, was seen to be so closely identified with that of England, by him, and the more informed of the Scottish Establishment clergy - dealing not with a similar, but with the same reformed Government at Westminster; being likewise concerned for the integrity of the Church; fearing that Parliament was dishonouring ancient provisions and usurping the Church's divine authority; rejecting the
civil intrusion into the exclusively ecclesiastical sphere - that it could never have been studied without reference to the English situation, or the English attempts at definition and resolution. Lee most certainly kept abreast of events there, and to him - as to many - the need for reform, and the problem of authority arising from that need, was as serious in Scotland as it was in England, more especially because of the different ecclesiastical polity entertained.

The Church of Scotland's government, and her relation with the State; her doctrines, standards, and tests; her worship, in competition with the popular Free Church, and the "genteel" Scottish Episcopal Church . . . all demanded reform, or at least serious rethinking and restatement. The Broad Churchmen - first Lee, and then those who formed the Church Service Society - accepted the challenge of the reform age, and provided the practical example of Liberal reform.

It is perhaps anticipating later developments to speak of these Scottish Churchmen who were anxious to embrace the new age of Liberalism as "Broad Churchmen", for that is to use a term uniquely applicable to the English religious situation. But in that these Scottish clerics found their inspiration, more often than not, in that particular tradition, and were most anxious that the Church of Scotland as the national church should be similarly "Broad" and comprehensive, the term "Broad Churchmen" with reference to them is not greatly misapplied.
By 1860 the pressures for change in Scotland were irresistible. In particular, the Church of Scotland was in need of significant reform. Dr. Robert Lee decided that he was the man called upon to address the situation, to provide the example, to give the lead. He appeared eminently well qualified for the task: Doctor of Divinity, Minister of the Church and Parish of Old Greyfriars, Edinburgh, Regius Professor of Biblical Criticism and Biblical Antiquities in the University of Edinburgh, Senior Dean of the Chapel Royal at Holyrood, Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen in Scotland, and Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh. He had a "dexterous and nimble rather than a profound or subtle intellect"; as a debater he was unequalled, displaying "... alertness, coolness, and smartness". Yet despite these credentials, he probably would have been deposed from the ministry by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1867 because of his "innovations", had he not been paralysed and ultimately killed by a series of strokes. As it was, the practical reforms he had effected at Greyfriars were left under an ominous cloud of postponed censure; his envisaged wider plan of Church of Scotland reform remained at best tenuous and highly suspect. And yet in one sense Lee won, for because of his untimely death the Assembly was not forced to act judicially; was not pushed to declare against all innovations upon common usage, and, in that it did not legislate, the door was opened to wider reform still.
Lee's whole approach to the matter of Church reform, more especially as regarded worship (the only part of the envisaged reform that he himself had time to consider in detail),\(^4\) has often been considered decisive in terms of the subsequent developments. He is often portrayed as the fountain of Church reform in Scotland; he is praised as the "founder" or "father" of the Church Service Society\(^5\) and - by implication at least - the true animator of the liturgical movement in Scotland. That Lee himself was acquainted with Dr. Cumming's 1840 reprint of the *Book of Common Order*\(^6\) and with various other private publications, that he was fully versed in the Oxford Movement, that he had little sympathy with the Church Service Society initially, and even at a later date found it troublesome and misguided,\(^7\) has been generally overlooked or deprecated. His enthusiastic biographer (R. H. Story), for example, said that the Church Service Society "... could not have come into existence, without the stimulus of Dr. Lee's example, and THE SECURITY OF THE FREEDOM WHICH HE VINDICATED"\(^8\) [emphasis mine].

Professor Story was probably wrong in this assertion. The seed of the movement that was to prove decisive was already growing in the successors to the "Middle Party", the descendents of the "High Flyers" - John Willison of Dundee and Thomas Boston of Ettrick; the so-called "security" Lee had obtained was but an illusion, a form of lawlessness; the "freedom" he had vindicated was but a tendency which - given sufficient support - might have destroyed Presbytery
in favour of Congregationalism. That Lee paved the way for one "school", in many ways the more popular and representative, is undeniable; for those of Broad Church, latitudinarian sympathies - like R. H. Story, A. K. H. Boyd, and Principal Tulloch - were inspired by Lee's rationalism and liberalism. But, it must be stated emphatically, that those who (though a school always in the minority) are best remembered for re-orienting and legitimising the worship reform movement - in the sense of their significant research and scholarship; in their strict adherence to the rules of "due process" in dealing with the Church Courts - had little patience with Dr. Lee. These men - G. W. Sprott, Thomas Leishman, William Milligan, and their disciples - were profoundly different from Lee in principles and emotion. The precise point of their divergence was their churchmanship, and, more particularly, their approach to those Catholic church principles which had been so clearly enunciated, practiced, and, to a certain extent - especially among the clergy in England - popularised, by the Oxford Movement.

Lee, undoubtedly, was a great and a good man; a man ahead of his time in many respects. He was given to charity, popular education, and social reform. He had a breadth of learning and depth of character unusual in his age. His practical reforms in the re-built Parish Church of the Greyfriars were revolutionary and exciting, and of far-reaching consequences; his lectures in the University prepared many of the younger clergy for the onslaught of
German learning; his skilful handling of the various social concerns committed to his care made Edinburgh one of the more socially aware - if not more progressive - cities of that day. It is, therefore, not with a view to recounting his failures, or undermining his noble character, that adverse comments on his work are introduced; but with a view to understanding how others - not critics, but those who, like Lee, himself, were committed to Church reform - perceived his example, and why they rejected his theory and practice.

Matthew Leishman of Govan, the leader of the "Middle Party" of 1843, is representative of those who disliked Lee's programme of reform. He spoke of Lee as "that most impracticable of all men"; as a man with a genius for rubbing people the wrong way. It would appear that it was not unusual for Lee's smartness to degenerate into "flippancy", his logical fence into "unworthy verbal quibbling". The Scotsman (in its obituary notice) confirmed Leishman's observation, though in a modified sense: "His wit was keen, flashing, incisive, essentially Scotch in its character, caustic, yet with a spice of kindliness and sympathetic humour in it, which made it, while fully amusing to the bystander, not altogether withering to the object of it. . . ."

Contemporary accounts would suggest that Lee's "wit", coupled with his advanced liberal views and practices (and perhaps also some
jealousy of his success at Greyfriars), had made him thoroughly unpopular with his fellow-clergy of Edinburgh. Indeed, he was so unpopular that some thought his very advocacy of worship reform prejudiced many against it: James F. Leishman has said that it "even set back the hands of the clock of ritual reform". James Leishman portrays Robert Lee as essentially an Englishman, reared in English Dissent; a man who "to the last . . . probably never quite assimilated the ethos of the Scottish Church". He records that Lee was ". . . a freelance, latitudinarian in doctrine, with little of the historic sense", and that it was because of this awareness that Matthew Leishman (though himself not enthusiastic about the reform movement) encouraged his son Thomas to collaborate with G. W. Sprott in republishing Knox's *Book of Common Order* and the Westminster "Directory" - a work, with historical introductions and illustrative notes, which was published in 1868. It was framed on what James F. Leishman has described as "constitutional lines"; it was thought that it might serve "as a corrective, almost a counterblast, to Dr. Lee's *Reform of the Church of Scotland*" (1864).

During the debates on Innovations in the General Assembly (28 May, 1862) Matthew Leishman again betrayed his annoyance with Lee when he wrote: "I did not speak on Dr. Lee's motion yesterday, though prepared to do so, as I might have been tempted to say things one might have afterwards wished unsaid. Dr. Lee was very insolent and offensive. . . ." Matthew Leishman thought that Lee's
undisciplined approach was destroying Presbytery: "If our modern rage for Innovations", said Leishman, "is to undermine our doctrine as well as alter our mode of worship, we may as well go in for independency at once." 18

This statement is the key to the diverging opinions: it was the matter of doctrine and churchmanship that was basic to the disagreement; of being "under authority" to history and tradition in matters of faith and worship, to the hierarchy of Courts in matters of church government, to doctrine in matters of liturgical expression. Thomas Leishman said that he personally had little sympathy with Dr. Lee because he thought that his ritual conceptions rested more on an aesthetic than a credal basis. 19 After Lee's death, Thomas Leishman recorded this confession: "We shall all miss Lee sadly. I have often abused him, voting against him when I had the chance, and think still he took the wrong line. . . ." 20 The "wrong line" for Leishman, obviously, was that Lee had not listened to the voice of the Church of Scotland in Assembly; he had left the high citadel of the Catholic faith for the unproven wilderness of Liberal thought; he was interested in ritual reform, but not in its doctrinal statement.

In English terms (which became Scottish usage also), Lee was a Broad Church ritualist. In the words of A. K. H. Boyd, "he valued dogmatic freedom incomparably more than ritual. His taste in matters ecclesiological
was exactly the reverse of Catholic.\textsuperscript{21} His mind was "essentially liberal and rational".\textsuperscript{22} He was always right up-to-date on the researches of the day, both scientific and theological, and he ". . . did not hesitate to confess change of opinion when truth seemed to demand it".\textsuperscript{23}

As The Scotsman said of him: "He felt himself cast upon days of gradual but inevitable revolution. He saw that the governing ideas of the Church must be adapted to modern emergencies if it was to play any other part than that of an interesting relic. . . . There were plenty of men busy conducting channels of efflux for the Church's influence. He thought he would be one of the few to make that influence truly powerful by rectifying it to existing necessities."\textsuperscript{24}

Lee was responsive to the spirit of the age. He said, for example: "If the world continually go forward, and the Church stand still or go backward, what can happen but an eternal separation between science and religion; they who study God's works and they who preach His Word regarding each other not as allies and friends, but rivals and enemies, and the multitude gradually imbibing the notion that he who inspired the Bible is not the same God who governs all things and made the worlds."\textsuperscript{25} His approach to a reconciliation of these two spheres left no doubt that he was quite prepared to reject traditional dogma and accept the Liberal principle of progress and development.

Lee's book, The Reform of the Church of Scotland, presented the new Liberal thought with skill and great
urgency. Indeed, his final plea on behalf of the reform therein proposed is a classic statement of the Liberal ideal that had permeated Scotland, no less than England:

We are not always surely to continue the slaves of our forefathers' superstitions, prejudices, or other peculiarities. Our circumstances are different; our experience is incomparably wider, and our lights are far greater than theirs. For them neither church history nor civil history had been written; the age of criticism had not come in any of its departments; the lights which shines around us from this source had now dawned upon them: so that we possess numerous means of understanding and judging, in all departments of knowledge, as well sacred as profane, which were not granted to those men - pious, sincere, and earnest as they were. Let us venerate their Christian virtues; let us imitate their earnestness and zeal and self-devotion; but let us not be guilty of the narrow-mindedness of following them in the letter rather than in the spirit of their conduct. We shall deserve to be condemned as fools if, in many things, we be not much wiser than they. To us far more has been given, and of us far more will be required. How deep a disgrace, not to say how great a guilt, shall we incur, if it shall appear that, with all our superior advantages, we are less enlightened, liberal, and wise than they were!26

To his University students Lee spoke, in similar unrepentent Liberal terms, of those in the Church who would return for authoritative teaching to the theologians of the seventeenth century (and by extension, to those of any other century):

They would 'stand firmly upon the old ways', and 'contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints'. But this is the whole question, whether the ways they call 'old' be not really 'new', and whether a thousand propositions which they comprehend in 'the faith', be not mere opinions and speculations (even if correct opinions), which never were delivered to the saints at all, or heard of in the Christian Church for many centuries; and which never should have been made, and cannot reasonably be accounted, points of faith, since no
man's salvation in any degree depends upon his believing, rejecting, or doubting, any or all of them. The Christian Faith is that which a man must believe in order to be a Christian - that which he cannot deny without ceasing to be a Christian - and not every deduction which may be even legitimately drawn from that; much less the whole body of dogmas which controversial ingenuity, sectarian vehemence, party spirit, and factious zeal may have piled up mountains high upon the one strong but simple foundation, Jesus the Christ.\textsuperscript{27}

Dr. Lee was seen by many of his co-presbyters as being at heart a Unitarian, and the fact that many people of that persuasion found themselves at home in Old Greyfriars, did not tend to allay their suspicion. Lee was hurt by their insinuation, but was not willing to alter his theological position on that account. His publicly stated definition of Christianity, for example, was not likely to improve their opinion of him; it seemed to reject entirely the institutionalised Church:

Only when men shall come to see that Christianity is neither a set of dogmas, nor an external regiment or ritual; but a set of rules of life founded on and animated with the purest and strongest motives; that its object is to make us not hate each other, but love each other; to pity and help, and not to curse and vilify those whom we think in error, and to manifest our own superiority rather by good deeds and kindly tempers than by supercilious conduct and pharisical speeches, - in short, . . . when people go back to the beginning, and learn what their religion is from the precepts and example of Jesus Christ, casting their doctors over-board, who, under pretence of explaining His words, have so often contradicted them, only then will they come to a better understanding with each other, and make that progress which is truly valuable - progress in real wisdom and substantial goodness.\textsuperscript{28}
It is hardly surprising that such an interpretation of Christianity should have led Lee to seek the abolition of University tests, and a relaxation of subscription to the Confession. Indeed, his entire attitude greatly fostered the formation of a liberal spirit in the Scottish clergy, and "... called forth amongst many of the intelligent laity a sympathy with tendencies to modernise ecclesiastical institutions...".

For inspiration, Lee looked to the sister establishment — the Church of England. His repeated reference to English affairs is indicative of the impact it was having not only on him personally, but also on Scottish clergy generally. Lee was well acquainted with the notorious Tracts for the Times. He knew Arnold's, Whately's, and Hampden's reactions to the Oxford Movement. He stated that the Tractarian attempt to curtail the State's authority and action (to him a most serious mistake, undermining the "national" status of the Church) was but "our own doctrine of spiritual independence in a surplice instead of a Geneva gown".

In his book, "Reform", Lee stated with complete frankness that the Kirk remained established in Scotland only because of "the suffrance of the English Church", and that this situation might soon cease because of the continued Tractarian advance. He said: "Controversy has tended powerfully to evoke the Church spirit. Episcopacy
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is now very generally regarded by the Anglican clergy as
of divine authority; so that no society is indeed a
Christian Church which repudiates or wants the three
orders of the Priesthood, or at least the Episcopal
order.\textsuperscript{35} Lee suggested that the Tractarians might even
connive to replace the Presbyterian Establishment in
Scotland with that of the Episcopal Church.\textsuperscript{36} On the
other hand, he did not fear that the English Church would
ever become predominantly High Church, and that because
of the freedom that had been determined and extended
through the secular judicial decisions in the Denison and
Gorham cases. He even thought of the Church of England
as a possible refuge; in his words:

\ldots the only refuge for those, whether laity or
clergy, who are not prepared to give themselves up
to absolute mental servitude, but are resolved to
vindicate for themselves some freedom of inquiry
and speech on theological doctrines; and who consider
that a national Church should be comprehensive and
liberal in its constitution; that it should brand
nothing as heresy except a denial of some one of
those very few points which constitute the foundation
and essence of the Christian Religion, as taught in
the New Testament. The late decisions of the Court
of Arches have served greatly to extend and deepen
such feelings - however the straiter churchmen may be
scandalised by them; and since the Judicial Committee
of the Privy Council has not only confirmed, but even
much extended those liberal interpretations of the
law, there can be no doubt that the Church of England
will gain an accession of strength in popular feeling,
which will set it on a firmer ground than it has ever
occupied. In such circumstances, no doubt, all those
who feel that their orthodoxy requires, besides
Scripture and reason, also the arguments of deposition
and forfeiture, the ruin of families, the brand of
"heresy", and other pains and penalties, will violently
denounce such latitudinarianism, as polluting the
Church and desecrating religion; but it is not likely
that they will weaken it by seceding. Rather they may
be expected to be satisfied with the privilege, still
secured to them, of denouncing corruptions and the
tolerations of them, and of charitably groaning over
the infidel shepherds and their misled flocks.
There cannot, however, be a doubt that any inter­pret­ation of the law which expands the institution from
the condition of a Sect to that of a Church, will in
the same degree contribute to render it national -
in fact as it is in style - and to draw within its
pale multitudes who are now hovering upon the borders
of sects with which their spiritual ties are fairly
broken; but from which they have not finally
separated themselves, only because not well resolved
whither they should betake themselves.

It was Lee's firm conviction that the Church of Scotland
had to be as comprehensive and liberal in her constitu­ tion as was the Church of England; that she too must be
truly a "national Church" in this sense. 37

The Anglo-Catholic advance at the parish level
troubled Lee, but his reaction was one of resignation to
human nature: "Poor, silly, gullible mortals - people
seem much the same everywhere, more eager to believe than
to know what they believe is true." As if to counteract
the Tractarian claims, Lee taught his students at
Edinburgh University to deride "the pleasant figment of
Apostolic Succession"; 38 to distrust any appeal to an
authoritative tradition. He himself had no respect for
such an authority; in Principal Story's words: "any author­ ity that was not a rational authority was alien to the
whole constitution of his mind". 39 "Tradition", said Lee,
"is . . . the denial of the authority of Christ, and also
the denial of liberty of thought, and of responsibility
to every Christian man. It is the substitution of human
opinions and commands in place of the authority of God, on
one side, and in place of our reason, conscience, and responsibility on the other. 40

Although Dr. Lee admired the English Church, and respected her jealously guarded liberties, he had no leaning either to Episcopacy as a form of Church Government, or to the English Liturgy as the model service-book. 41 He was fond of The Book of Common Prayer, 42 but he could not use it in its entirety, and seemed averse to using "scraps" from it: to Lee's mind, using bits of the Prayer Book made the Kirk out to be "some poor Lazarus, subsisting on crumbs that fall from the table of a rich neighbour". 43 He himself was bold enough to venture altering even the Te Deum, and to defend the alterations. 44 Apparently Lee had neither a "tender reverence for Catholic usage", nor an appreciation of "the antique sacredness of venerable words". 45 His own printed prayers were (to quote R. H. Story) "... the embodiment of his idea of a rational Christian worship, free, alike, from the intermixture of obtrusive dogmatism, and from the archaic forms of Catholic tradition". 46

The rapid advance of the Scottish Episcopal Church was of grave concern to Lee. He readily admitted that many had left the Scottish Establishment to swell her ranks, especially from the aristocracy and landed gentry. He accounted for it, however, not in religious or doctrinal terms, but in terms of fashion, of seemliness, and of the discipline and training of English public schools (which many of these classes then attended). 47 He thought, too,
that many were quitting the Church of Scotland because of her "bald" worship, because of her rigid system of government and discipline, because of "the extent, minuteness, and strictness of the Creed, and of the subscription required of office bearers". But Lee had no patience with the Scottish Episcopal Church's claim to be THE Church in Scotland on the basis of a Divine Commission guaranteed in her historic Episcopate and its boasted Apostolic Succession. Although he read her journals and printed sermons, Lee never treated the Scottish Episcopal Church as an acceptable extension of the Church of England, and that because of her continuing High Church principles, traditions, and prejudices. Certainly the famous sermons preached at the consecration of the Church of St. John the Evangelist, Jedburgh, by advanced Tractarians, left him scathing; his comment:

"So long as Scotchmen in general are deficient in that capacity of believing contradictions, . . . these Catholic doctrines are not likely to make much progress among us - among those of us, at least, who would prefer that their religion should be true, as well as Catholic and fashionable."

Lee, himself, rarely looked to the traditional "deposit" of the Catholic faith to further his own particular programme of reform. This is not to suggest that he was unacquainted with the early Fathers and
Doctors, or the later Protestant Reformers; on the contrary, he was well versed in their writings. But he could not accept that their words were in any sense definitive or binding upon him, or that they could address from their antiquity his contemporary situation and problem. The tradition that placed great confidence in the early periods of the Church's history was completely wanting in Lee; nor was he anxious to become nearer the Reformers. Lee was most unfavourable, for example, toward Dr. Cummings' suggestion that Knox's "Liturgy" was worthy or resumption in its original form. "The Book of Common Order", said Lee, "is singularly, almost absolutely, devoid of beauty; the sense of which, if not wanting, was at least sadly uncultivated in its framers... its impressiveness is of a kind that would not be tolerated by any congregation which had learned to distinguish Christianity from the law of Moses;..." 54 "In short", Lee concluded, "The Book of Common Order is too cold, hard, and dry - too fierce in its spirit, and too declamatory in its style... to be tolerated by any congregation which had learnt how widely the Christian religion differs in spirit from 'that which is abolished'." 55

Repeatedly Lee drew the distinction between the old religion, its laws and rites, and the new religion of "progress in real wisdom and substantial goodness". It was a distinction which he had drawn out with great
clarity in the preface to his book, *The Thesis of Erastus Touching Excommunication*. 56 Lee's book on Erastus was published in 1844, shortly after his move to the Parish Church of the Old Greyfriars. Most of the congregation had "gone out" with Lee's predecessor to the Free Church. The book was written to show the uninformed of that Communion that their taunt of "Erastianism" leveled against the Scottish Establishment was unfounded.

Lee pointed out that Erastus, contrary to public opinion, was neither an atheist nor an infidel, but "a man whom good and great men pronounced great and good". 57 Lee argued that in the quest for Truth, Erastus had considered as the primary question whether excommunication was a divine ordinance or merely a human invention. 58 Lee stated that Erastus had not been concerned about "... an ignorant person, a heretic, or an apostate from the faith ...", 59 for it was self-evident (to him at least) that these should be excluded; he was interested in "... persons who have been baptised, who are sufficiently instructed in the Christian faith, who are orthodox in their sentiments, and who are desirous of partaking of the sacraments". 60 Lee said that Erastus had thought that members of the Church could never, according to the institution of Christ, be punished for their sin by being excluded from God's Ordinances; punishment, with civil penalties, belonged to the civil magistrate in a Christian country. 61 God's Ordinances in Christ had nothing to do
with the Old Covenant, or with legal ritual uncleanness, or with the Passover, or any other such tradition; these in no sense should be used as warrant for exclusion from the Christian Ordinances.

With reference to post-exilic expulsion from the synagogues, Lee noted that Erastus had stated that "... what was done in the synagogues can form no rule as to what should be done in the Christian Church, because the practice of the synagogues was ... unsupported by any divine warrant or authority". "These same people", he had continued, "were not, and were never attempted to be, excluded from the temple, or prevented joining in the sacrifices and other acts of the public worship instituted by God." This example, he had stated, should form the Christian paradigm. The only examples the Church had been given was that of John the Baptist's indiscriminate baptism, and of Judas' partaking of the Last Supper with Jesus' consent. Lee said that Erastus had argued that the Sacraments are not of superior dignity or importance to the written or preached Word, or to prayer, and that ecclesiastical authority has no more right to exclude persons desirous of partaking of the Sacraments from joining in them "... than they would ... did they attempt to prevent anyone from hearing the Word, or joining in the public prayers of the church, on the ground that they judged them unconverted or unholy". He said that Erastus had maintained that it was the business of the clergy to "TEACH" the nation, and that of the magistrate
to "GOVERN" it;⁶⁵ that authority ". . . to punish offences resides only with the magistrate, and that no other party has right to arrogate that office to himself, or is to be submitted to if he does".⁶⁶

After having recounted this thesis with his whole-hearted approval, Lee said by way of summary:

[Erastianism] is not a theory concerning the relation in which the civil authority stands to the ecclesiastical, so much as regarding that in which the people of any church stand to their clergy primarily, and secondarily to the civil power. It has very remote reference . . . as to whether it be lawful for the civil power to interfere at all, or, if at all, to what extent, in the proceeding of ecclesiastical courts regarding ordination and induction of ministers. . . . Erastianism is a controversy . . . between those who entertain different views regarding the terms of admission to the sacraments.⁶⁷

Lee emphasized his point by stating that Erastianism means ". . . that excommunication is not a divine ordinance, but a device of men; in other words that the sin of professing Christian people should be punished by the Christian magistrate with civil penalties, not by pastors and elders denying them access to the sacraments".⁶⁸

In the thesis Lee drew the distinction between the "Independents" - who believed that Sacraments were designed primarily for those who were truly children of God, whose marks as such could be recognised and distinguished from those who were to be refused admission - and the "Erastians", who directly opposed the Independent position. He also posited a third category, that of the Church of Scotland, which, he said: ". . . takes upon her,"
not to determine who are, and who are not, true Christians; but a much lower office, namely, to exclude those whose open conduct makes it manifest that they cannot be, according to the most charitable judgment, the children of God. Indeed no Church, assuming the character of National, could easily pretend to act on such a theory as that professed by the Independents." \(^{69}\) Lee said: 

"... no sober person would easily permit himself to expect that the bulk of any population would, in the present circumstances of the world, attain the condition and character of the living members of Christ's body. We have", he said, "no reason, either from the past history of the Church, or the declarations of holy Scripture, to expect any such consummation, ..." \(^{70}\)

Lee, even at this early stage of his public ministry, was advocating a broad, liberal Christianity in which clerical (in the sense of "priestly") authority had no place. He could never have accepted Oxford principles, or Newman's position advocating the restoration of an effective ecclesiastical discipline, for they sought those evidences of spiritual life which Lee had identified with a misguided Independency. He rested discipline in the hands of the Christian magistrate without even considering that the Tractarian claim - that the magistrate was no longer necessarily Christian - had merit. He held that Reason made this position untenable; and besides, he could not accept that it was as serious a matter as the Oxford men had contended. For Lee supreme and ultimate
authority was Jesus Christ, Himself, and that eliminated not only all uniquely ecclesiastical authority, but also all problems deriving directly from it. Since Lee thought that Reason was always the key, he would not be brought into Oxford's attempt at definition or exclusivity; he could not understand the problem they had posed, nor why they chose to bind themselves to - what he considered to be - fallible and ignorant human agencies and directives. He said, for example: "It is... only regarding matters indifferent, that the conflict of civil and ecclesiastical authority can ever seriously perplex an enlightened and conscientious man. In other cases the rightness or wrongness of the things themselves will determine his conduct." Lee was profoundly sceptical of "the power of the keys", or any such guaranteed formal succession as protecting the indefectible deposit of "the faith once delivered". "All that are children of God", he said, "have mutual bonds, which even their estrangements and separations cannot break. Whether they will acknowledge each other in that character or not, all believers in Jesus Christ, the Head of the body, are members of one holy, catholic, and apostolic Church, and members one of another." Within such a position, there was place for neither exclusivity, nor a rigidly defined ecclesiasticism.

Lee's position was highly rational and eminently well defined. In view of this observation, it is of profound
interest to note that Lee deviated from his Liberal stance, and, in his book, Reform of the Church of Scotland, justified himself not as a "progressive" - which might have seemed his logical defence - but as a "restorer". Lee denied that he was in any sense an "Innovator"; he stated that he merely wanted to correct popular corruptions and accretions that had perverted the approved formulae; that he had simply laid claim to the traditions both of the Church of Scotland, and of the Catholic Church. He said that his reforms only tended "... for the most part, to restore those customs and practices which the fathers of Presbytery thought expedient, and which they established and themselves practised. ...". 74 Lee concluded: "... no one should raise an outcry against ritualism, formalism, or any other ism, when nothing more is suggested that a return to some practices which the universal Church has sanctioned, which our earliest and wisest Reformers approved, and which the more enlightened portion of the Scottish people at least are prepared to welcome". 75

It might be suggested that this appeal to an authoritative Catholic and Reformed usage provided the source of the subsequent advance. This position is untenable, however, for in Lee's work, and even in his life, is absent that centrality of the sacramental extension of the Incarnation which featured so prominently in the later reform movement. Lee seemed to think of the Sacraments in much the same way as did Erastus: of no more "dignity" or
"importance" than the written or preached Word, or the prayers of the congregation. Lee did not argue for a return to weekly Communion as the Scottish, or even the Christian ideal, in his Greyfriars reforms. He never pressed for those objective means of grace which so clearly mark a particular type of churchman.

Nowhere was Lee's omission of the sacramental more obvious than in the changes he effected in Old Greyfriars after its reopening. Lee fought for Church baptisms and weddings, for kneeling during his read prayers, for standing while singing. He was the first in Scotland to restore coloured glass in church windows since the Reformation; he may have anticipated the wide-spread return to organs. He advocated restoring the commemoration of the principal events of the Christian year. But his changes were just as Thomas Leishman had said - based on an aesthetic rather than a credal basis.

One pair of historians have written that the rebuilding of Old Greyfriars "... set the pattern for restorations which were to bring churches such as St. Giles, Glasgow Cathedral and Paisley Abbey back to their mediæval splendour...". This position also is untenable: it overlooks several important facts. The first is that Greyfriars was a Post-Reformation building, and although it was built during an Episcopal period, it was not in any way architecturally distinguished from the Presbyterian period on that account. The second is that it was "reconstructed" from a fire-gutted hulk, not "restored" in
the Camden sense. The third is that during this re-
construction no attention was paid to trying to return it
to conformity with its original shape. In fact, the
most important remaining ancient feature - the arcading -
was actually destroyed; an open timber roof was built; and
the windows were given "Early English" tracery. It was
not until 1932 that these drastic measures were "corrected"
- the arcading being rebuilt, and the roof and the east
gable recast. But of most importance in this considera-
tion of Lee's example is that in his daringly rebuilt
Church of 1857 there was no provision for a permanent
Communion Table - Old Greyfriars did not have one until
1912. This fact is a clear indication of Lee's Liberal,
non-Catholic churchmanship: the "Holy Table" was not the
focus of Lee's reform programme.

It is impossible to consider that Lee's lead was
decisive in terms of the subsequent Catholic developments
within the Church of Scotland. His aestheticism naturally
tended to be followed; his defiant stance before the
several courts of the Church created an interesting prece-
dent; but his Liberalism made his programme of reform
unacceptable to those who ultimately assumed control of
the "innovation" movement. Lee's programme of reform was
explicitly and logically Broad Church; there were no High
Church pretensions or positions attributable to his
system - no sacerdotalism, no exclusivity, no peculiarly
ecclesiastical authoritarianism and discipline. His
programme was one in its integrity with that planned by
the English Broad Churchmen to ensure that the Southern Establishment remained truly national and boldly comprehensive. It was Thomas Arnold, and not Newman, who was Lee's mentor. According to Dr. Lee, it was the decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and not the restatement of Laudian principles at Oxford, that had saved the English Church.
CHAPTER IV

THE SEDUCTION OF THE DOCTRINALLY INDETERMINATE
CHURCH SERVICE SOCIETY BY CATHOLIC ANTIQUITY

On 31st January, 1865, the Church Service Society was founded by "three conspirators" - R. H. Story, J. Cameron Lees, and George Campbell. Branded as a "set of beardless youths", the three - all Broad Churchmen - associated themselves together for the purpose of effecting necessary changes to Scottish worship. Their stated object was the study of liturgies - "ancient and modern - of the Christian Church, with a view to the preparation and publication of forms of Prayer for Public Worship, and services for the Administration of the Sacraments, the Celebration of Marriage, the Burial of the Dead, etc."

The Society claimed to be carrying on the work of Robert Lee. When he died in 1868 the Society adopted a Minute which stated:

In one sense Dr. Lee may be said to have been the founder of the Society, for without his sagacious, bold, and self-sacrificing labour in the cause of freedom of thought, and worship, such a Society as this could not have been formed among the clergy of the Church of Scotland at the present time.

The Minute was extravagant. While it may have been charitable eulogy, it ignored the fact that there was current a general desire to improve the public worship of the Scottish Church.
Many reviewers have noted this movement for a more cultivated worship, and have said that it was "to some extent a ripple from the great wave of ritualism which had then begun to wash over England"; that "to a limited extent . . . the influence of the Oxford Movement upon the Church of England awakened the Scottish Church from its liturgical slumbers". Few have cared to acknowledge that the Oxford Movement played a definite role in the Scottish liturgical revival: that it awakened the Church of Scotland to the Catholic deposit of faith and devotion; that it not only set the religious ideal, but also provided the romantic antiquarian example. The emergence and direction of the Church Service Society evidence it; its publications after 1890 prove it.

The Church Service Society did not follow Lee's example. It had been toward a "rational Christian worship, free alike from the intermixture of obtrusive dogmatism, and from the archaic forms of Christian tradition". Lee had even written to the founding members of the Society reaffirming his position. "I hope you will be prudent and wise", he had said, "and not take up your time by talking of Greek liturgies and such far-away projects. None who have any tolerable acquaintance with these formularies will imagine they can furnish anything suitable for us." Oxford's example was quite different - look to a "golden age", to the medieval Church, to the Primitive Church, to the Fathers; restore that which is Catholic and can convey and instil the devotion and the piety of the ages; restore
that which can unlock the deposit of faith once delivered to the Saints.

G. W. Sprott showed which way the Society was headed when he defended "cribbing" from the English Prayer Book. "The English Liturgy", he said, "is taken from the Greek and Roman sources which are as much the heritage of the Church of Scotland as that of England; and further, what may be said to be peculiar and special to the English Liturgy was borrowed from the other reformed churches."\(^3\)

Undoubtedly the Scottish "wave of revival" was also due to the fact that "worship had reached such a degraded and deplorable condition".\(^9\) Of importance, however, is that nothing like a general movement happened in Scotland until the Tractarian advance had made continuation of this sad condition impossible. Although there had been several incidents of stirring before the Oxford Movement became strong - most notably Willison's *Prayers and Meditations* (1750), Dr. Robertson's *The Scotch Minister's Assistant* (1802), John Logan's published set of sermons and prayers for the Communion season (1882), and Dr. George Burns' volume of prayers for public worship (New Brunswick, 1829) - it was Dr. John Cumming's reprint of John Knox's *Liturgy* (so-called) in 1840, and the General Assembly's appointment of a committee in 1849 to provide forms of worship for Scots abroad, that first evidenced the new "wave" - and both of these were Anglican affected.
It was John Cumming, the minister of "the Scotch Church, Crown Court", London, who, in the preface to his edition of John Knox's Liturgy, gave shape to the "historiological mythos" which was to dominate the liturgical revival in Scotland. Some twenty years before Sprott assumed leadership in this line of historio-liturgical research, Cumming had laid the foundations of the High Presbyterian bulwark. Cumming attributed to the English Puritans and Presbyterians about the time of the Westminster Assembly the "extreme notions entertained in more recent times on the use of a liturgy in the Scottish Church". 

"The popular antipathy which exists among the humbler classes of the Scottish nation to a liturgy", he said, "is not an offshoot of the Reformation, but of the days of the Covenant." He argued that "a liturgy was generally preferred by the Scotch clergy and laity at the Reformation". He cited the ordinance of the Lords of the Congregation (1557) to support his contention that the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI "was used at least seven years, viz. from 1557 to 1564, at the reformation of the Church of Scotland", and that only then was this superseded by "the liturgy of Knox" - a liturgy which Cumming described as "little less beautiful and impressive than that of England", and one which could be reassumed because it was "never interdicted".

Cumming stated that it was "not the Common Prayer-Book, but that prepared and set forth in 1637", that "provoked" the Scottish Church. "The Scotch Church", he asserted
"never objected to a written liturgy in her public worship, provided there was room left in the service for extemporaneous prayer." He surmised that the beau ideal of a Scottish service had to combine "the authoritative injunction of the use of so much of the liturgy every service" and "scope for extemporaneous prayer before and after sermon". He argued that it was not to the Covenanters that the Scottish people should look for a model, but to "our Reformers, and the Church of the Reformation". "Let us not forget", he continued, "that the use of the Common Prayer-Book of the Church of England by the Scottish reformed clergy at the period of the Reformation was eminently useful in advancing our ecclesiastical and national freedom, our knowledge of the subject-matter and of the most suitable vehicles of prayer." Cumming advocated the "resumption" of Knox's Liturgy to help draw out "devotional feelings", and to reduce the "mediocrity" so evident in Scottish worship. "Let it not be thought", he said, "that were the whole service of the Church to be a written instead of an extemporaneous liturgy, there would in this be any violation of her constitution." For Cumming, the constitution of the Church of Scotland involved doctrine and government; "the former catholic, and the latter apostolic". "The parity and the succession of our presbyters", he explained, "I hold to be the primitive and scriptural policy. Our episcopacy of Church-courts I hold to be also in substance primitive and scriptural."
In this regard he stated that he considered the Archbishop of Canterbury "ecclesiastically and spiritually, as a co-presbyter" with himself, albeit a co-presbyter to whom the clergy of the province have "delegated the power of the synod". In the same way he held that the Lord Bishop of London was but a co-presbyter, though delegated the power of presbytery by the clergy of his diocese. "The presbyter", he stated, ".. is the scriptural and apostolic minister." He went on to define and delimit the Church in terms of this statement.

All the developments of this [the simple order of presbyter], for order and discipline, whether he meets with his co-presbyters in the presbytery, or with their consent merges and compresses the power of order in another, called the bishop, arise from the necessity and expediency of the case. The arrangement of the Church once made, however, becomes BINDING AND DIVINE. WITHOUT ONE OR OTHER OF THESE EPISCOPAL OR SUPERINTENDING AUTHORITIES, THERE IS, ECCLESIASTICALLY SPEAKING, NO CHURCH [emphasis mine].

The improvements to worship advocated by Cumming were private devotions on entering church, "like English Churchmen"; the beginning of service with a call to worship in the form "of a few appropriate versicles"; and "standing at praise, and kneeling at prayer" - something which Cumming stated was in accordance with "Scripture precedent, the usages of the primitive Church, and chief portions of the Catholic Church of this day". These changes, he argued, would
not only benefit our own devotional feelings, but would also generate among the Scotch episcopal dissenters, and the sister Churchmen of England, a more cordial feeling, and help to remove the obstacles that prevent the conformity of the former to the Church of their fore-fathers and nation, and the prejudices against our worship, which may actuate the latter.26

Cumming also advocated the use of organs and instrumental music - the "violoncello" for example;27 the frequent use of litanies in prayer - such as "the English Litany";28 the use of the Apostles' Creed "at the close of the last prayer in the service";29 and the use of a distinct and audible "amen" at "the close of each prayer".30

There can be little doubt that Cumming as the minister of the Scots Kirk in London was hard pressed by the cresting Tractarian wave. His concern for the resumption of an historical liturgy, his apology that it was English Puritans who had subverted Scottish Reformed usage, his defence of "presbyterial succession", his definition of the Church in terms of a divine "episcopal or superintending" authority, . . . must be interpreted as his defence of the Church of Scotland in the light of Tractarian principles - principles which "de-churched" both him and his congregation.

It is important to note that it was these contentions of Cumming which were re-asserted and expanded in the subsequent works of G. W. Sprott, Thomas Leishman, and their successors. The accuracy of Cumming's reading of Scottish history is relatively unimportant.31 What is highly significant is that this defence was formulated in
London around 1840 when Tractarianism was at its height, and it was subsequently assumed by members of the Church Service Society. In its programme the Church Service Society bore little resemblance to that quest for "a rational Christian worship" which had characterised Lee's programme of reform; it accepted rather Cumming's Tractarian-affected apology and programme as its pattern.

The movement towards worship reform, although started privately, soon became the interest of the whole Church. In 1849 the General Assembly approved of an overture on "Aids to Devotion". (It may be of significance that in the same year the Duke of Argyll published his treatise, *Presbytery Examined*, advocating certain reforms.) The Overture (the work of Principal Lee and Dr. Robertson) was in favour of preparing forms of service in the interests of the Highlands and Islands, and of the Colonies, where Church ministrations might be conducted under the sanction of the Church on the basis supplied by the Directory of Worship, and conformable to the practice in use in the time of the Reformation, so that Presbyterian families of a destitute neighbourhood might be enabled to join together in worship, in conformity with the usages of the Scottish Church, in prayer and praise, and the reading of Holy Scriptures.

It would appear that in the Colonies especially, the disadvantage to Scots when pitted against Englishmen with their *Book of Common Prayer* was keenly felt. As it was, the appointment of this Committee led to the Act of 1856.
which enjoined ministers to read the Scriptures in church, "which for two centuries had been ignored". In 1859, the General Assembly appointed it a "standing committee", but with the clear remit that it was to concern itself with private, not public, worship. By that point it had already prepared the volume *Prayers for Social and Family Worship* (1858), a publication which was revised and improved in 1863. The Assembly "authorised and heartily recommended the use of these prayers by Soldiers, Sailors, Emigrants, and all other persons deprived of the ordinary services of a Christian ministry".

In 1862 the Moderator of the Assembly (Dr. Bisset) commended this movement toward worship reform, and some - like James Cooper - held his speech to be the legitimisation of the early efforts, and the Church's official stamp-of-approval on the general direction being taken. In 1863, in response to public interest, the Assembly appointed a special committee "to examine into the state of worship in the Church of Scotland". Its report, received the next year, stated that although they were of the opinion that the Assembly had "the right" to lay down the laws for ministers and congregations in their methods of worship, they considered that legislative measures were "unnecessary and inexpedient". The Assembly agreed with the Report. Since no official action was to be taken, the ground was cleared for the formation of an independent agency to guide the movement: the Church Service Society was that agency.
The movement had certainly gained momentum. In 1855 Charles W. Baird, in America, issued a volume entitled *Presbyterian Liturgies*. It was republished in London in 1856, edited by Thomas Binney. In 1858 one bearing the same title was published in Scotland, anonymously, although it is attributed to Andrew R. Bonar of the Canongate. In 1847 Lee had published *A Handbook of Devotion*, and in 1857 he published his service book (new editions of which appeared in 1858 and 1863). In 1863 Sprott issued a pamphlet entitled *The Worship, Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of Scotland*, and it is to this publication in particular that George Campbell - one of the original "conspirators" - attributed the idea of forming the Church Service Society. Lee published his celebrated book, *The Reform of the Church of Scotland*, in 1864. It was a "wave" of revival, and predominantly a Tractarian-affected "wave" - not Robert Lee - that really fathered the Church Service Society.

It is of note that even in ritual "innovations", Lee was in no sense the "father" of the movement. Principal Marshall Lang, while incumbent of the East Church of St. Nicholas, Aberdeen (1856-1859), seems to have earned that dubious distinction. In one of his sermons he had referred to various acts of worship - "to the prayer of the Church as Common Prayer, and to the praise of the Church as the choral expression of its gratitude, adoration,
and love". In the process he had mentioned "that IN A CHURCH IN LONDON [emphasis mine], which was Presbyterian, so strongly had this [standing for praise] been felt by the people when put before them, that at the first act of praise after the sermon all had stood, and had continued standing ever since when engaged in that act". When Marshall Lang finished his sermon the congregation of the East Church chose to adopt the same attitude, and rose to sing; but the Presbytery quickly sat them down again. Robert Lee wrote to Marshall Lang "begging" him "not to surrender", and offering his support in any appeal. 41 But Lang did not appeal for three reasons: he thought he was too young "to be taking such a prominent position"; he thought it would hurt his work; and he though that "if fighting had to be done", he wanted to "advocate something of greater weight . . . than a mere question of postures". 42 Apparently Lee, just before his death, had come to think that Lang had "acted wisely". 43 Of importance is that here also the "ripple" from Tractarian England, most probably mediated again through Cumming's "Crown Court", London, had anticipated the Scottish innovations.

Shortly after the Church Service Society's formation in 1865, a sub-committee's report (over the signature of R. H. Story) enlarged on its aims. 44 It stated emphatically that its design was not to introduce a liturgy into the Church of Scotland, and made it clear that the Society
would not even discuss whether or not the introduction of a liturgy was "desirable and possible", or undesirable and impossible". The Society was to be literary and intellectual. It considered that liturgics formed "as rational a subject of enquiry as Homiletics or Dogmatics", and that "such study is competent to those who have time, ability, and inclination for such a line of investigation".

It stated that "the premature or ill-advised use of any of the forms that may be prepared" should not be allowed any member "in his clerical capacity, until it has received the Society's sanction or recommendation". The forms were to serve "as models of, or aids to devotion", and were not intended "to supersede what is called 'free prayer'", but were "to add richness to its language and solemnity to its worship". It made it plain that the Society's aim was not to provide a "Manual of devotions", but a "great Magazine of prayers". It said that "on the whole our plain service is suited to the constitution of our Church, and to the genius of our people, and may not be radically departed from". The model was to be "consistent" with Reformed usage, even though English usage was more easily accessible. The report stated, for example:

It might be well to remember that although our better acquaintance with England, and our readier opportunities of studying the ritual of the English Church, are apt to lead us, in any alteration, to approximate to what we consider excellent in that ritual - yet our truer model is to be found in the Reformed Churches of
the Continent, with which, in all matters of historical position, of creed, of worship, and of government, we have and ought to have a much closer affinity, than with the Episcopal communion established in the southern part of this island.

The justification for the Society's undertaking was that "every clergyman of a church which, like ours, is a national branch of the Church Catholic, is at liberty to use whatever in the recorded devotions of the Church he finds most suitable to his own congregation's need". It was an interesting position to assume, not only because of its implicit acceptance of the Oxford Movement's apologetical "national branch" theory of the Church, but also because of its acceptance of their restated "deposit of devotion" position.

In 1867 the Society issued a volume of services under the title, "Euchologion": or, Book of Prayers, being Forms of Worship issued by the Church Service Society. It is undoubtedly of significance, and must be seen as a sort of sub-conscious apology for the Church of Scotland, that this first edition carried, as an unofficial motto of the Society, the words attributed to the Archbishop of Canterbury (Grindal) in 1582: "Juxta laudabilem Ecclesiae Scotiae Reformatae formam et ritam." The book consisted of 220 pages and was divided into two sections: the first containing draft forms of service for the Sacraments, Marriage, and Funerals; the second containing a Table of Psalms and Lessons, and "Material for the construction of a service for public worship on the Lord's Day". The contents and layout conform closely to the
Society's publicly stated aims and to other such Reformed products. It was quite simply a "directory" of worship.

There was a fundamental problem with the publication, however, which was not obvious at first. It was that the worship reform movement generally, and the Society and its Euchologion in particular, were not grounded in a set of agreed doctrines. In this it was totally different to Tractarianism. Whereas the movement in England had been based on certain features and principles of Catholic doctrine deemed agreeable to - even required by - accepted Anglican standards; that in Scotland was aesthetic rather than doctrinal.

Euchologion, initially, was a Broad Church product. It was the product of an age of theological and social transition. The substance of its basal creed was "tolerance" and "progress" - the Broad Church ideal. This "school" had evidenced increasing impatience with the traditional Confessional standards; it had displayed a determined desire to conform to that which was considered to be "genteel" and "seemly". In his presidential address to the Society in 1948, Dr. Baird (St. Machar's Cathedral) gave this description of the original publication:

[Euchologion] was . . . the product of its time in a sense which cannot apply to such a book as the Anglican Book of Common Prayer. It represented no evolution. There had been almost no thought given to the outward forms of worship for almost two centuries in Scotland. It was also of necessity coloured overmuch by the influence of Anglican custom of the time. It drew very largely on Catholic and Reformation sources, but for all that it was a product of the mid-nineteenth century.46
Although the Society was generally seen as a High Church institution because of its purpose, the majority of its members were - and continued to be - of the Broad Church persuasion. Certainly there were those within its membership who desired a "Higher" form, who advocated a formal liturgy, and who were active in committee. There was, in fact, a constant tension between the two schools of High and Broad Churchmen. In 1871, for example, John Macleod (later of Govan) encouraged the Society to "contemplate the elaboration of a comprehensive ritual with more frequent church services". He said that the Church of Scotland "in her Standards practically conveyed the idea that there should be weekly Communion". He did not see why daily services should not be revived "where such a step was practicable". He stated that he would like to see "special services" prepared for "the commemoration of our Lord's Passion and various other events in the life of our Lord". Dr. Dykes of Ayr, however, representative of the Broad Church "school", said that while he sympathised with some of John Macleod's remarks, "with much he entirely differed, particularly what he said about the Communion". R. H. Story, trying to relieve the tension, reasserted that the Society was very much confined by their original programme to "the improvement of the general worship of the Church, and the provision of material for that improvement; and that they were almost expressly debarred by the general feeling of the Society from attempting that further work referred to -
viz., the provision of a positive liturgical series of services for the Church; but that question must be very carefully considered". 49

The matter smouldered for a time, finally bursting into flame in an 1880 motion to the effect that "it be referred to a committee to consider and report as to the expediency of drawing up and publishing a partial and permissive liturgy". It was withdrawn, however, after Dr. Sprott (the Chairman of the Annual Meeting) expressed doubts about the expediency of the motion, unless it was presented in more general terms. 50 Although the motion did not stand, it was indicative of the changing emphasis in the Society.

Most interestingly, James Cooper became a member of the Society in 1873. He was appointed to the Editorial Committee in 1880, 51 which was then preparing the fifth edition of Euchologion. With Cooper's personal commitment to encouraging daily service, to restoring the Christian Year, to providing for more frequent celebrations of Communion, to formalising the orders of service, to restoring a rite comparable to Confirmation, and above all, to making all prayers and forms exude Orthodox and Catholic doctrine, one might reasonably assume that changes indicative of this general orientation would betray a growing High Church ascendancy in the Committee, and bespeak Cooper's personal influence - which was always considerable.

The fifth edition was issued in 1884, and because of its length (almost 500 pages), was issued in two volumes.
The contents were grouped in three parts: the first contained the Table of Psalms and Lessons, and the orders of service for five Sundays in the month. The third part (which was bound with the first to complete the first volume) was an Appendix containing a magazine of prayers and collects in twenty sections. Part two, which itself formed the second volume, concerned itself with orders for the celebration of the Sacraments, for the admission of catechumens, for weddings and funerals, for the visitation of the sick, for the ordination and induction of ministers, for the "admission" of elders, for the laying of the foundation stone, and for the dedication of churches.

The change from the Apostles' Creed to the Nicene Creed, and the move to the *Sursum Corda* form in the service of Holy Communion, is attributable to Cooper,\(^52\) as is probably the inclusion of "The Litany" of the Church of England Prayer Book with but a single alteration.\(^53\) Other features, such as the change of sequence which placed the Celebration of Communion first in the volume containing the series of orders,\(^54\) the inclusion of orders for "the Visitation of the Sick", "the Induction of an Ordained Minister", for "Laying the Foundation-Stone of a Church", and "the Dedication of a Church", as well as the choice of the word "Admission" (instead of "Ordination") in referring to Elders, also betray a new High Church ascendance in the Committee.
The continued advance of the Society in this High Church direction - as evidenced in the preparations for the sixth edition - resulted in the Broad Church representatives issuing a "Manifesto". Dated 21st November 1888, and signed by the Rev. Principal Tulloch, Professor Allan Menzies, Dr. Honey, Dr. Donald Macleod, and some 142 others, the "Manifesto" declared that in former editions, while there was "a valuable storehouse from which materials can be drawn for the construction of services, the services already constructed in it labour under defects which make it difficult or impossible to use them".

The "Manifesto" complained that the morning and evening services of the fifth edition were "in general too doctrinal in tone and expression", and that while one of the ends of Christian worship is to "show forth the faith of the Church", that there are other ends "which must suffer if doctrinal statements and allusions are introduced unnecessarily or in too great detail". It stated that the "effort after doctrinal accuracy and completeness should not be allowed to appear so prominently as it now does, that they might thus be made more effective for the moral and spiritual ends of worship". It complained that many of the confessions as printed were "of an unreal character", that they were "statements of doctrine rather than experience". It deprecated the insertion of the Apostles' Creed in every service, and thought that its use should be left "to the option of the officiating clergyman".
It stated strongly that prayers should tend "not only to form . . . dutiful and submissive members of the Church, but to make men faithful to all the duties naturally incumbent on them . . . to encourage them to exercise their various gifts for the good of the community". It wanted worship to reflect the infusion of a Christian spirit into society; to treat the world not "purely as evil, but as the scene in which the Kingdom of God is growing up by the co-operation of all true and Christian men". It stated that in the services of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, the ordinances were connected with the benefits "too directly, in too mechanical a way". It also stated that the general order of service was capable of improvement, and that "the employment of extempore prayer should at least in one part of the service be more clearly recognised".

The "Manifesto" was but little more than an expansion of Principal Tulloch's remark to the 1882 Annual Meeting. In Assembly he had spoken against "High Presbyterians"; to the Society he now pleaded strongly against the High Church direction being followed. He said that the object of the Society was "for maintaining purity of worship in Scotland"; that their aim from the beginning had been "to restore, if possible, the original character of the service of the Scottish Church, to impart to it a truer character of devotion, more simplicity, more directness, and, in a word, more spiritualness".56
It seems clear that the Broad Church "Manifesto" with its plea for adherence to the indeterminate theology that had traditionally marked the Society, came as a severe blow to the High Churchmen. It almost certainly anticipated the creation of the Scottish Church Society in 1891, the stated purpose of which was "to defend and advance Catholic doctrine". The High Churchmen in fact, now became preoccupied with this matter of Catholicity. They did not desert their position within the Church Service Society, however. If anything, they took a more definite resolve to press the publication of the Society into some doctrinally specific Catholic shape.

The sixth edition of Euchologion, largely revised and re-cast, appeared in 1890, and showed certain changes - most notably in the position of the Creed (given permissive use after the Gospel and before the sermon), and the Intercessions (placed after the Gospel and before the sermon). The High Churchmen were now making a concerted effort to break the Broad Church position. As Chairman of the Society's Annual Meeting in 1891, John Macleod (Govan) again presented the sacramentalist theory of worship with great urgency, and this time with some effect.

Macleod said that when he first joined the Society he was "profoundly impressed . . . by the importance of the question as to the need of the celebration, according to a higher order, and more frequently, of the Holy Communion, in its relation both to the worship of the Church and to
its effective work in the world". He said that he believed that Communion is "by divine institution, the distinctive ordinance of Christian worship"; that the congregation should meet for the celebration of that rite every Lord's Day. "Any reform in the matter of worship must", he continued, "... be more or less superficial that does not touch that question." He said that he was confirmed in these convictions from his knowledge "that the restoration of Holy Communion to its proper place was in harmony with the opinion and belief of all the teachers who have been held in highest esteem in the Reformed Church of Scotland".60

In the same year, the matter was taken a step further by H. J. Wotherspoon, who pressed the High Church demand for a more definite doctrinal position. Officially, he was considering the matter of Church music, but he took the opportunity to address the whole reform movement, and - in an extended passage - to chastise the Church Service Society for their "museum"-like handling of ancient liturgical fragments. He said:

We have left the old - that was inevitable - and we have not yet assimilated the new - a good deal of it, one humbly hopes, is too indigestible to be assimilated. Tradition, custom, association, are important elements in the joy of worship ... there is a restfulness in traditional worship, which is grievously wanting in tentative worship. We have left our tradition ... and we have not fallen back on the older tradition, which, if it had been meantime possible, would have been our safest guide ... Ours is no longer the worship of those immediate puritan fathers of ours, and just as little of those remoter fathers, who worshipped in a forgotten beauty of praise. ... At present, ours is the worship of
noone else in creation - not even the next parish: for what two churches of ours have the same service on the same day? . . . We are, be it remembered, the victims of circumstances. We have walked for long in the straightest Puritanism - yet we have retained many Catholic instincts, much churchly culture and dignity of thought concerning sacred things. Close beside us the Anglican Communion has kept translating Catholicism to us, interpreting to us Catholic worship in our own language, and illustrating to us our own ideas and beliefs in the most venerable forms; continuing showing to us that pure doctrine and apostolic order are compatible with solemnity and beauty of worship; and that a Reformed Church may use all the apparatus of devotion, without compromise of its doctrinal position. . . . [We] threw ourselves upon these shores of ancient accumulation - . . . we seized on this and that, as it attracted us - bits and scraps of ritual, shreds and patches of ornament - to fix them here and there upon our service, and stitch them haphazard into our worship. . . . Our service has become like nothing in the world but a local museum, where antique fragments, beautiful in themselves, are placed in the order of discovery - along with much 'ancient and modern rubbish'. Have we not a Society [Church Service Society], embracing a good third of our clergy, which occupies itself in nothing but arranging and re-arranging its collection of fragments?

The Church Service Society, in the opinion of the High Churchmen, had failed to provide a definitive dogmatic system on which to base its publication and its programme of reform; it had not served to protect and advance the Catholic inheritance of the Scottish Church. It was this failure that had to be rectified immediately. In his address to the Annual Meeting of the Society in 1892, William Milligan, too, picked up the general theme. In a strong speech he questioned:

Will tasteful arrangements, music and flowers, pictures, embroidery and carved wood, everything in what is surely ironically characterised as 'an attractive service' long continue to avail? Things like these may be good when they are the well-regulated expressions of realities, when they are the blossoming of a tree rooted
in Divine soil and drinking the rain of heaven that cometh oft upon it; but to imagine for an instant that they can occupy the place of the most solemn revelations of what the Church believes to be the gospel of God, is to show ignorance of human wants equalled only by its insensibility to all experience." 62

In the light of these several attacks by such influential men on the indeterminate theology of Euchologion and its general preoccupation with aestheticism, it is perhaps not surprising that the next edition, the seventh edition (published in 1896), should have continued the programme of systematising the book begun in 1890. The order of service now was made to conform unashamedly to Anglican mattins by adding the Lord's Prayer to the first prayer, and by putting the great Prayer of Thanksgiving and Intercession before the sermon — in direct violation of Reformed usage and the ante-Communion format. Professor J. M. Barclay has said that this trend was attributable to the growth of an "anglicising party" in the Society after 1885 — and this was undoubtedly the case. He has said that unlike Sprott and Leishman, who knew their history, these men "were enamoured with Morning Prayer in The Book of Common Prayer, but had little liturgical knowledge; and so from their misunderstanding of Anglicanism, obscured to some extent the eucharistic norm of public worship." 63

Many, even those who had signed the "Manifesto", wanted Euchologion to look like Anglican mattins: Donald Macleod, for example, was vocal in his desire to have greater Anglican conformity. But to speak of the movement
simply as one of "anglicising" is perhaps too simplistic. It is more probable that many within the Society were concerned to "Catholicise" Euchologion. The Book of Common Prayer afforded their best known source of the Catholic liturgical heritage. R. S. Louden has said: "As 'revival Gothic', furnished more Anglicano, became the one pattern for the 'church beautiful', so too, much of the liturgical backwash of the Tractarian Movement was uncritically accepted into the Scottish Church."64 Undoubtedly there were those who simply wanted a pretty "English" building, but in most cases Gothic Revival architecture was copied not only because it was English, but also because the Tractarian Movement had "proved" that Gothic represented the height of Catholic aspiration; it had identified Gothic with the true Catholic spirit. It is probable that in the same way there were those who thought that the Catholic inheritance in the English liturgy could be used to good effect in the Scottish Church, more especially in a day of waning orthodoxy. As the Tractarian definition regarding acceptable architecture was generally accepted, so too its definition of Catholicity, and Antiquity, and even - to some extent - its definition of Apostolicity through an unbroken manual succession of imposition of hands at Ordination, became accepted into the Scottish Church. The English ideal was accepted because of its inherent Catholicism, its effectual pietism.

That there were other factors aiding this process is undeniable. Greater interaction with England, extensive
travel, common papers and journals - helped to familiarise Scots with English forms. The continuing secession of the gentry to Scottish Episcopacy must have helped. So too the apprehension felt by many of the "Fathers" in the Kirk that the Church of England was soon to become the Church of the Empire - given credence no doubt by the increasingly international character and the inflated claims of successive Lambeth Conferences - made many consider Anglicanism anew. Many things, in fact, were contributing to making Scotland consider seriously the English Church and her Prayer Book. But even conceding these forces, it does not necessarily follow that those who chose to adopt the English inheritance of Catholic tradition as formalised in the Prayer Book were "Anglicisers".

Whatever the reasons, it is clear that Euchologion was made to conform to Anglican mattins in its basic service. Although it provided the publication with a Catholic doctrinal system, it had the effect of confusing still further the troubled relation between Scottish Reformed polity and its liturgical expression.

It is probably true that the Church Service Society and its Euchologion (to quote one author) "did more than anything else to establish the norm of Church of Scotland worship in Victorian and Edwardian days". It is certainly true that whereas in 1865, when the Society was formed,
there had been a remarkable uniformity in use and wont in the Scottish Church, by the end of the century there was extraordinary divergence and confusion,66 and that also because of Euchologion primarily. It is important to realise that by 1896, more than 10,500 copies of Euchologion had been printed.67 The several editions of Euchologion had had the effect of encouraging and legitimising private amateur liturgical composition - much of it, to quote Dr. A. K. Robertson, "too ambitious, too ponderously formal, too fanciful"; often "divorced from the realities of the prevailing worship".68 Euchologion not only served to undermine the quality of extempore prayer, but it also failed to provide an acceptable formal substitute.

Dr. Scott, in his speech in the General Assembly on the Barnhill Case (1902), gave formal expression to the opinion of many when he said:

In regard to prayers, the Church had manifested a wise tolerance of the conduct of its ministers in the ordering of the services of public worship. They were free to study those manuals of devotion which belonged to other churches, but they were not free to 'crib' them. Manufactured prayers that were put together by a scissors-and-paste process out of liturgies, ancient or modern, were useless in the worship of the Church of Scotland.69

It was clear that by this point the initial Broad Church concept of providing a "Magazine of devotion" based upon the example of Reformed "directories" had been subverted into being a type of liturgy: an individualistic "Manual of devotion" based loosely upon the English model.
Some ministers took the book into the pulpit with them, and read the prayers word for word; others patched together services from various ancient bits. But it was just as Dr. Lee had said - like a Lazarus eager for the crumbs from the table of a rich neighbour.

The publication, *Euchologion*, was well meant, and was useful in bringing about a due concern for the formal act of worship; it brought a certain decorum to Scottish worship. But its later editions, in particular, fostered an improper understanding of the nature and meaning of Reformed worship, and encouraged a faulty reading of Scottish history as related to worship and service-books. Editions six to ten of *Euchologion* (1890-1919) bear witness to an open and unashamed programme of "Catholisation" by "Anglicisation" in the Church of Scotland, and Cumming's original "apology" was used to justify and extend this quest.

In this approach not only was the relation of Reformed doctrine and worship lost sight of, but also an inappropriate doctrinal position was advanced. Lee's initial ideal of a rational Christian worship, free from both obtrusive dogmatism and archaic forms, was bold, and geared to the exigencies of a Liberal age; but the Church Service Society, though committed to Broad Church reform and freedom of thought, would not forsake the gentility of the archaic forms of Catholic Tradition. It was obvious that doctrinal confusion would attend their programme of worship reform: the indeterminate doctrine was bound to
be unacceptable to the consistent Liberal no less than to the convinced High Churchman. Acceptance of the Anglican pattern in later editions of Euchologion helped to solve the doctrinal confusion, but its Catholicity proved to be specifically Tractarian defined and identified. It represented the beginning of a subtle programme of Tractarian reform in the Church of Scotland.
PART III

EMERGENT SCOTO-CATHOLICISM
CHAPTER V

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SCOTO-CATHOLIC DOGMA

In 1882, the Scottish High Churchmen were expressing grave concern for the integrity of the Church, not dissimilar to that of a few Oxford High Churchmen of almost fifty years previous. The same features were prevalent: rampant Liberalism; secularism; disestablishmentarianism. The Education Act of 1872 had removed from the Church her traditional role in the education of the young. The abolition of Patronage in 1874 had opened the pulpits to popular preachers. The press toward disestablishment seemed politically irresistible. Liberalism was in the ascendancy. Unlike the anti-establishment Philosophic Radicalism of the Reform era, Liberalism was now trying to present itself more and more as a form of socialism. There was current a suspicion of traditional standards. The movement that had sought the abolition of Patronage to secure spiritual independence in the matter of electing a minister, now sought to obtain spiritual independence in the matter of creed. That the Confession was fixed immutably in an Act of Parliament seemed the height of Erastianism. Increasingly "Establishment" was being interpreted as nothing more than a national recognition of religion; an appreciation of Christianity as a great instrument of social regeneration.
The age of theological transition and dogmatic agnosticism caught everyone unprepared. Until recently the largest stone thrown at the Church of Scotland by her opponents was that she openly countenanced heretics within her Communion. That she was the Church of Caird and Tulloch, Norman Macleod and Robert Lee, seemed to say everything. Now the Free Church found herself possessed by Robertson Smith, Professor Bruce, and Professor Dods. The stone of heresy could no longer be thrown at the Establishment with any strength of conviction. There were movements toward reunion. The old battle over the "Headship of Christ" and the "Divine Rights of the Redeemer" faded into history proportionately as the Broad confession of the "Fatherhood of God" gained currency. With true "spiritual independence" in hand, there was no reason for the breach of the Disruption not being healed. Simultaneously there was a movement toward a more ordered and aesthetic form of worship, and this cut across all denominational lines.

Scoto-Catholicism emerged, even as Oxfordism had, to provide some sound thinking in a perplexed age. Its primary concern was not to undermine the newfound implications of the doctrine of the "Fatherhood of God", but to reassert the doctrine that was becoming obscured because of it - the doctrine of the "Majesty of God". Its faith was simply that of the early Church as formalised in the Creeds. Its programme was to defend and advance a Catholic interpretation of the Church, the Ministry, and
the Sacraments. With the Press everywhere paying homage to fifty years of the Oxford Movement, it is hardly surprising that some should see in the contemporary situation the same problems, and should seek to solve them in the same way. A survey of English religion on the eve of the Oxford Movement revealed some striking similarities; perhaps a similar approach would be as effective. And besides, the move toward Presbyterian reunion would, at best, be on a Broad Church Liberal basis; if this could not be arrested, it had to be extended to include Scottish Episcopacy, where High Church doctrine and traditional dogma were now jealously guarded. Somehow the ministers of the Church of Scotland had to be reminded of the High Reformation doctrines on the Church, the Ministry, the Sacraments; they had to be reminded of their Apostolic descent and faith; they had to be made aware that the Church of Scotland is not only the National Branch of the Catholic Church, but is also the Church continuing from the first Apostolic mission to Scotland; they had to be exhorted to stir up the faith that had been delivered to them in their Baptism, and to honour their vows.

It could be said with good justification that G. W. Sprott's book, The Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland, published in 1882, was "The Christian Year" of the Scoto-Catholic movement. Dr. A. K. Robertson has
said that this volume proved to be "a beacon light in a day when Scottish churchmen were forsaking the old and groping to find the new path in the practical concerns of the Ministry of Word and Sacrament." Sprott's book may not have reawakened a sense of Catholic devotion or rekindled piety in the same way that Keble's poetry undoubtedly did, but it served none-the-less to prepare the ground for a revival of Church principles in the Scottish Church on the basis of her historic continuity.

The analogy could be continued, for in some ways Professor William Milligan's Moderatorial Address of the same year was the "Assize Sermon" that fired the imagination of a young romantic visionary of rather extraordinary faith and piety, a young Newman if you will, one James Cooper. Milligan was no Keble, however, and his address savoured more of the deep theological presence associated with Pusey. Milligan was the first theologian of the movement; his learning was profound, his vision unimpeded by national prejudices. Cooper, like Newman, was young and full of ideas, a medievalist with an acute distrust of Liberalism in any form. Indefatigable in action, undaunted by opposition, decided in his views as Cooper was, yet his allegiance to the Scottish Church, not unlike that of Newman's to the English Church, was essentially conditional; conditional upon her being a true branch of the Catholic Church.

The analogy is far from perfect, but there are some curious features that bear rethinking. Sprott (1829-1909)
for example, like Keble, was really unaware of the profound implications of his writings, and the use to which they could be put to legitimise and extend a movement that could have proved subversive to that which he wanted to protect - Presbytery. He provided a "Golden Age", a noble ideal, a historical precedent and warrant for a radically different ecclesiastical system and structure. He himself was a convinced Presbyterian, even as Keble was a convinced Anglican. Sprott probably even echoed Keble's sentiments that even if the National Church were to fail, it would still be found in his Parish. His allegiance to the Scottish Church was not conditional upon any specific feature of ecclesiastical polity. His faith in her remained unshaken, for example, when the Assembly of 1882 failed to accept his high view of Ministerial Orders and Apostolic Succession.¹³

Sprott was a serious and reputable scholar, even though as Dr. Robertson has pointed out, he, "like so many within Presbyterianism who have taken upon themselves to give guidance on pastoral theology, ... does not always give good authority for what he says".¹⁴ Sprott was content to work and study in his small parish with few practical evidences of his particular ecclesiastical orientation; there was no "North Berwick Case" similar to that of Duns,¹⁵ the East Church, or Barnhill, cases that marked John Macleod, James Cooper, and T. N. Adamson respectively. And yet for some fifty years Sprott was to exercise "greater influence than any other single individual
upon . . . the form and content of the prayers used in the Divine Service".\textsuperscript{16} It is noteworthy that in his work, Sprott consistently and rigidly excluded anything "which could not be fitted into the doctrine and form of worship of the Church of Scotland as established by law".\textsuperscript{17} He believed that the Church of Scotland's form of worship was inferior to what it had been in her "Golden Age", and he publicised this belief. Constantly he endeavoured to defend the Church's position as a true branch of the Catholic Church, "inveighing against the sin of heresy at a time when, amid the exuberant life of Presbyterian Dissent, all too few saw it as a sin at all, and working for Christian unity on sound doctrinal principles".\textsuperscript{18} He lamented the loss of Irving, and thought that he could have corrected the Zwinglian notions of the Sacraments, restored the authority of the ministry, and helped to eliminate from the Scottish Church the "hard austerity of a Calvinism which is not Calvin's".\textsuperscript{19} Sprott laboured to show that the Church of Scotland's Ministry and Sacraments are fully valid in the light of Scripture and in accord with the teaching of the Primitive Church. He tried to recover a right understanding of grace in the Sacraments and in ordination, but resisted both the exclusive claims of Anglo-Catholicism and the Congregationalist alternative. Sprott was of the old school of Reformed High Churchmen.
Sprott was far from being alone, however, and the dedication of his book, *Worship and Offices*, bore witness to another. It read:

To the Rev. William Milligan, D.D., Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism in the University of Aberdeen, Convenor of the Committee of the Church of Scotland on Pastoral Theology, and Moderator Designate of the General Assembly; Who in a time of unbelief, schism, and confusion, has witnessed for Catholic Truth, Unity, and Worship...20

Milligan (1821-1893) was the Pusey of the movement; he supplied the theological scholarship. As a student he had spent a year in Germany (1845), and there he had made the acquaintance of Neander, to him a "kindred spirit". In politics he was a Liberal, in scholarship a mild Broad Churchman. Cooper (in his article on Milligan in the *Dictionary of National Biography*) apologised for this in these words:

Although in his earlier days his humanitarian feelings, and his enthusiasm for liberty and progress, had allied him with those who were then called broad churchmen, Milligan did not have at any period of his career the slightest sympathy for the disregard for doctrine which has sometimes marked the members of that school. Ultimately he ranged himself with high churchmen, being, he declared, impelled to join them by increased study of the New Testament. Cooper might well have added, "and increased exposure to Anglican scholars", for in 1870 Milligan had joined the committee formed for the revision of the English New Testament. Leishman has said that "[Milligan's] eyes [were]...opened to higher things, chiefly by contact with scholars in the Bible Revision Committee at
Cooper says that Milligan derived his doctrine of the Church from his study on the Epistle to the Ephesians, and his views on the Sacraments from St. John, of whom he was "a lifelong student and diligent expositor", but certainly his Westminster contacts must have helped.

In 1879 Milligan wrote an important article on "Ephesians", but it was in 1881 and even more in 1882 (the year he was the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland), with his publications The Resurrection of our Lord, and "Commentary on St. John" (in conjunction with Dr. W. F. Moulton), that his theological position became clearly articulated. In 1883 he added his "Commentary on the Revelation" and Discussions on the Apocalypse, in 1886 the Baird Lectures - The Revelation of St. John, in 1887 "Elijah", in 1890 The Resurrection of the Dead, and in 1892 his opus maximus, The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord.

Milligan's work came at a most important point in the history of the Scottish Church, and his significance is well summarised in John Macleod's witty quip: "There was a man sent from God, and his name was 'Milligan'."

Milligan was extremely active in the service of the Church, not only through the Chair of Biblical Criticism at Aberdeen, to which he was appointed in 1860, but also as Depute Clerk of the General Assembly from 1875 to 1886, and thereafter as Principal Clerk.
The Church of Scotland had traditionally placed emphasis on the kingly and prophetic offices of Christ; kingly in the sense of Divine Right claims over those of the State; prophetic in the sense that preaching the Word formed the locus of worship. Milligan sought to restore an awareness of Christ's other office, that of His Priesthood. Milligan held that it was in the office of Priest that Christ mediates between man and God;\textsuperscript{38} that His work of Atonement has to do with the Resurrection and the Ascension - the culmination of Christ's work. Milligan extended his stress on the person and life of Christ as heavenly High Priest to encompass the priesthood of the Church as one with whom He shares His life and ministry.\textsuperscript{39} The Church of Scotland in rejecting clerical priesthood had, to Milligan's mind, neglected the Church's priesthood, and in this she was failing.

Milligan appears to have built upon McLeod Campbell's *The Nature of the Atonement*,\textsuperscript{40} for like him he emphasised the life of Christ as man, in His offering of Himself to the Father. The Atonement had to be linked first to the Incarnation, and then to the Sonship and Priesthood of Christ.\textsuperscript{41} The Atonement could not be treated merely as penal substitution - it had to encompass Christ as representative as well as substitute;\textsuperscript{42} its essence had to be not in His death and physical suffering, but in the surrender of His will to God.\textsuperscript{43} The Incarnation was the beginning of a new relationship between God and man - a relationship continuing in the work of Christ as Priest.\textsuperscript{44}
The point of the Incarnation was not to provide an expiatory victim, but "to bring us into a state of perfect union with the Father of our Spirits, and so introduce into our weak human nature the strength of the Divine nature, that . . . we might receive the right to become children of God". The Resurrection and Ascension complete the Incarnation, for the basis of Christ's present work as Priest involves His person as God and man - His manhood having passed through death. The offering was not of His death, but of His life that had passed through death. Christ's offering to the Father continues a life of perfect obedience, suffering and humiliation - a perfect sacrifice of life passed through death. Christ's work as Priest, therefore, not only involves intercession, but also His eternal offering of Himself in Heaven. This understanding was Milligan's most important contribution to theology. In that Christ had shared the whole of human experience, the whole of it had been renewed in Him, and is presented as a perfect offering of life to the Father. The Holy Spirit is the agent of our union with this self-offering of Christ; with His person and present life. On the basis of the Atonement made by Christ, the Holy Spirit now lives in human life to penetrate and to transform it into the likeness of Christ.

Union with Christ by the Spirit was the very heart of Milligan's theology, and was for him the central doctrine of the New Testament. It is this union effected by the Holy Spirit which makes the person and work of Christ, the
heavenly High Priest, the source and life of the work and worship of the Church upon earth. In this work the Church is even more than "an extension of the Incarnation". Milligan said: "If the Son's primary office is priestly, then the Church is to re-present the Son primarily in a priestly character." The Church is united to Christ to share His priestly life and work, to be the channel through which He sends His Spirit into the world. The Church's priestly character is that of Christ himself, and is not her own. It is in Christ's priesthood that the Church is called to live and minister. Those who are called to the Ministry within the Church, concentrate in themselves, for the sake of order, the priestly functions of the Church; their ministry is priestly in that it shares in the universal priesthood of the Church. But their uniqueness is not this sharing in the priesthood, it is in their being "servants of the priesthood".

The implications of Milligan's theology on the Church's worship were tremendous. As he said:

Multitudes regard the Christian sanctuary as a place in which, if they have not to be converted, they have at best simply to receive instruction. It does not occur to them that there is something strange in receiving the same instruction for fifty years, or even for a life-time, in 'ever learning, yet never being able to come to the knowledge of the truth'.

Milligan held that worship had to be related to Christ in His risen and ascended state; to His present self-offering to the Father. He said that the Church's worship is a
repetition on earth of all that is involved in Christ's presentation of Himself in heaven as a continual oblation. 58

Milligan said an elemental characteristic of the Church's worship should be joy in her Risen Lord and praise lifted up to Him; that the Sursum Corda is the true spirit of traditional liturgy, 59 for in it one is led to the thought of the glorified Redeemer, and praise flows naturally.

The low dull tone so often marking our Public Worship has never been the tone of any Christian liturgy. Nothing strikes one sooner than the absence of confessions except on special days or seasons of penitence. The service of the Church was almost exclusively joyous. . . . It was one chant, culminating in the Eucharist, the peculiar sacrifice of thanksgiving. It was one effort to 'set forth God's most worthy praise' when the Church forgot for a moment her own necessities in contemplating the love which passeth knowledge. 60

In this regard Milligan noted that extemporaneous prayer, however fervent and however tasteful, can never be the Church's voice in worship. He wrote:

We can never hear in it those common utterances that, sanctified by centuries of Christian usage, proclaim the faith and hope and love of ten thousand times ten thousand souls, which, amidst all the varieties of their outward condition, have been really one. 61

Milligan argued that the Church lives her life in her Lord, and that the blessing of His glorified condition is known most significantly in the Lord's Supper. 62 It should, therefore, have a central place in the life, work, and worship of the Church. In the Lord's Supper the Church is presented to the Father in the one self-offering of Christ; in it the Church remembers not just
Milligan said that the Sacraments were channels of Christ's grace in that they provide assurance of salvation—of what He has accomplished for us. Christ is in the Sacraments in an objective way to seal engrafting into Himself; to seal remission of sin, regeneration, adoption, and resurrection; but not in any *ex opere operato* sense, for that can only flow from a dead victim. Worship of the Living Lord abolishes and guards against any such identification.

Milligan's Moderatorial Address of 1882, published as *The Present Position and Duty of the Church of Scotland*, was in keeping with this theological position. According to Cooper, "his address . . . was notable for its declaration that, in any scheme for church reunion in Scotland, the Scottish Episcopalians must be considered; while its enunciation of doctrine concerning the church called forth the warm approval of Canon Liddon, who wrote and thanked him for it". (In Cooper's mind there could have been no finer laudation than this!) The Address was a bold and inspiring call for visible unity of the Churches in Scotland; something which, to Milligan's mind, was demanded by the very nature of a common priesthood shared in the Body of the Risen Lord. Through union with Him by the Holy Spirit, the Church exhibits Him to the world. As He is One, so the Church is one. For Milligan, incarnate union is a visible union, a reconciled and reconciling union; the unity of the Church must, like its paradigm,
be a visible unity in some "appreciable sense". Bishop Wordsworth, a fellow member with Milligan of the Bible Revision Committee, was also a vocal proponent of this position.

Cooper in a letter wrote:

I am so glad you liked Dr. Milligan's closing Address; I was very proud of him and of it. How far some of those who applauded him understood or agreed with what he said, I do not know, but the effect of his utterance is not likely to pass away soon. And those of us who are longing for reunion in Scotland have been greatly cheered by (I think I may say almost) all the utterances of Scottish Episcopalians, who have received Dr. Milligan's words about them in a very cordial manner.68

According to Cooper, Archbishop Benson (Canterbury) told Milligan in May, 1883, in private, that he was quite prepared to acknowledge the "Orders" of the Church of Scotland, but she would need to accept for the future a modified Episcopacy.69 On the basis of this Cooper suggested to Dr. Sprott that they should form a Scottish Reconciliation Society; that the time was ripe for movement in this direction.70 Sprott was probably less than enthusiastic about Cooper's proposal, for nothing more is heard of it.

In July, 1883, The Catholic Presbyterian71 magazine took Milligan to task for having said in the General Assembly of that year that he looked "with suspicion" on the "Pan-Presbyterian Council". It suggested that the reason was that it was "too Presbyterian for his taste", especially in the light of his Moderatorial Address. "We are Presbyterian by conviction", said the Magazine,
and we can conceive no greater evil to the northern part of the island than that any of its [Presbyterian] Churches... should relax its hold of what is really strong and scriptural in its Presbyterianism, for the sake of alliance with the Church of England."^72

Milligan's response was clear. ^73 "The Christian Church is weakened", he said, "and the Christian religion is dishonoured, by our divisions to an extent unfitting us for the simple and earnest discharge of our most sacred duties, and depriving us of that fulness of blessing from the Great Head of the Church which might otherwise be ours." He said that the thought of Christianity, as a positive revelation from God, was dying out, because contentions had "defaced and prostrated in the dust that Church of Christ to which our Lord committed the guardianship of His truth, and which He commissioned, in one form or another of visible unity, to be the messenger of His mercy to men". Milligan held that Church union across denominational lines within a nation was far more ecumenical than any trans-national denominational unions and that the union of which he spoke was with the Episcopal Church in Scotland, not with the Church of England. He said that the slogan, "Scotland for the Presbyterians", was to his mind without principle; the only one acceptable was, "Scotland for the Church of Christ". He said that while he was thoroughly and truly loyal to the system in which he was a minister, that he yet believed there might be a "higher and better state of things to which a large and
generous Christian combination" might gradually bring them.

Bishop Wordsworth read Milligan's words with great enthusiasm; so much so that in his Charge to his clergy he advocated that "a Scottish Church Union Committee" be formed of Presbyterians and Episcopalians. Milligan became active in this plan, not only with Wordsworth, but more especially with Wordsworth's successor in the see of St. Andrews, Bishop Wilkinson. Neither of these Episcopalian representatives, however, were prepared to see Episcopacy as of the bene esse (or with Dean Ramsay, the optima esse). Oxford had taught them that it was of the esse, and in such a definition there was no place for "modified" Episcopacy.

Sprott wrote with Keble's influence, Milligan sounded the call and wrote the theological "Tracts", but it was James Cooper who popularised the position. Sprott was Presbyterian by conviction; so was Milligan, even though he was pressing for a still higher and better representation of the Christian vocation. Cooper was quite different from Sprott in that he was no lover of Presbytery, but was faithful to the Church of Scotland; he was different from Milligan in that he had more of an historical than a theological bent, even though Milligan admitted receiving valuable hints from Cooper for his book on the "Ascension". But it was on the matter of Churchmanship
that Cooper and Milligan disagreed fundamentally, for they looked quite differently upon the institutions of Christianity. Perhaps this is where the "Newman" is seen most clearly in Cooper - in the conditional institutional allegiance. It explains why he was so willing to accept the principles and ideals of the Oxford Movement himself, and so eager to impress them upon the Church of Scotland in some practical way. Cooper was the most significant individual in the Scoto-Catholic drive to approximate late Victorian Anglicanism because of his unremitting quest for the true institution - the "true branch" of the Church Catholic in Scotland.
CHAPTER VI

JAMES COOPER

PART I - HIS LIFE AND FORMATIVE INFLUENCES

The emergent Scoto-Catholicism within the Church of Scotland became popularly identified with James Cooper (1846-1922), not only because of his ardent devotion to, and unceasing labours in, this particular cause, nor simply because of his wide breadth of learning in the fields of liturgy, ecclesiology, and Scottish Church history; but more especially because of his unique vision of a "higher" and "purer" Church of Scotland. It was the "East Church Case" which first brought Cooper into prominence. According to his enthusiastic and ever-loyal biographer, H. J. Wotherspoon, Cooper, in the East Church Case,

... recalled the Church's attention to certain aspects of its teaching which were in danger of passing from recollection; he... elicited emphatic repudiation of Zwinglianism; he... vindicated a place for his school of thought within the Church's ambit.1

A more recent researcher, D. M. Murray, has said that "The outcome of the East Church Case was of the greatest significance for the high church movement in the Church of Scotland";2 that "the case was... a test of orthodoxy of the principles which were later to be embodied in the
constitution of the Scottish Church Society";\(^3\) that the East Church Case was "a vindication of the principles of the high church movement as part of the tradition of the Church of Scotland".\(^4\)

The relative truth of these statements is but a secondary matter; of greatest moment is that the East Church Case was seen to be a vindication of orthodoxy, and was hailed by the emerging High Church Presbyterians as the vindication of their particular doctrinal orientation within the Church of Scotland. Consideration of the Case is important, therefore, to see not only what was the nature of Cooper's statement and the meaning that was intended to attach to the Presbytery's deliverance, but also whether Scoto-Catholic doctrine, even at this early stage of development, was determined to be within the Reformed tradition. Prior to such a consideration, however, it is important to see if Cooper himself, or his movement generally, bore the marks of the Oxford Movement, or evidenced a purposed practical approximation to Anglicanism.

The beginning of Cooper's uncompleted autobiography, (begun in his later years), provides some important glimpses into his personality and into his reasons for accepting the Catholic principles and ideals as restated by the Oxford Movement.\(^5\) He wrote: "I claim a patriot's right to censure where censure is deserved, to advocate desirable reforms,
and as a teacher to labour in the weary task of at least trying to correct the hoary misrepresentations of our ecclesiastical history especially, which still appears in our popular manuals."  

He wrote that on his reminiscing on Scotland's "age-long fight for freedom" he had to confess realisation of "the immense ruin and the unutterable sins and miseries which those same wars involved; and I bless God", he continued,

for the happy union in which His gracious providence has long since bound the two realms of our island in a United Kingdom more secure and greater than either nation could ever have attained to be itself alone. Of the two members in this indissoluble partnership, so beneficial to both, Scotland has unquestionably been the greater gainer; while its accomplishment came in such a manner as to hurt the susceptibilities of neither. . . . James VI and I strove to unite the two Parliaments and thus to enable Scotland to share in the trade of England. He did manage to get the two national Churches to agree in a settlement that gave to the Church of Scotland twenty-five years of greater progress than any single quarter of a century has done since. . . . With the unanimous consent of a General Assembly held at Glasgow in 1610 . . . the Church of Scotland obtained an Episcopate canonical yet subject in matters spiritual to her General Assembly, and was brought into full Communion and cordial fellowship with the Church of England. . . . Charles would have given us further a noble Liturgy of Scottish compilation - that of 1637, . . . but unfortunately . . . these merits were for a time obliterated and their authors execrated instead of blessed.7

This, in brief, well summarises the life of Cooper, for it was spent largely in the cause of restoring "both these benefits". Jacobitism was in Cooper's very bones.

Cooper was reared in the shadow of Elgin Cathedral, and this fact seems to have loomed large over his entire intellectual and spiritual development. Cooper said that
he was a Lowlander of Morayshire, "stamped" in his religious sympathies by that which gave the district "its chief distinction . . . Elgin Cathedral and the Priory of Pluscarden", and this even though both lay in ruins. "It was not for the sake of Art that Elgin Cathedral was built", he wrote, "it was reared . . . for the glory of God, and for the amplification and more honourable fulfilment of His appointed worship; and the strongest admonition that its ruins read to me . . . is . . . of how miserably our Reformed Church has failed in regard to Worship." He was emphatic on the implications of this lesson: "Whatever else may be the duty of a Scottish Minister, he must aim at reviving the spirit of worship; this . . ., I may say without boasting, I have laboured through my whole ministry to do."

"Puritan I never was", Cooper wrote; "I think they deprived the Church's worship of that glory and beauty for which God provided at the erection of the Tabernacle, and which he has impressed on every whit of His great Temple of the Universe." Cooper said that he disliked the Puritan "temper", and their characteristic theology - which "concentrated too much on the subjective peace of the saved rather than on the objective glory of the Saviour". "I cannot but feel that they were by no means trustworthy as guardians of the Faith once for all delivered to the Saints", he wrote. According to Cooper, it was from the Puritans of the seventeenth century that the Scottish Church had learned to "scruple" nearly every
Catholic practice she had retained. "It was they who led the Arianising movement in England in the beginning of the eighteenth century", he summarised; "it was mostly their congregations there that turned Unitarian, while it was from them . . . that these deadly heresies invaded the West of Scotland."  

Cooper stated that he favoured the provisions of the "Five Articles of Perth", and this because he knew "through long pastoral experience, their great spiritual value". He thought that the Scottish bishops had been right to press for "a Prayer Book on the lines of that of England", and it is not surprising, therefore, that it was Cooper who undertook to edit the Church Service Society's republication of "Laud's Liturgy" in 1901, and that on his own motion.  

"I could not have signed either the National Covenant of 1637, or the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643", wrote Cooper, and he reasserted that he thought the Solemn League was a "dreadful compact".  

The last portion written of this autobiography deals with Cooper's hope that the introduction of the paraphrases and hymns, and the revival of sound doctrine - especially that regarding Ordination, the Ministry, and the Sacraments - would avail to strengthen the Church of Scotland. He gives his own apology for a ministry spent in the Church of Scotland:
I venture to think that a man is justified, if, out of piety to his own Spiritual Mother, he stays in the Church of his baptism (provided of course that it is sound in the fundamentals of the Faith); and if he does his best to improve it, and to teach it to recognise that it is not an independent whole, entitled to do as it pleases, but is at best only a part of the One Body, with the whole of which it ought to live in brotherly love, and mutual service to God and man.  

Cooper was no lover of Scottish Presbyterianism; continually he admired the English Church as identified by the Tractarians. The reasons for his Anglican orientation and his acceptance of Tractarian principles and ideals can be found in his upbringing, his romantic nature, and his education at Aberdeen University. Cooper was born three years after the "Disruption". His father, though Church of Scotland, had - on his maternal side - come from a long line of Scottish Episcopalians, and the love for the Book of Common Prayer indoctrinated in him, he communicated to his son, James. Cooper's mother was always very close to her son, and he remained a most devoted son until her death. It may be significant that early in life he was taught the Lord's Prayer and the Creed by his devout old Roman Catholic nurse, and that the family as a whole looked favourably on the Episcopal Church. When there was no evening service in the Parish Church, for example, the family attended the local Episcopal Chapel. It was there that James Cooper became familiar with the Anglican Liturgy. Cooper was
not very strong in his youth, and instead of sports, he
took a keen interest in flowers and birds, and reading
became his great pastime - especially the works of Sir
Walter Scott.

Cooper went to Marischal College for his under­
graduate work in 1863, and although he did well in Latin
and Greek, the four years he spent there were otherwise
undistinguished. Even at this point, however, it was
remarked that he possessed a wealth of literary and
historical "lore", and that he loved the beautiful,
venerated the antique, and sympathised with the romantic. 22
Wotherspoon has said that while still a student "he had
arrived at convictions on theological questions which he
never afterwards saw reason to depart from or to modify". 23

In 1867 Cooper entered upon his divinity studies at
King's College, Aberdeen, and it was there, principally
under the formative influence of Professor William Milligan,
that he matured. In Milligan, says Wotherspoon, Cooper
found "a teacher and a man literally after his own heart,
while in Cooper the teacher had a pupil who became a dear
and intimate friend". 24 The two, according to Wotherspoon,
had mutual debts: Cooper to Milligan for High theological
truths and encouragement; Milligan to Cooper for helping
to clarify and develop his apprehension of Christian
doctrine. This theological and personal interaction
between Cooper and Milligan was fundamental to the sub­
sequent growth of Scoto-Catholicism.
Cooper's diaries of this period are filled with references to the books he was reading, and the people and events that were bearing on the formation of his doctrinal and practical orientation. He refers to Liddon's "Bampton Lectures" on our Lord's Divinity as "most excellent". Matthew Arnold's poems he notes are "pretty but deeply tinged with that liberalism which consists in deprecating doctrine for the sake of feeling - a reaction necessary in many respects, but still one, I am sure, of greatest danger". He commends Milligan in one entry for starting to consider Clement of Rome's first epistle to the Corinthians, for - he notes - "I am pretty sure most of our Scottish ministers know too little about the Fathers, otherwise they wouldn't run them down so much". He is often thereafter found reading the works of St. Augustine, St. Anselm, St. Jerome, Clement and others of the Fathers and Doctors of the early Church.

Of his professors, Dr. Pirie, in the Chair of Church History, seems to have been most repugnant to Cooper. Extremely liberal in his views, Pirie earned this note in Cooper's diary: "notwithstanding Dr. Pirie's honesty as a man, I can't trust him as a Divine nor as a Churchman: his views of the Sacraments are almost those of a Socinian: as a Churchman he is a liberal of the coarsest [changed from "worst"] type". In the 1869 General Assembly Dr. Pirie motioned against Patronage. Cooper referred to this as a "suicidal proposal".
Alas for a church ruled by ministers ambitious of popular applause. The last cord that bound the people and the nobility of Scotland together in religious matters has been snapped, and the church inaugurates a revolution! Were I to consult my own pleasure alone I should leave the church for that of England today: there is now no prospect of healing the breach between the Episcopal Church and us: Presbyterianism cuts us off from all the past church of Europe. 30

Cooper's reference to his being bound to something beyond his "own pleasure alone", seems to refer to the decision he had taken in 1867, shortly after entering King's College. At that time he had formulated his "Reasons for entering the Ministry of the Church of England in preference to that of the Church of Scotland", and the opposite. 31 It is clear from all records of the period that his love of, and attachment to the English Establishment was growing irresistible, and that he was becoming increasingly troubled by the state and character of the Scottish Church. Things listed in favour of the Church of England were her Episcopal form of government, which he considered to be "as agreeable to Scripture as Presbyterianism, as more expedient, as more likely to be the primitive, and also as more Catholic"; the awareness that he could not swear to uphold Presbyterianism and not push for the adoption of Episcopacy; her Liturgy, and forms for the administration of the Sacraments, etc.; her more definite statements on certain Catholic doctrines - such as Apostolic Succession, and her practice of certain Catholic rites - such as Confirmation; her adherence to the Christian Year; her frequent Communions; and her
romantic history, which demanded Cooper's love and sympathies. Also listed, but erased, was: "That I positively disapprove of certain practices (which are not conform[able] even to the Church of Scotland's laws) which are carried on without let or hindrance." Under "Reasons for not leaving the Scottish Church", Cooper had listed that the difference on all important points of doctrine is negligible; that given time the Scottish Church might adopt frequent Communions and the Christian Year; that he was already a member of the Church of Scotland; that even in the Church of England the law of the Church is often broken with impunity; that the Church of Scotland was the Establishment and he was a Scot; and that "the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession may be held (in a modified form) in the Scottish Church".

The reasoning on the points he considers is clear and represents a mature consciousness of the ministerial vocation; but one is left wondering what "positive" features Cooper saw in the Scottish Church besides her legal establishment. His acceptance of the Scottish Church is that of resignation to "Divine Providence"; his vocation quite simply that of making the Scottish Church resemble that of England - at least that of England as interpreted by the "Puseyites", and not by Lord Shaftesbury, or Thomas Arnold, or Charles Kingsley, or Dean Stanley. An awareness of the depth of conviction held by Cooper in this matter is fundamental to any understanding of the subsequent Scoto-Catholic drive
associated with him. Oxfordism represented practically the romantic idealism of Sir Walter Scott — Cooper's literary hero. It is hardly surprising that one of Cooper's temperament and susceptibilities should be captivated by its mystical medievalism. The remaining years of his divinity course at Aberdeen merely served to confirm him in this vocation - his mission to reform the Church of Scotland, and to press toward union with Scottish Episcopacy and the Church of England.

While still at King's College, Cooper was anxious for re-union projects, especially that involving Scottish Episcopacy. In 1868 he proposed setting up a Church Union Society for students and ministers. He wrote a draft of its object, and proposed that the last of Liddon's "Bampton Lectures", and Lightfoots "Treatise on the Christian Ministry", should be published and circulated with this in view. His idea was that "the Nicene Creed with a few additions (on 'Inspiration' and the 'Atonement') to meet modern heresies, would be a sufficient doctrinal basis of union".

The obvious question is from where did Cooper get his High Church opinions, for they were certainly not then current in the Church of Scotland. His High thoughts on the Sacraments, the Ministry, and Tradition; his regard for "Holy Mother the Church"; his care for the visible part of devotion; his fear of Liberalism and
heresy... all evidence that he was a keen student of English ecclesiastical affairs, and, in particular, that he was a devotee of Pusey. Of this his student diaries bear ample evidence.

In 1867 Cooper notes: "I see a memorial signed by Pusey... has been addressed to the Primate praying him to resist the University 'Reform' Bill. I trust it will be successful. Secularising the English Universities is intended to ruin the Establishment." In 1869 he made reference to the Education Bill in these terms: "... secularism in education is a virtual disestablishment of religion and the Church. The Church ought to recognise now her position as an enemy - uncompromising - of the godless spirit of the age, and should expressly and vigorously fight against it. She must fight now or never. She must resist and conquer or be swept away bit by bit, as the French Church was, to destruction and to the loss of many souls." September, 1869, saw the death of Phillpotts, Bishop of Exeter, famous for the "Gorham Case". Cooper noted: "The brave old Bishop of Exeter, fiery Tory, and honest High Churchman, is dead. With him another link with what was best under George III has passed away." This is followed shortly after by the related note:

It is said that Dr. Temple of Rugby - a writer in the notorious 'Essays and Reviews' and an advanced 'Liberal' in religion as in everything else, has been recommended by Mr. Gladstone for the see of Exeter! Shade of Bishop Phillpotts! Besides its being specially insulting to the High Church clergy of that diocese, it is
an insult to all the orthodox in the English Church, and looks like a deep move to induce the Church to cut her connection with the State. 38

Cooper was often to be found reading the early works of Newman, Manning and Pusey; sometimes their volumes of sermons for "inspiration and ideas" - as with those of Manning which he read with "much admiration", 39 and sometimes their more scholarly works - like Pusey on Daniel, which Cooper thought was "magnificent", 40 "a masterly work". 41 "I should fancy", he wrote, "S. Jerome must have resembled Pusey, learned, and vehemently in earnest." 42 At one point Cooper is found copying part of Dr. Pusey's (et al.) manifesto on the subject of the Real Presence, of which he notes: "except for a few things in No. 3 (which I don't strongly repudiate) I quite agree with the whole, and I think that it could be shewn that the Confession and Catechism of our own Church do also, though they are certainly not conventionally held to do so". 43

It must not be thought that Cooper's doctrinal and theological interest in the Church of England was without its practical extension. Repeatedly in his diaries one finds the record of his attendance at, and enthralment with, Episcopal services. On his first Christmas away from home, for example, he attended the services at St. Andrews Episcopal Church, which he "enjoyed thoroughly". 44 On Good Friday, 1868, he was at home, and recorded:
I wish I could have gone to church today: I would have gone to the Episcopal Chapel but fear the tongues of Elgin gossips which attacked me for something similar already. In default of this I went over the service fully in my study in the morning. I wish our church would observe these great days: it is almost senseless by the perpetuation of what may have once been useful but is now certainly unnecessary that the Scottish Church should thus shut herself out from the communion of feeling of the Catholic Church. 45

While staying at Cologne in 1868, Cooper attended with some regularity the "English Church", and, with the consent of the incumbent (who is described as a "low Church Evangelical"), he partook of the Sacrament, which was celebrated fortnightly. He noted: "The Church of England Communion Service is very sweet, but, I like our own better." 46 Wotherspoon takes this statement at face value, 47 but it is more than probable that by "our" Service, Cooper is not referring to that commonly practised, against which he continually protested, but rather the ill-fated Liturgy of 1637, which he ever considered the Church of Scotland's great liturgical treasure. "It was sweet too", the note continues, "to feel that difference of 'denomination' doesn't prevent intercommunion. Would that we could have more of this."

On Friday, 1st May, 1868, Cooper records: "S. Philip and S. James. Went to the English Church for divine service which was refreshing: we had no sermon." 48 It should be noted that this dating with the "feast" appropriate is found everywhere in Cooper's diaries; his dating "30th January, Feast of King Charles, martyr", for example, is indicative of his particular ecclesio-historical orientation.
Perhaps nowhere in this formative period is there better evidence of Cooper's awareness of English Tractarianism - at least as regards its ritualistic extension - than in his description of the opening of the new Episcopal Cathedral at Inverness. It would appear that, as a son of Morayshire, he felt bound to attend so significant a ceremony. In the diary he records a good impression of Dr. Ross's "noble design". He says that inside, the church was completely filled, and what especially fired his imagination was the sight of "old wivies in caps, etc." in the midst of the select assembly. "Of all things", he notes, "class worship is the most detestable." He records that some forty priests and six bishops - including Wilberforce of Oxford and Grey of Rochester, took part; and with no little enthusiasm he writes that although the service was "choral throughout", "instead of confining it to the clergy as I feared, it seemed to make the people's part only more prominent: the responses were heartily given and the worship looked real". He records that Bishop Eden (the Scottish Primus) "read the Absolution and part of the Communion service very beautiful[ly]", and that Bishop Wordsworth (St. Andrews) was "Epistoler" and Bishop Forbes "Gospeller". "I was somewhat amused with a little episode", he notes, "the Primus put down the book on the South-end of the altar: Bishop Forbes rose and removed it to the canonical North-end." Cooper's understanding of these matters is clear; it would be interesting to know
how many - even of the Episcopalian brethren - had noticed
or understood the significance of this act which amused
Cooper! In the afternoon Wilberforce preached, and
Cooper records this glowing report: "The sermon lasted
45 minutes: I scarcely thought it 10!"

Wotherspoon records that Cooper on an occasion was
offended by an Episcopal Clergyman's "High Church
pedantries - 'he wore a white stole'".50 The diary, how­
ever, does not connect these two statements. It records
that Cooper, on Christmas Day 1869, went to the Scottish
Episcopal Chapel - as became his custom. The note
continues: "... a capital sermon though disfigured by
the pedantries of his High Churchism. ... He wore a
white stole."51 The "pedantries" were associated with
the sermon, not with the stole: Cooper's ultimate
adoption of altar frontals, etc., and his restoration of
the "frogs" on the Moderatorial dress, confirms that
Wotherspoon's interpretation is untenable.

Cooper, even in these University days, knew the
evils inherent in Broad Churchism. It is not surprising
then that he should be wary of its most ardent exponent -
Dean Stanley. In 1872 Cooper notes:

Dean Stanley in Scotland is the theme of all conver­
sation: he gave four lectures in Edinburgh on the
Church of Scotland. He preached in Dr. Wallace's
Greyfriars, Edinburgh, and for Dr. Caird in the
University pulpit, Glasgow, and now he is lecturing
in Glasgow - complimenting everybody and everything
all round - I seem to stand pretty much alone, but I
don't relish his flattery: it is to make us all
Broad Churchmen.52
Cooper is even harder on him sometime later when he records: "Dean Stanley has been by a majority elected a select preacher at Oxford: another blow to the Church Establishment, and, if truth can be injured, another injury to truth, I believe."\textsuperscript{53}

Cooper hated Liberalism in all its forms from an early age, and remarked that while it would be too much to say that a Tory is in every case a Christian, there was yet good hope for such a man.\textsuperscript{54} "I cannot but look on much of the Liberalism (ecclesiastical or political) of the day as Anti-Christian", he wrote, "and against that I wish to protest and fight."\textsuperscript{55} At one point the diary records that Cooper had determined that one of his "intimates" in the College was infected with Liberalism and "leaning toward atheism". The entry continues:

\begin{quote}
O Lord, enable me to be of some use in prevailing on him to choose a more excellent way - let him see the danger in time. He is young and intelligent and honest I think yet. If not, I must give up intimacy with him.\textsuperscript{56}
\end{quote}

Such prayers and such examples of strength of conviction, are not uncommon in Cooper’s diaries, and evidence the increasing depth of his devotion and piety.

At the end of Cooper’s third session of divinity he hesitated about taking the usual steps toward "licensing" by the Presbytery. He still seems to have been drawn to the Anglican ministry and in despair of ever seeing a more excellent Church of Scotland. He considered going as a tutor to an English rector’s home. He notes:
"... it might be advantageous to me if I should decide on taking English orders, but I am scared from that by the present state of doctrine and discipline (so palpably bringing the Church to the verge of an eruption) in the Church of England." It was said that on licensing he was to become the Assistant to the Minister of the East Church of St. Nicholas, Aberdeen - a Church that seems to have kept an eye on his progress. As it was, he took a travelling tutorship and went to the Continent where he was continually offended by the show of Romanist "idolatry", but learned to appreciate the Orthodox Church. He also witnessed a Lutheran Confirmation service, which he considered to be "a beautiful and most instructive rite". In general, however, he frequented the "English Church".

On Cooper's return to Scotland he was licensed, and after serving a probationary period at Banchory, became the Assistant at Stirling's East Church, and then moved as Assistant to Elgin. In 1873 he was offered, and accepted, the charge of St. Stephen's, Broughty Ferry, and it was there that his unique ministry, in the sense of his movement toward the realisation of his ideals, first began.

St. Stephen's was a new church with no tradition, and this was important in Cooper's case, for he was more-or-less free to mould it as he wanted. He was ordained on April 9, 1873, for which he "attempted" to fast...
accordance with Scripture and our Church's orders".  
Wotherspoon has written of this period that Cooper had the good sense not to "rush his people into unfamiliar ways before gaining their confidence".  

He [Cooper] was a Tractarian much more than a Ritualist - Dr. Pusey was, I think, his model; and Dr. Milligan his teacher - neither of whom cared for ceremonial or the ornamental. Cooper cared for both, but in a degree remotely secondary to his care for what he believed to be the truth or the institution of Christ. He loved beauty in all things and in all places and uses - in the House of prayer as in the garden or the home; ... Nor did he see that what Sir Walter Scott in another relation has called our national sluttishness should be taken for simplicity and let rule in the House of God.  

[Cooper] certainly did prefer the traditional ways of Christian worship ... and generally speaking saw something venerable in the antiquity of a custom. ... But far before beauty he set order and reverence, a prayer above any furnishings; while for any detail of the Christian creed he would freely have let go whatever else he thought precious. If he laid more stress on the accidents or methods or gestures or implements of worship than some ... what is it but that he anticipated psychology in recognising that action and environment shape as well as express the soul?  

Wotherspoon, as well as Cooper it would seem, had accepted the Camden principle that association with the "Catholick" environment will - hopefully - give rise to the "Catholick" ethic and soul,  

but he deliberately underplays Cooper's interest in Church furnishings and arrangement. 

In September, 1873, Cooper was to be found engaged in selecting linen and sacramental plate from brochures of English firms.  

One diary entry records: "... we had a meeting of the Managers about choosing Communion plate."
Mr. Robertson settled our difficulty by offering £5 if we would go in for a Coventry set of solid silver, Gothic in design and jewelled. So all is well and harmoniously settled. How fortunate I am." At Christmas that year Cooper gave Robertson a copy of Keble's The Christian Year in appreciation. The entire cost of the set, apparently, was to be £53, a handsome sum if one considers that Cooper's salary as an Assistant had been £80 to £84 per annum. The set duly arrived and was described by Cooper as "exceedingly beautiful - all hand made in good mediaeval design. The chalices are solid silver, set with carbuncles and crystals. ... Everyone must admire them." The day following this meeting of the Managers, the diary entry reads: "In the evening I went with Mr. Robertson to measure the ALTAR [emphasis mine] in the church for linen vestings we are to get from Cox and Co. in London. Mr. Geddes, the artist, was with him, and helped us in our selection of the design." A fortnight later he notes: "The Communion linen came from Cox's: it is pretty but not exactly what I wished." Within a few years of the beginning of his ministry at Broughty Ferry, Cooper had a chancel added onto the Church - "the first purposely erected in Scotland", according to Wotherspoon. He had also presented the congregation with a brass lectern obtained from London.

Cooper's concern for the externals was not the only manifestation of his unique vocation; features which are later to bring him before the notice of the Courts of the
Church in the East Church Case were clearly evidenced here. In 1873 he let it be known that it was his intention to hold "a special sermon on Christmas morning" in his church. In the same year he celebrated Communion in a dying parishoner's house, but this explicit violation of the law of the Church troubled him. He notes:

... twas not a private communion: Mr. Smith, two Miss Mackenzies, a nurse, besides the invalid and I are more than the 'two or three' of whom our Lord speaks; and I did not omit any necessary part of the service. I am aware that what I have done is contrary to the usage of our Church, and to some old statute, but the sooner that old statute falls into disuse the better. The Apostles broke bread from house to house, and the service today seems to me more likely than anything else to be beneficial to all of us. May God forgive me if I have done wrong: may He defend me if I have right, and bless each of us concerned, through Jesus Christ.

Later in the year he dined at the Episcopal minister's house, and there met the minister of Monifieth (Mr. Young). Cooper notes his statement to the effect that Private Communion "was punishable in our Church and said he would promote a suit against trespassers: yet he said there would be no more prosecutions for false doctrine!". Cooper concludes this note: "Then have we lost our faith and retained our rationalistic tradition in worship?" He thereafter conferred with the Parish minister, and also went to consult Dr. Honey (Inchture) about Private Communion. Dr. Honey advised him to heed the objections he had heard, but in any case, to consult his elders and take some of them with him in future.
Cooper's record of the sermons he preached in these early years of his ministry also shows the direction of his thoughts. Of one he notes: "I preached today in the morning on the mystery of Christ's presence in the Sacrament of Communion." Of another he records: "I finished my Action Sermon (for which I am in a large degree indebted to Dr. Pusey's 'Addresses on the love of God')." Yet another entry (of one preached away) states: "I preached a sermon on S. Mary at the Cross - one of my best sermons, but the people didn't seem to like it." The entry for the week following indicates that he spoke of the minister's "special commission of forgiveness". "Is it not", he asked, "the ordained channel of forgiveness? I think he is, and I think his office as such is his central office. He ministers the word of it, the sacraments of it, and why not the assurance of it? And Christ says so!" On 25th January, 1874, he notes: "This being the Feast of the conversion of S. Paul, I preached in the forenoon on that subject, as I have resolved to do whenever a Saint's day falls on a Sunday." Yet another diary note records: "I spoke of the sin of separate and antagonistic National Churches - the sad schism caused by the Reformation, which more than anything else, I believe, has been at the root of the diffusion of the principle of schism. It is actually difficult - in the face of Scripture - to teach men that schism is a sin." Cooper's review of others' sermons shows that he was still fearful for the life and health of the Church
infected by Broad Churchism. "We have much cause to fear", he wrote, "for the future of the Church: -
Broad Churchism, infecting prayers and sermons both, would wither our Christianity far more quickly than it has been able to do to that of the Church of England." 82
On another occasion he makes mention of having met a minister who thought that the Ministry was but the mouth-piece of the people, the representative of their opinions, and not their teacher. Cooper's response was "why does he study then?". 83

Throughout the period Cooper continued to attend Episcopal services when he could. On Christmas Eve, 1873, for example, he went to the Episcopal Chapel and found it "prettily decorated". 84 On Good Friday he went to St. Paul's, Dundee, where he heard the Bishop of Brechin go "fully into the Atonement. A most moving sermon". 85 On another occasion he went to see a Confirmation by the Bishop of Brechin, and was most impressed. 86

How much this exposure influenced Cooper is uncertain, but it clearly had an effect. He composed a Baptism service for use in his church. 87 He had the choir learn the Te Deum and the Dies Irae; the Te Deum being sung there for the first time on St. Stephen's Day, 1873. 88 He pressed for quarterly Communion, and although one elder objected at first, it was instituted in February 1874. 89 Cooper was then twenty-seven years old. 90
That first year of his ministry was the year of Moody and Sankey's visit to Scotland, which created so much interest. Wotherspoon has said that "Cooper was an evangelical, as all Scots, trained in our Catechetics, naturally tend to be, and as every high churchman and sacramentalist must necessarily be". Cooper, however, exercised a certain reserve in these matters. He wrote: "I think ultra-Protestantism, or rather the rationalistic 'tradition' in Evangelicalism and Moderatism alike, to blame for much of the alienation of men's minds from the Catholic faith. Only in corporate re-union of the great National Churches, on the basis of the ancient Creeds, and ancient government, do I see a way for the Church to cope with 'Liberalism' - which is twin to infidelity."

Cooper's diaries stop at the end of the first year, so far as St. Stephen's is concerned, perhaps because he had little free time. The church grew large and in 1879 became a parish church. On welcoming Cooper into membership of the Presbytery at that time, the Moderator (Dr. Cameron, of Rosebank) commended him for making St. Stephen's "one of the largest, most influential and prosperous congregations within the bounds". He went on to say that although Cooper had avoided everything contrary to the genius of Presbyterianism, he had made it more beautiful and more effective "by the exercise of good sense and refined taste". He had supplied a want, according to Dr. Cameron, that "was too seldom supplied in the Scottish Church".
In February, 1879, Cooper was having second thoughts on his decision to accept ordination from the Scottish Church, and was wrestling with doubts about its validity. He wrote to Dr. Sprott about this "crisis" in his spiritual life, a crisis which made him think that he must leave the Church of Scotland's Ministry. "I have torturing doubts", he wrote, "as to the validity of my Presbyterian Orders. . . . If I cannot be satisfied that I am really a Presbyter in Christ's Catholic Church . . . I feel that I cannot (without sin that could be fatal to my hope of Heaven) continue to minister where I do." The remaining passages of the letter make it clear that Cooper had accepted wholeheartedly Oxford's mistake of Tract I: confusion of "ministerial succession" with "Apostolic Succession" through the Episcopal "chair". Cooper continues:

The thorn has been long in my flesh, and the whole neighbourhood of it is inflamed and sore. A year ago it was aggravated by a statement that ordination was omitted in the Scottish Church for some thirty years at the time of the Reformation, and that our succession hangs on nothing. . . .

My difficulties are mainly two: (1) That the great stream of the Church seems to be without exception Episcopal to the Reformation. (2) That since then the Catholic Faith seems to have died out in nine-tenths of the non-Episcopal Churches.

The contents of Sprott's letter of reply can only be assumed from Cooper's subsequent letter, in which he makes it plain that his "great anxiety is not so much about the validity of our Presbyterian orders, but about the continuity of our succession. . . ." In this Cooper was
asking a question which had never before been seriously considered in the Scottish Church, and it can only be conjectured that it derived from an undue concern borne from the quips of the Tractarians and the tracts and sermons of Bishop Wordsworth. The Oxford confusion of "ministerial" and "Apostolic Succession" is, in Cooper's case, further confused with that of "Presbyterial" and "Evangelical Succession". As he confesses to Sprott, "the Reformation age has always rather repelled than attracted me". Cooper suggests that what is needed is "a series of Tracts for the Times for Scotland", and it was undoubtedly his position that they should deal with the same matters in the same terms with the same principles and ideals underlying them, as those written by the "Members of the University of Oxford" almost half a century previous.

Cooper's resolve of his "crisis" seems to have been - at best - rather tenuous, for in 1880 he wrote that he was no longer "dissatisfied" with his own position, on the basis that the "restored Episcopate" of 1610 would have purified the subsequent line through the introduction of the English succession, since maintained inviolate. He also believed, however, that "the whole question of Church organisation and the forms of religious life, etc., . . . must soon undergo great changes". It is not clear what Cooper was here referring to, but it seems as though he was preparing for a new rupture in the Church of Scotland, this time between Liberal and Catholic churchmen.
Certainly he thought that the Liberal "infection" would have to be healed or severed before it destroyed the entire body. "I am more and more opposed to popular Protestantism and the philosophic liberalism", he wrote, sounding very much like a young Newman. "I am anxious", wrote Cooper, "in preparation for such a time so to build up my flock and myself that, when the inevitable cleavage takes place, we shall be found on the side of Catholic truth and order."}

Cooper was an incurable romantic. He was a "Scoto-Catholic" long before that term had any currency. He had a devotion to traditional Catholic doctrine and usage. He looked to Anglo-Catholicism for an authoritative expression of his Catholic ideal. He loved the Anglican service, and, even more, the Book of Common Prayer. He longed to see the greatness which once had characterised the Scottish Church — men of the stature of Columba and Kentigern and the Aberdeen Doctors, buildings of the grandeur of Elgin Cathedral and Pluscarden Abbey, a liturgy of the grace and beauty of Laud's — reasserted. He dreamed of a day when the Church of Scotland would again accept the historic Episcopate and the three-fold ministry; would again be in full Communion with the Church of England; would again restore the Catholic rites of Christendom abolished by overzealous Scottish Reformers in an age of confrontation and rebellion. Cooper was always
uncomfortable in Protestant circles, and found Presbyterianism to be a system little suited to his temperament. He had little in common with those tinged with the modern heresy of Liberalism. His master was Pusey; his educational and devotional materials the writings of the Tractarians. His Scoto-Catholicism was neither a badge of party nor a clearly articulated doctrinal system. It was rather a temper of mind which had as its distinguishing features certain Catholic traits: High thoughts of the two Sacraments; a High estimacy of the Ministerial Commission; a High estimate of the visible Church as the Body of Christ in which Christians are incorporated and sustained; regard for the public ordinances of the Church and for the visible part of devotion; a certain reverence for and deference to the ancient Church and to Catholic Antiquity, and devotion to the Catholic Creeds. It was, in fact, precisely the same "temper of mind" which Pusey had defined as distinguishing Puseyism; and it was this which Cooper took with him into the pastoral ministry of the Church of Scotland.
In 1881 the East Church of St. Nicholas, Aberdeen, became vacant, and Cooper (according to Wotherspoon) was recommended to its vacancy committee by Dr. Milligan "as likely to be useful because of his opinions and by Dr. Flint as likely to be useful notwithstanding his opinions". The committee went to see him at Broughty Ferry, and, as Cooper mentioned to Dr. Sprott, "the deputation saw all my 'Ritualism' in an accentuated form. But they liked it rather than otherwise". Cooper was interested in the East Kirk of Aberdeen because of "the traditions of the City, the large congregation, and the important sphere", but because he rejected the concept of choosing a minister by popular vote, by a call based upon a single sermon, he declined to preach as a candidate. Nevertheless, on the committee's recommendation the congregation unanimously called him, and he accepted.

Cooper lost no time in making his imprint on this ancient Church. Upon entering the building prior to his induction to the charge, he found that the Communion Table
was in the "West Lobby" serving as a hat-stand for the men of the choir. With the help of the beadle, Cooper brought it, and "some handsome chairs" he found in the transept, into the church, and placed them near the pulpit.\textsuperscript{5} Cooper records that his father upon entering the church was greatly disappointed to see "that there was neither organ nor lectern, font nor altar, such as we had in St. Stephen's"; but Cooper's reaction was typical: "We just must have it rectified."\textsuperscript{6}

Shortly after arriving, Cooper resumed the "old weekly 'exercises'" in the crypt-chapel under the apse of the Church.\textsuperscript{7} He also instituted Daily Morning Prayer in this "St. Mary's Chapel", thereby becoming the first in the Scottish Church to "re-introduce" daily prayers.\textsuperscript{8} The transept of the ancient church served as a vestibule to the churches East and West, but the East Church apparently had some claim to the North side of it, known as "Collieson's Aisle". It had at one time served for coal storage, but was now empty. Cooper converted it into a summer "ante-chapel".

A reporter for The Scottish Guardian, the publication of High Episcopalians, visited the church, and recorded a most favourable impression of the small chapel "fitted up in Collinson's [sic] aisle, and furnished in a very neat and aesthetic manner".\textsuperscript{9} He reported that the chapel was divided from the open portion of the aisle by a screen "which extends from each wall, leaving a blank space in the centre". The chapel was seated for about forty
people with "elegantly finished wooden seats or benches, furnished with nicely fitting kneeling cushions". In front of these seats was "an elevated dais, covered with crimson cloth, to which one ascends by a step". On this platform was a large table draped in crimson cloth, the same as the dais covering. A "brazen reading stand, well polished and of very attractive design", was on the west end of the table, and at each end of the table was a kneeling stool, "very nicely padded". To the east of the platform was a lectern, "very prettily carved, and bearing on each side a candle", both of which had been used recently. The Episcopalian reporter was somewhat baffled by this fact, for, as he noted: "The candles may have been lighted to enable the open Bible which the lectern carries to be read, though it is not easy to see any need for this, the window behind being a very large Gothic one, while the chapel . . . is used during the day only."

A correspondent to the same Episcopal journal some time later made reference to the East Church ante-chapel in which "the holy table is placed against the wall permanently on a raised platform, and covered with a red cloth, as with us, the altar-cloth having been worked by the ladies of the congregation". He also mentioned that "in the mission-chapel of the same parish there is a similar arrangement, with a super-altar, with candles and flowers". This mission chapel was the responsibility of Cooper's assistant, the Rev. Thomas N. Adamson, and it is
important to note that here - in the mission station - an even more "advanced" arrangement was introduced.

Cooper said himself that two subjects naturally called for enquiry at the outset of his ministry - Public Worship and the instruction of the young.\textsuperscript{11} It is clear from the above how he approached the former; the latter proved initially to be a little more problematic. Cooper's predecessors had left the Sunday Schools (there were three!) under the superintendence of an elder, but Cooper was not about to follow their example. He determined to take the "opening worship" with them himself, and accordingly showed up in cassock, gown and bands, to the surprise and consternation of the superintendent.\textsuperscript{12} He assumed direct control and arranged fortnightly meetings for the teachers, for prayer and preparation - under his guidance - of what they were to teach. He also immediately increased the number of teachers from twenty-seven to fifty-five, and prepared liturgical services both for these Sunday School assemblies, and the teachers' meetings.

In this connection, and possibly as a way of introducing the observance of the Christian Year into the East Church, Cooper prepared and had printed a special order of service entitled "Christmas Office for Children". For some time before the occasion he rehearsed the children carefully, and then, on the Saturday afternoon preceding Christmas Day and with the assistance of an augmented
choir, the special service was held. Cooper had planned to have a brass band present, but that idea was thwarted by the objections of some of his elders. Even as it was the service caused a great sensation when it was reported in the local press [APPENDIX B].

As reported, the service consisted of ministerial sentences and congregational responses, interspersed with Christmas carols and prayers. The basic format was that of the English Prayer Book, amended with seasonal sentences. The report stated that the Lord's Prayer was recited at the end of the first prayer, the "Amens" "being admirably intoned". The Magnificat, "as found in the English service", was intoned by the minister and children - "very pleasingly and perfectly". After the lessons the Apostles' Creed was recited, "all standing", and then followed the sermon. After this the "offertory" (reported as a "novelty") was received by "a number of young lads, who went from seat to seat carrying small bags in red and black cloth for the reception of the contributions of the audience". A specially prepared "Litany" followed, then a closing hymn, and then the benediction pronounced - "all kneeling". The report noted further: "Mr. Cooper throughout the service at various passages intoned in a highly artistic way; all the 'Amens' as already stated, were intoned sweetly, and the final 'Amen' was executed in a very striking fashion."
In April 1882, a petition signed by a minority of Cooper's Kirk Session was forwarded to the Presbytery of Aberdeen, complaining about his "High Churchism", which, they maintained, was "altogether different" from what they had been given to understand. The elders, in fact, gave a whole list of grievances: that Cooper wanted to relocate the pulpit; that he spoke of the "Christian Altar"; that he varied the sequence in public worship; that he used a Litany in the Sunday School; that he held daily services and used a prayer-desk and reading-desk, "so wasting precious time"; that he gave the Communion to the sick; that he wanted to revive the Christian Year; that he held a service for the children at Christmas and rehearsed for it; that he had prepared a "Christmas Office"; that he had wished to have a brass band present; that he had intoned sentences and taught the children to sing responses "like an Episcopal Congregation"; and that he did not have, and denied that he needed to have, the Session's permission for such services. The more serious complaints, however, were that Cooper had introduced novel and alien preaching and practice; had magnified the importance of the Ministry and the Sacraments; had spoken on the Virginity of Mary, the Saints, the Fathers, and on Feasts; and had taught Baptismal Regeneration, Transubstantiation, Apostolic Succession, and Absolution. The charges were clearly quite serious, and the Presbytery decided to act by appointing a strong committee to investigate.
The petition, according to Cooper, was "entirely unexpected", although it might reasonably have been anticipated. As Wotherspoon records, however, his experience at St. Stephen's had not taught him "the wisdom of regard for custom and usage"; St. Stephen's had "no long traditions to hamper him". Here in Aberdeen it was quite different, and the proud people of the East Kirk were not to be converted so quickly. As early as December 20, 1881, a correspondent to Aberdeen's The Daily Free Press, had raised the protest:

The Church of Scotland is understood to be a Protestant Presbyterian Church, and so accordingly, as a member of the East Church congregation, I record my solemn protest against brass bands, candles and candle-sticks, morning prayers, a modified confessional, and the preaching of the Virgin Mary, as being contrary to the law of the Church. The congregation are thoroughly disgusted with the ritual of our priest, and look to the Kirk-Session to uphold and defend the tenets of our Protestant faith.

Other letters referring to the East Church found insertion over the next few days, and they were fairly evenly divided between those "entirely satisfied with the great work carried on by our beloved pastor", and those who were "disgusted". Cooper's remarks on what the early Christians had believed concerning the Virgin Mary seem to have aroused the most hostility; so much so, in fact, that one letter, signed "West Church", tried to lighten the correspondence by recounting this anecdote:
In a parish school on Deeside the parish minister was one day examining the children in their Catechism. Coming to a Catholic lassie's turn, he asked her to say the Lord's Prayer, which she said: and immediately after it began, as was her wont at home, the 'Hail Mary'. 'Stop! Stop!' cried the horrified parson; 'None of her here. Go on with the Creed.' The lassie went on with the Creed until the words, 'Born of the . . .', when she stopped, and looking up into the parson's face said, 'Eh! please, sir, here she is again, fat will I dee wi' her noo?'

After the special children's Christmas service, a correspondent to the paper had complained about the "miserable mincing of the Anglican service in the East Church". Another wrote:

... I protest against the ritual of the High Church party in the Church of England being introduced into our Church, and I also protest against the doctrines of the Church of Rome being expounded from our pulpits. I join issue with Mr. Cooper, and either he or I must quit the Church of Scotland. Let the Courts of our Church decide.

It is hard to believe that the petition in April came as a complete surprise to Cooper. Upon his receipt of the notice of petition, Cooper immediately sought the counsel of Professors Milligan and Trail, and he dashed off a note to Sprott asking for his recommendations. In this note he indicated that he would use great "reserve" in dealing with the charges: "I desire", he wrote, "... to put things as moderately as possible, and I shall not state my views on any points except those before the Presbytery."

The petition emerged at a particularly bad time for Cooper, for he was to act as Milligan's (the Moderator
elect) "Secretary" (Chaplain) at the General Assembly. He tendered his resignation, but Milligan refused to accept it. As it happened, however, it was Milligan who was chosen by the Presbytery to head the investigating committee (which also included Professor Trail), and even though Milligan indicated privately in a letter to Sprott that the Presbytery could not be trusted to reach a fair judgment, this appointment of Milligan as Convener obviously worked in Cooper's favour. It soon became clear that an agent of Jacob Primmer had been involved in the preparation of the petition, and that Cooper's every move had been watched for six months. Before the Committee had delivered its report, however, the General Assembly had met, and both Milligan and Cooper were sitting strong in its afterglow.

The Committee reported in July that they thought few of the complaints should be noticed by Presbytery. They reported that although Cooper had reserved all rights as regarded the Sunday Schools, that he had agreed to consult the Session about reorganising services, and that he had also agreed that in future he would give notice to the Session of his intention to give Communion to the sick. As regarded the doctrinal charges, the Committee thought that some of them had to be left to a Christian minister's good sense and judgment, and that on the other points Cooper's explanations had satisfied them. They recommended, however, that Cooper should be counselled to frame his speech and guard his services so
as not to be misunderstood, and that the elders should be cautioned to avoid suspicion and censoriousness.

In September the eleven elders presented a "Minute" to the Presbytery, supported by certain new allegations but no new charges. According to Cooper, a "policy judgment" by a majority of the Presbytery allowed the former decision to be reopened. He, Milligan, and another, appealed this "incompetent" decision to Synod. The elders' "Minute" complained that the Presbytery had minimised their grievances by dealing with the minor points but not with the major ones, and by not considering "the cumulative effect of the whole". The new allegations involved a recent statement by Cooper on the Baptism of dying infants, and was supported with correspondence with him on this matter; Cooper's failure to honour his promise to consult the Session about Sunday School arrangements; and "his general attitude of 'prerogative' and 'priestly authority'". One elder attributed Cooper's ideas to Pusey:

There had been a priestly assumption of power, and indeed the ideas which had of late been taught among them had been strongly brought before their minds by the death of the late Dr. Pusey. The same ideas which actuated the Puseyite party seemed to be those which were inculcated, viz: - baptismal regeneration, the superiority of ordination, and the gift with it, and the change of the elements at the Communion; and indeed, Cooper's diary verifies the accuracy of the charge:
26th September, 1882. Dr. Pusey has gone to his reward; my thoughts of course have been full of him, for I have looked to him as a Master for many years; even when I could not agree with him, I could not help venerating, as who could? It is rather singular that one of the complainers today witnessed to his influence having penetrated into our Church.37

Before the Presbytery had had time to hear Cooper's reply to this "Minute", however, Synod met, and sustained Cooper's appeal of res judicata.38 But it went further than he had wanted: it quashed the earlier deliverance of the Presbytery on the grounds that the petitioners had not been heard in support of their petition, and it ordered the whole matter to be re-opened. The petitioners duly appeared before the Presbytery, and Cooper was asked to prepare a statement. This he did, but the petitioners submitted yet another "Minute" repeating their earlier complaints, and adding to them Cooper's institution of Guilds and the Mission Sunday School without reference to the Session. They also felt "aggrieved" that Cooper repeatedly refused to answer their doctrinal charges (he contended that these should be laid by way of libel). The Presbytery asked Cooper for a further statement, and this he gave, in spite of his having found an instance of the Assembly's upholding an appeal against a Presbytery because they had examined a minister without a libel.39

Cooper presented a lengthy and carefully constructed defence40 that bore the counsel of Dr. Trail, Dr. Sprott,
and Dr. Milligan. As he said in a letter: "My statement will be in order to satisfy them, and in all probability their decision will be that they see no grounds for instituting a libel." "The eleven will certainly not like my statement, but I think it will show the public very clearly that my doctrines are neither unreasonable nor contrary to my ordination vows." In the statement he claimed that there seemed to be a misconception on the part of the petitioners as to both a minister's position and duty. He said that he did not consider it the duty of a minister to 'flatter the views and habits of thought of his parishioners, but to preach the truth". He stated that he did not regard the Church of Scotland as "only one of a number of human clubs among which a man is free to choose that whose arrangements best suit his idiosyncrasies". "I regard her as the National Branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church", he declared, "with Divine claims, therefore, on the allegiance of all our people." Cooper indicated that he was a member of the Church of Scotland because he believed that "till she do something that would make it a sin in me to continue in her, it is my duty to Christ to do so". Cooper did not elaborate on what that "something that would make it a sin" might be; nonetheless, it is clear that Oxford's two-fold assertion of Apostolic Authority as defining the Catholic Church - that is, Apostolic Succession, and Apostolic Tradition - had thoroughly captivated Cooper's imagination. He said that as for human tradition, he had
tried faithfully to obey the terms of the Presbytery's July deliverance, and had endeavoured to be tolerant of, and tender toward, the prejudices of his people. But he made it perfectly clear that where traditions have prevailed "contrary to the constitution and standards of the Church", and where they make void "the very Word of God itself, it is the duty of the Christian minister to remove them, and to win his people, with all wisdom, to better ways".

Cooper responded to the major complaints under four heads. In the first he dealt with the charge relating to the Sunday School and the institution of guilds. He held that the minister alone was responsible for religious teaching, young and old, and was subject in this responsibility to the Presbytery alone. He said that quite apart from there being a falling away as was alleged, the Sunday Schools had grown. He cited the relative rolls to show that when he had come to the Parish there were 200 in the Sunday School and twenty-nine in the combined Young Women's and Young Men's Bible Class; he claimed now to have 450 in the Sunday School, 124 in the Young Women's Class and 106 in the Young Men's Class. Cooper maintained that associations could be formed in the congregation and countenanced by the minister, without the Session's consultation. "If the Kirk Session", said Cooper, "is to claim as a matter of right to have a hand in everything of the kind that is started in the congregation, the work of the parish will rather be impeded than promoted."
Cooper said that elders, so far as he was concerned, were for "Church discipline"; they were the "minister's assessors in the parochial consistory" in the sense that they guarded against the possibility of a clergyman's personal bias in those whom he chose to admit or refuse the "sealing ordinances". Cooper's position was that elders are not "ordained" into an "Order of Ministry", but duly elected and "admitted" into the parish consistory, or disciplinary council.

In the second section Cooper dealt with "Apostolic Succession". The charge was that he held that "ministers have received in virtue of their ordination a special grace and special gifts from the Spirit, and that only thereby are they fitted to minister the Word and Sacraments"; but more particularly, that Cooper had said that he believed in it, and was quoted as having said that he himself had it, and that if he did not believe that he, and all of the clergymen of the Church of Scotland, had it, he would not remain a minister of that Church. Cooper admitted that this "correctly enough" expressed his sentiments, and said that although he had not specially preached on the subject, it might be desirable to insist upon the subject "as against the exclusive claims of Episcopalians on the one hand, and the erroneous theory and practice of Congregationalists upon the other". Cooper cited in defence of this position Donald Macleod's recent statement in The Times that "many Presbyterians believe in the Apostolic descent of
their orders as firmly as Bishop Wilberforce did in his. Cooper quoted from the "Form of Church Government" the words "no man ought to take upon him the office of a minister of the Word without a lawful calling"; and "ordination is always to be continued in the Church, and that any minister of the Word is to be ordained by imposition of hands, with prayer and fasting, by those preaching Presbyters to whom it doth belong". This hardly proved his position over and against the elders' charges, however, so he quoted Principal Hill on the subject:

Presbyterians hold that preaching the Word, dispensing the Sacraments, and exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Christians, are functions which in all ages belong to the office of a Christian teacher; that the right of performing every one of these ordinary functions was conveyed by the Apostles to all whom they ordained; that the persons who in the New Testament are indiscriminately named presbyters and bishops, had the right of conveying to others all the powers with which they had been invested; and that every person who is ordained is as much a successor of the Apostles as ever a Christian teacher can be... We are content that we are successors of the Apostles, invested with all the powers which, of rite, belong to any ministers of the Church of Christ.44

Cooper said: "I accept these statements of Principal Hill as sufficiently expressing my view." It is quite certain that Principal Hill, writing at the end of the eighteenth century, was not saying what Cooper was trying to make him say. If Hill's statement sufficiently expressed Cooper's position, as he claimed it did, then he had certainly climbed down from his initial assertion of High doctrine. As it was, even if Hill had supported Cooper,
it would then have had to be proved that Hill was "equal" to the Standards of the Church; but Cooper stopped far short of this.

In concluding the section on the Apostolic Succession and Ministry, Cooper had to deal with the extension of the charge; that is, what he believed about lay Baptism and Communion. He tried to beg the question by saying that the Church "does not allow either of the Sacraments to be ministered by persons unordained". He said, "I do not personally hold that baptism administered by a layman is invalid", provided it were done "with water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost"; but here Cooper was following the line taken by Anglicans and Romanists on "emergency Baptism", which the Reformed Church had consistently resisted as "superstitious" and as implying false doctrine on the "peril" of the unbaptised. On the matter of lay Communion, Cooper said that he had never "pronounced an opinion" as to its efficacy, but thought that if it were done "not in conscious despite of the ordinance of the ministry", that they would not be left without the blessing which they had sought. He did not comment on its "efficacy", however, which, to a High Churchman at least, certainly involves more than a "blessing".

Cooper's teaching concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper occupied the third section. He stated emphatically that he did not hold that the ordinance was "merely a commemoration of Christ's death". He said that
his was simply the teaching of the Shorter Catechism. Cooper said that at the Communion he used the sentence, "I shall now as the appointed spokesman of our common priesthood, make the commanded remembrance of Him", and not as the charge hadworded it, "... make the commanded sacrifice of Him". The charge had also placed in Cooper's mouth the words, "we offer Thee our Lamb of Sacrifice in righteousness"; but he said that the wording was inaccurate, and that although he had used words "of somewhat similar import", he had been careful to employ it in no "dangerous or Popish sense". He said he taught that "the Eucharist, like all Christian worship, has a sacrificial aspect", but that he had never represented it as being "an expiatory sacrifice", nor as if the sacrifice of Calvary were repeated, "or said anything in any way to derogate ... from the perfection of the one sacrifice and oblation once for all offered on the Cross". He stated that, quite on the contrary, he had tried to point out in a sermon on Hebrews 13:10 that "our Christian altar was not one whereon we were to slay a victim, but one whereof we were to eat - the slaying being past"; and that in another sermon, on Malachi 1:11, he had attempted to show that "the pure offering which, as the Prophet foretold, is now 'offered unto God in every place’ is set forth in terms which imply the sin offering accomplished, and only the commemoration, the Thanksgiving, the Participation going on". As regarded the charge of transubstantiation, Cooper said that at the
Communion he did invite the communicants to "partake of the body and blood of our Redeemer", but said that our Lord does that in the words of Institution which it was his duty to repeat. Cooper admitted that as the elders distributed the elements, he used the words: "The body of Jesus Christ which IS given for you, preserve your body and soul unto everlasting life." [emphasis mine] This, he held, conformed to the "short declaration" enjoined in the Directory. He said that it was meant "to raise the people's minds from the mere elements to the body and blood of Christ, which, by means of them, the Holy Ghost applies to us, and which alone could be 'meat indeed, or drink indeed'". He maintained - very cleverly, like Queen Elizabeth - that the form of declaration that he used "no more involves transubstantiation than do our Saviour's own words, 'This is my body'".

To the charge by the elders that Cooper had taught his communicants' class that "after the elements had been consecrated they became changed - that no one could say exactly what the change was - all that could be said of it was what the Children of Israel said when they found manna, ... they called it manna - 'What is it?'"; Cooper said that the report was "garbled and essentially inaccurate". He said that he had used the incident in Exodus simply to illustrate "the mystery of that operation of the Spirit whereby the elements, still remaining bread and wine, are made the channels of a real communication". He quoted Calvin's *Institutes* \(^{45}\) to support this interpretation. He
said that on this subject he had been "no less careful to repudiate the Roman Catholic and Lutheran errors . . . than to state positively the full doctrine of our Church", and that he was astonished that the petitioners who had heard his sermons could make the assertions they did. He quoted from one of his sermons on "spiritual sacrifice" to show how perfectly clear was his teaching:

Then we have the sacrifice of praise including as its very chiefest the great thanksgiving service of the Christian Church, the Holy Eucharist. Where having in remembrance the death of our Redeemer, His mighty resurrection and prevailing intercession, we make with all possible praise and thanksgiving, our solemn memorial of them before the Father, and plead (with the symbols in our hand of Him who is Himself our plea in heaven) that God for His sake would bless the Church, and save our brethren of mankind. We do not need (God could not give) another Victim, another Mediator. We thankfully lay hold of Jesus - we plead His sacrifice, we do it till He come.

In the fourth section Cooper dealt with complaints against his teaching on Baptism. It was charged that he had taught that Baptism, "except in extraordinary cases, is indispensable to salvation". Cooper accepted the statement, but said that he was speaking, "of course, solely of those to whom, in the Providence of God, the Gospel with its privileges is actually offered, and who are therefore bound to receive them". He re-asserted the position which he had assumed in a published article, that "God is free to give whatever grace He pleases to persons unbaptised", but that "we are not at liberty to dispense with an ordinance which He has instituted, and that it is (as our Confession says) a great sin to condemn
or neglect His ordinance". Cooper said that in view of the strength and solemnity of our Lord's words concerning Baptism, and the increasingly common "despising of this Sacrament as almost amounts to positive hostility towards it" in some quarters, that he was duty bound "to set forth fully our Church's teaching as to its import, its value, the life long duty to which it binds us, and the peril of receiving God's grace in vain".

It also was charged that Cooper had not only taught that Baptism was efficacious conditional on its being administered by an ordained minister, but that he had stated that the grace of Baptism is given by the Holy Ghost to infants at the moment of its administration. Cooper was quoted as having said at Baptisms: "May the spark which has this day been kindled in this child's bosom be kept alive". Cooper said that the Shorter Catechism not only teaches that Baptism "signifies and seals" our ingrafting into Christ, but also our "partaking of the benefits of the Covenant of grace". He said that the Confession of Faith "lays it down that 'by the right use of this ordinance the grace promised (a grace defined before as including "regeneration") is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost, to such ... as that grace belongeth unto'". "No doubt the Confession also teaches", continued Cooper, "that 'all that are baptised are not undoubtedly regenerated'." He said that the Confession gave no countenance that Baptised infants "receive only
an empty sign", and he supported his assertion with a quotation from the Larger Catechism; but he stated that he had taught that the grace given could be fallen away from.

Cooper then dealt with the elders' charge of "priestly absolution" at the Communion service, and their quotation: "If any of you feel that you are sinners, yet earnestly desire forgiveness, I, the unworthy priest of God, do now forgive your sins." Cooper said that the exact words he had used were these:

In the name and by the authority of Him who hath power on earth to forgive sins, who is now exalted to give remission, whose unworthy minister I am, I declare and pronounce to each of you who truly repents and unfeignedly believes His Holy Gospel, the full and free forgiveness by Almighty God of all your sins through the blood of Jesus.

Cooper said that he had always avoided most carefully any form of absolution which he thought likely to defeat its object of comforting the penitent, or which would lead "any honest hearer" to suppose that his part in the proclamation of forgiveness was anything other than ministerial. "For introducing an absolution after the confession at the celebration of the Lord's Supper", said Cooper, "I could plead (did I want any further justification than the comfort of communicants and the nature of the ordinance itself) the example of our great Scottish reformer". He then cited Knox's Berwick Liturgy.

To the charge that he had taught an "intermediate state", Cooper, quoting from a sermon he had preached, said:
we learn that in this state, intermediate between death and judgment, no conversion can take place. There is a making perfect, . . . an improvement, I doubt not, even for the best. But there is no passing from one side to another. . . . It is a heresy condemned by all the Catholic teachers that a disembodied soul can pass either out of Christ or into Christ. . . . Between these two there is no intermediate position either in this world or the next. . . . No doubt the Roman Catholic branch of the Church teaches a doctrine of purgatory, which we believe to be unscriptural and dangerous. . . . We deny that any external application of pain is needed to purify the souls that die in the faith of Jesus. . . . We believe with the whole Church that while that judgment is not publicly announced, and not actually inflicted on any till the resurrection of their bodies at the day of judgment, yet each soul at the moment of death does, in what is called the particular judgment, receive from Christ some notice or presage of its future sentence and remains happy or miserable, according to the tenor of that notice, throughout all the interval—waiting in blessed hope, or trembling with a fearful looking for 'fiery indignation'.

Cooper did not attempt to prove that this was Reformed doctrine through reference to the Standards.

In summary, Cooper said that he had to express deep regret at the "unfortunate differences" which had caused pain to all concerned, but said that far from forfeiting the love and sympathy of his congregation, that he received almost in every house new tokens of their affection and confidence, and he offered as proof the increase in the Communion Roll. With reference to the general charge of High Churchism, Cooper stated: "it may perhaps be thought that my views on many points of Church order—views which I have long held and have never concealed—may not be in perfect harmony with those of many of my brethren"; that there was probably a "certain difference in . . . mode of expression from some of them". But he did not indicate that he was ready to alter his opinion.
After a long speech in Cooper's favour by the Rev. C. C. Macdonald of St. Clement's, a moderate motion was tabled (approved of by Cooper's friends). It stated that although none of Cooper's doctrinal statements were such as to warrant judicial inquiry and process, that many of his expressions were (to pick up Cooper's own words) "not in perfect harmony with those of many of his brethren", and that he had "not been sufficiently careful in his public teaching to show that they are in accord with the doctrines of the Church". It concluded by enjoining Cooper to use greater caution in future in expressing such views. The minister of the West Church in seconding this motion said that he thought that the charges had disappeared in the light of Cooper's statement, but that he wanted to agree with cautioning Mr. Cooper, and that because:

Mr. Cooper had come to the East Church congregation, and they were unanimous and hearty in their favour. He did not remember any settlement where the minister had received such a general and cordial welcome, and there must have been gross impudence on Mr. Cooper's part . . . when within a few months after his settlement this matter had come up, and the petitioners had been constrained . . . to assume this position.

The Rev. G. Jamieson, the minister of "Oldmachar" (it had not yet been so affected as to re-assume the name "St. Machar's Cathedral") said that although he could not concur with the comments preceding the former motion, his amendment would be in much the same terms. He said that he thought the previous motion did not lay enough stress and strength on the "sentiments" expressed in the elders'
petition. He thought that the petition should be more carefully compared with Cooper's statement, and that the statement should itself be more thoroughly examined. Accordingly, he motioned for judgment to be postponed. Milligan objected to this plea on the ground that Presbytery already had heard the full statement, and should therefore "go calmly and resolutely forward to the duty they had before them, and dispose of the case that day". Presbytery was not to be rushed, however, even by the Moderator of the past Assembly, and Jamieson's motion was carried.

It is strange to learn that Cooper did not see the significance of this postponement; he thought the Case was all but over. In a letter written to Sprott that same night, Cooper said that his statement was so well received "that Mr. Jamieson, who had a violent Puritan speech and motion, suppressed both", and that there was now no expectation that there would be any "real opposition". This impression soon proved to be quite mistaken, for Jamieson used the time gained through postponement of the judgment to prepare a formal reply to Cooper's statement. It is a salient feature of both Wotherspoon's biography and D. M. Murray's recent study, that no serious consideration is given to the subsequent highly significant speeches which led to Cooper's "censure", and also that the censure is seen as being related only to Cooper's "manner of propounding his doctrine and of introducing his practice". The facts are quite different.
The case had by now become highly celebrated and of serious consequence, and when Presbytery re-convened some days later there was a large attendance of spectators - including Free Church and Episcopal Church observers. Jamieson was the first to speak. He read to the Court a long and detailed document dealing with some thirteen items on which he took exception to Cooper's statement. He asserted at the very outset that although there was no moral charge against Cooper, everyone agreeing that he was "a self-denying, earnest and industrious servant of Jesus Christ", that the complaints were of a very serious character, and had to be dealt with accordingly. He considered first the matter of the liturgy which Cooper had instituted into the Sunday School, but had withdrawn on the order of Presbytery. The elders charged that not only had Cooper retained the service word-for-word without the book, but that he reserved his right to introduce another, considering that Presbytery's injunction in this matter was not binding for ever. Jamieson said that there had been no stipulation in Presbytery that Cooper's promises in this matter were to be only temporary, and that he could not but conclude that Cooper was "trifling with the elders, trifling with the Presbytery, and trifling with the important principle involved".

Jamieson said that he disagreed with Cooper's understanding of the eldership as the "minister's assessors" in the Kirk Session, and said that the elders had an entirely independent position in it, with a voice and a vote equal
to that of Cooper himself, "the only difference being that he as moderator of the Court had the control in the guidance of its procedure". He said that even if Cooper as minister had the right of superintendence of the Sunday Schools, that if "liturgies were introduced, if intonations were practiced, and sensational services conducted, which had no consuetude in the Church, and the introduction of which was of very questionable propriety", then the Kirk Session had every right to remonstrate with him, and to complain to the Presbytery if need be.

Jamieson said that Cooper's statement on Apostolic Succession and the grace that was imparted by virtue of it, which alone fit ministers to dispense the Church's ordinances, was not supported by the quotation from Principal Hill. He contended that Hill had not touched at all on the matter of a special grace derived through direct and continuous succession from the Apostles. He said that to believe in such manual succession of sacramental "grace" was to be "out of accord with the doctrines of the Church" and he asked if Cooper was now willing to give up his opinion in the matter. He said that the idea of special grace bestowed in ordination through manual acts was nowhere to be found in the Church of Scotland reformed; that it was foreign to Reformation principles which proclaimed the common priesthood of all Christians and eschewed any peculiar priesthood attachable to the ministry by virtue of the ordination act. He stated that no mechanical act could infuse grace into the soul; that there was no
grace bestowed in ordination "beyond what was involved in his being set apart and consecrated to his holy office, and beyond that which he continually draws from his constant communion with God". Ministry, said Jamieson, is to apply the sacrifice of Christ to their fellowmen, and this involves proclaiming the message of Christ, and prescribing the necessity of repentance and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ; it is not to pronounce freedom, but to declare that God pardons the penitent and receives the sinner.

Jamieson took strong exception to Cooper's language about the Lord's Supper, and said that it was the wildest delusion to suppose that any change takes place in the elements. He thought that Cooper was losing sight of the symbolical character of the mystery, and was tending toward the "absurdities" of transubstantiation. His feeling was much the same on Cooper's statement on Baptism. Jamieson denied that the Church of Scotland teaches Baptismal Regeneration. He said that Cooper's assertion - that by the external act of Baptism, at the hands of an ordained clergyman, a "spark of grace is communicated to the soul of the child" - was overlooking the relation in which the Church regards the child. Jamieson presented the argument that the grace of Baptism is in the parent as sponsor, and that the "lesson" of the ceremony was preeminently for the parents' benefit, and for the gathered Church's benefit. He stated that the Reformers had never held that the act of Baptism,
itself, can take away sin and infuse the grace of life. He said that it was commanded as an object lesson of purification from sin, and "as a token of God's promise when that purification is effected by the application of Christ".

Jamieson's amendment of motion was to the effect that there was no case for judicial process, not because the charges were unfounded, but because of Cooper's express repudiation of the charges of erroneous teachings. Jamieson noted, however, that Cooper still appeared to "have a leaning to sacerdotalism in his views generally, of the Christian ministry", and that he had shown "a disposition to attach undue value in ceremonials in Christian faith and worship". Cooper was, therefore, to be "seriously warned" to avoid in his teaching anything that might lead to a dependence on ritual, and anything in his ministrations "inconsistent with the principles and practice of the Church of Scotland, or offensive to the true Protestant feelings of his congregation". He was to accept the counsel and co-operation of his session, who were themselves cautioned "against hasty interference regarding the teaching of their minister".

In seconding this amendment, Dr. McClymont said that it was perfectly clear that it was Cooper's concept of Apostolic Succession which was the main point at issue, and that the further problems of ritualism and the Sunday School derived from his view of ordination and the bearing it had on the status and functions of the Christian
ministry. He quoted Principal Tulloch's statement to the General Assembly of 1882 to the effect that Apostolic Succession was a superstitious dogma that struck at the very root of Presbyterianism, and could not be consistently held outside of Rome; and these words of Dr. Cunningham:

There are only two sources from which clerical authority can proceed - the transmitted commission of the first Apostles, or the will of the Christian. Either of these theories have had its advocates. It is an article of the Roman creed, and has been a favourite dogma of many Anglican divines that no one can be a true minister of the Word and Sacraments unless he can trace his spiritual pedigree up to the apostles of our Lord. In opposition to this it is maintained by all Presbyterian, and by some Episcopal doctors, that the power of calling to the ministry lies essentially in the Christian Church itself. It is argued that under the Gospel economy there is no radical distinction between the clergy and the laity, and that ministers are merely appointed to act as rulers and teachers in the Church. They are in no sense mediators with God; they have no special powers but such as the Church, as a matter of convenience, confers, and occupy no higher platform than the humblest believer.

He said that for some Apostolic Succession would be an innocent theory of history without practical applicability; but that with "an earnest, enthusiastic, and devoted man like Mr. Cooper" the historical theory would become doctrine, and would be carried out, apparently regardless of consequences, to its logical conclusion of sacerdotalism and ritualism. He said that these "modern High Church Presbyterians" were departing from the best traditions of their Church, and were "going right in the face of the teaching on the subject by Knox", who attached no value to Orders, but regarded his commission to preach as coming by
way of a "call" from the Christian community. He cited the Reformation's abolition of ordination as sufficient proof of this statement. Its restoration, he held, was of the form of "recognition" to the outward office, not of returning to any doctrine of sacramental grace. He said that Cooper's statement on "regeneration" was not Presbyterian, nor were his words "spokesman of our common priesthood", and such like.

Mr. Smith in tabling yet another form of amendment, said that the problem as a whole was not that Cooper maintained this or that erroneous doctrine, but that he "entertained and in practice exhibited an erroneous conception of his own position, posing before the congregation not as a simple pastor and minister of the Gospel, but to some extent as a priest". He said that Cooper's statements indicated that he was beset with a "vicious and incipient clericalism". He said that he had been unaware that the elders had had so much reason to complain until he had read Cooper's statement with its beautiful hedges. Smith said that he thought Cooper was "taking shelter" under the Standards of the Church; Standards which would have to be interpreted ultimately by the General Assembly after a full libel trial. He stated that with regard to "clericalism", it was quite possible that their Standards, "being framed as concordates under pressure of circumstances, might possibly in their naked letter . . . give some shelter to the very beginnings of clericalism - to a very small modicum of
clericalism"; but he said he was sure that if a case of clear and pronounced clericalism - a modified sacerdotalism - were to come before the Supreme Court of the Church, the doctrine of the Church would be seen not in the light of the letter alone, but in the light of history and of previous decisions, and that this clericalism would be "smitten in the cheekbone". He thought that the motion, therefore, had to be worded as a general caution, but that it also had to be specific enough to be intelligible, and this because there was an obvious danger in giving too many directions as well as in giving too few. He noted that if they were too specific, Cooper might take them to the letter, and fail to do that which they had meant but had not stated. What, in fact, Smith asked the Presbytery to do, was to give Cooper a chance to reform, or enough rope to hang himself in a libel action that could be proved.

Smith's amendment became the one adopted. It stated:

The Presbytery, having considered the petition and other documents lodged by the eleven elders, and Mr. Cooper's statement thereon, are of the opinion that Mr. Cooper's undertaking with regard to the management of the Sunday School ought to receive a full and fair trial, in the hope that it may prove permanently satisfactory, but under reservation of the rights of all parties: . . . the Presbytery, recognising that the elders had colourable grounds for complaining, enjoin Mr. Cooper to be careful in discharging his ministry not to give occasion for the suspicion that his opinions and practices are not in thorough accordance with the doctrines of the Church of Scotland.
The elder who seconded this amendment said that Cooper had acted "very injudiciously" in going against so many of his elders, and that although he had been called to the East Church, it did not follow that he was at liberty to introduce any form of worship he thought proper. He said that the elders had good ground for petitioning Presbytery, and that Presbytery "would only be doing their duty if they censured him and required him to be more careful in the future". Mr. Macdonald, the author of the first and more lenient motion, said that "a more indefinite motion, and one dealing less with the facts of the case, had never been submitted to a Church Court than that put before them by Mr. Smith". None-the-less, it became the finding of the Presbytery; the petitioners acquiesced in the judgment, and Cooper thanked the Court for its very long and patient hearing. Cooper's diary has the cryptic entry:

13th February, 1883. Presbytery at 2. (Settled East Church Case; declining to prosecute: not traversing in any point my statement; but in the teeth of the evidence censuring me - virtually.)

It seems clear that Cooper was incapable of understanding the clear implications of Smith's motion, or of appreciating that Smith's terms of censure were, in fact, broader and more encompassing than had been those of Jamieson. It is hardly credible that Wotherspoon's summary of the Case was that:
The deliverance amounted no doubt to a censure; but it was a censure, not of Cooper's doctrine or practice, but of his manner of propounding his doctrine and of introducing his practice. ... the word 'colourable' ... does not usually convey the idea of substantial ground for allegation or grievance. It had been easy for Cooper to show that his language as to the Sacraments and Ministry was covered by that of the standards of the Church. ... Nothing that he had done was condemned or forbidden. He had withdrawn no phrase; he had apologised for no opinion.51

One can only wonder if Wotherspoon had read the speeches antecedent to the final deliverance. More recently D. M. Murray has said: "ten years before the Scottish Church Society was formed, the doctrinal position had been challenged and successfully defended in the courts of the church".52 Murray, too, has failed to grasp the meaning of the Presbytery's statement. It is impossible to believe that such a "hard-nosed Presbyterian" Presbytery as Aberdeen should here have accepted the High Anglican position being advanced by Cooper. In the light of the speeches made before the Presbytery, "successfully defended" hardly seems an appropriate summary; "successfully hid under the Standards" would have been more accurate. Mr. Jamieson, though - it must be admitted - he was not always strictly Reformed in some of his contentions, put forward a good case against Cooper. His terms of motion, as he said himself, were not greatly different to those advanced by Cooper's friends, but with the difference - a most important one in this particular case - that they were not greatly different because of Cooper's express denials of holding or teaching doctrines at variance with
the Reformed position. Although Jamieson thought that Cooper was following a course subversive of Presbytery, and misreading the Reformation documents, he allowed that Cooper might yet discover that he was misguided in his assertions. Mr. Smith, for his part, thought that Cooper would shortly find himself in a libel suit, and he worded his amendment of motion in terms of a "severe warning", to try and save Cooper from deposition. No one wanted to lose Cooper to the Church. But the libel action did not come: the elders who differed from Cooper seem to have either left the congregation, or become silent - confused no doubt by the conflicting opinions expressed before Presbytery, and by the ambiguous terms of the final deliverance. The Presbytery itself did not lay any charges, even though it had admitted that there were "colourable" grounds for complaint. Heresy trials at this point were proving far too diffuse and volatile; Aberdeen especially was acutely aware of the problems involved - even the Free Church Presbytery had failed to prove their case against Robertson Smith. Heresy, or doctrinal "heterodoxy" (as it might more properly be called), was difficult to prove even in a conservative age, but in an age of theological and social transition it was practically impossible, for everyone's standards were fluid. What proved even more problematic was when the traditional words had been given new meaning, or made to express new doctrinal intent; it was difficult to prove the subtle change of definition - a change say from the
Protestant orthodoxy of the Reformed Standards toward a medieval sacramentalist Catholicism.

Cooper defended himself through a systematic appeal to the Church's approved formularies. He stated that the words he had used were always strictly in agreement with these, and he himself disowned - and denied having ever taught others - words at variance with the Standards. It was a good defence, and showed very scholarly counsel.

Calvin's High Churchmanship and the High doctrines embedded in the "Scot's Confession", for example, provided Cooper with ample shelter from the cloud-burst of charges ranging from priestly pretension to sacerdotal conceptions. He was safe under the Reformed umbrella, for it was Catholic in its basic construction. It was the Catholicity of this umbrella that was vindicated in the East Church Case: the High doctrine basic to the Reformed position was reasserted. But it is quite another matter to consider - as many have done - that it was Cooper's position that was here vindicated before the Church Court; that is neither an accurate reading of the proceedings nor a fair appraisal of the Presbytery's decision. Cooper at almost every point couched his defence in the words of the Standards, but in his "reserve" he did not venture a formal definition of his understanding of these words. There can be little doubt that Cooper's understanding of the technical words he used derived from the Tractarians generally, and from Pusey more particularly: his own confession of Pusey's influence upon his
theological position is decisive in this matter. Cooper hated the Reformation, and everything it stood for. He longed to see the restored *Ecclesia Scotica*. Cooper was not so much possessed by an "incipient clericalism" - as Smith had suggested - as he was by the assertions of *Tract I*: by the grace that attaches to the ministerial vocation by virtue of the Apostolic Commission. Cooper's expressed concern for the unbroken chain of succession in the Scottish Church, and the validity of his ministerial Order, were part of this; so was his understanding of the minister as the special channel of forgiveness and absolution, and the unique agent of sacramental effectuality. Cooper was, in fact, possessed by the Tractarian definitions generally, and it was these definitions he read into the Reformed Standards. Calvin, for example, had spoken of Apostolic Succession; Knox had spoken of absolution; Principal Hill had spoken of the importance of the laying on of hands - but this was not to suggest that they defined them in terms acceptable to the Victorian fathers of the Oxford Movement. The Oxford men, in fact, expressly repudiated the definitions of the Reformers and the integrity of their system; they rejected their locus of authority; they denied their claim to Catholicity and Apostolicity; they refuted their statements on the Church, the Ministry, and the Sacraments. They used the same words, however, to their Anglo-Catholic position, but with difference and within a different system. It was this
of words and definitions which saved Cooper in the East Church Case. The words used by Cooper were vindicated, but not the definitions which he wanted to - or at least seemed to - attach to the words. Of necessity in such a situation, the terms of the Presbytery's deliverance were left ambiguous, but the ambiguity was meant to apply greater strictures than a more definitely worded censure could have achieved. The broad terms of the Presbytery's statement were meant to arrest all aspects of Cooper's clericalism and ecclesiasticism; they involved not only a censure of Cooper's method in propounding his High Church definitions, but a censure of the definitions themselves. Cooper understood that he had been "virtually censured" by the Presbytery, but he was unable to appreciate that the root of his troubles lay in his misappropriation and misapplication of Tractarian definitions - definitions which, because of his upbringing and education, his romantic nature and posited ideal, became part of his religious subconscious.
PART IV

 ECCLESIOLOGICAL AND RITUALISTIC
 RESTORATION AND INNOVATION
CHAPTER VIII

THE ABERDEEN ECCLESIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

THE REFORM OF THE ARCHITECTURE, FURNISHINGS AND
ARRANGEMENT OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND

By the 1880s there was need of some agency to take
control of and give direction to Scottish church archi-
tecture, furnishings and arrangement. During the 1860s
and 1870s, Art began to be accepted again as a handmaid of
religion. The 1857 attempt to change Greyfriars from a
seventeenth century Scottish church into a thirteenth cen-
tury English one,1 though unsuccessful, was indicative of
the movement. Many of the former cathedrals and abbeys of
Scotland were put into the hands of "restorers" - most of
whom were English trained. The movement, generally, was
accelerated by the change in the manner of administering
Communion, which itself coincided both with the movement to
restore instrumental music, and the theological uncertainty
which led to the decline of the older style of preaching.

Gothic revival had reached Scotland through England
long before these innovations, but only in externals.2
Nearly all of the 600 churches built before 1900 - the
result of the 1828 Committee (the one-time child of
Dr. Thomas Chalmers and then of the Home Board) - were in
the Gothic style.3 The Disruption of 1843 and the emergence
of the Free Church had required an even more extensive
building project, and most of these new churches were also in "Gothic". These Free Church buildings could seldom boast anything resembling the architectural quality of some of the older Parish Churches, however, even though they were well built and maintained. In nearly every case the Gothic was superficial. A. L. Drummond has pointed out that although these churches were generally built by architects, there was seldom a realisation that Gothic involves an oblong, if not a cruciform plan, and that it cannot be easily applied to square, round, or oval places of worship.

In 1846, The Ecclesiologist had reported that the state of ecclesiastical edifices in Scotland was such "as must invariably awaken painful feelings in the Churchman, for if not actually ruined, they are desecrated by puritanical worship". It went on to report that all internal decoration had been swept away, and ecclesiastical order set at nought for the sake of utilitarian arrangement. "Not only are their fine buildings deformed by an infinity of pews and galleries", it continued, "but the large churches are often cut into two or three separate portions, in order to accommodate distinct congregations." By 1859, however, the report had improved significantly. "Gothic", it noted, "now carried out with very tolerable correctness, seems to have quite made good its ground as the style for places of worship both in the Established and Free kirks, but more actively in the latter." The Ecclesiologist also noted that gable crosses were now a matter of everyday
occurrence, and that projections imitating chancels were constantly found. It further noted that it was a Mr. Hay of Liverpool who was the architect chiefly employed by the Free Church - thereby proving to its readers the English origin of and connection with these "better" developments.

Scottish ecclesiastical architecture, not unlike that of English Nonconformity, was quick to follow the fashionable "Ecclesiological" lead of Anglicanism. Instead of merely "Gothicising" a normal kirk, as had been done previously, the buildings were now made to conform to the English ground plan, and to carry English spires and steeply pitched roofs and more importantly - a chancel-like appendage. Inside, however, the T-plan layout was still general. In 1859, for example, The Ecclesiologist noted with dismay that although Glasgow Cathedral had been "restored", and the nave cleared and left unused, yet a central pulpit still dominated the ancient quire.

The decision of the General Assembly to permit organs (1876), and its failure to arrest the movement toward the new manner of administering Communion in the pews, required certain changes to internal arrangement. According to Ian Lindsay, a kirk of the 1870s, 80s and 90s would generally have had an English or French Decorated Gothic façade, with a dominant tower surmounted by a large spire. The narthex would have been tiled, and would have had a staircase at each end leading to the galleries. Inside one would have had the over-whelming impression of organ pipes towering above a sea of sticky varnished pews arranged
facing it on a gently sloping floor. In the midst would have been bracketed a pulpit, and below and in front of it, the organ console – the top of which would sometimes have doubled as the Communion Table. 13

This caricature of a Scottish kirk in the final quarter of the nineteenth century is supported essentially by contemporary witnesses. H. J. Wotherspoon, for example, wrote in 1891:

We Scots are always in extremes: we begin with anthems before we have learned to say 'Amen'; one day we will have no organ on any terms, and the next we build a chancel to our preaching place and fill it with an organ – we have paid hundreds of pounds for it and we mean to have the worth of our money – so the machine is set up in the Sanctuary, that we may worship toward it, and a pulpit is bracketed above the keyboard. 14

Sprott in his book Worship and Offices (1882), had said much the same thing, and had added mention of another "strange device": a font, to the top of which was screwed a board to serve as a Communion Table. 15

Contemporaneous with these developments, the liturgical movement, associated with the Church Service Society, joined hands with the anti-Disestablishment movement, probably because of a pre-existent harmony of principles and persons, and this progressed logically into the new avenue of architectural differentiation from rival Presbyterian dissent. What more natural way to distinguish the Establishment than by making her resemble more closely the sister Establishment – (or as Dr. A. K. H. Boyd spoke of her) "the Great National Church south of the Tweed". What better way to win the English Church's political support than to
evidence an approximation to her practically: architecturally. Some highly influential men within the Auld Kirk were eager to purge her of anything readily identifiable with English Nonconformity. Interestingly, Drummond has noted that this general movement was associated with the assumption of a subtle Anglicised snobbery, as evidenced by the affected use of the name "Holy Communion" for - what in Scotland was traditionally called - the "Lord's Supper", and employment of the theologically irreconcilable term - insofar as the Reformed Church is concerned - the "Holy Table".  

It is also probable that the restoration of the stone "font" was equally affected, for at this time few Baptisms actually took place in the church.  

George Hay has written that nearly all the churches built in the last quarter of the nineteenth century in Scotland were eclectic renderings of medieval styles, but more than this, that:  

Such buildings were designed in the main to satisfy the predilections of well-meaning clerics to whom 'the beauty of holiness' meant a Gothic Anglican church planned according to Victorian precepts which had been current in England fifty years earlier.  

Hay has said that it was as though the Kirk "had turned its back on Geneva and its Reformed and continental affiliations". He has noted in particular that much of what went under the name "restoration" was in effect "unintelligent mutilation", and that post-Reformation churches in particular were "viciously handled" by uncomprehending ministers.
and architects. He has cited as examples the apses which were broken through the long wall of T-plan churches, the Georgian sash windows which were replaced by leaded glass, or even "Gothicised", and churches which were "orientated" - their original fittings being superseded by (what he has not unfittingly termed) "essays in Church Furnishers' Gothic" in an effort to achieve "the Victorian Anglican approximation".

A substantial part of the blame for this movement must be attributed to the Aberdeen Ecclesiological Society, for although its members themselves aimed at a high standard of "restoration", building, and furnishing, theirs was the affected Camden ideal. The Society was instituted on 2 February, 1886, at James Cooper's home, and its stated object was two-fold: (1) the study of the principles of Christian Worship, and of Church Architecture and its allied arts; and (2) the diffusion of sound views and the creation of truer taste in such matters.

The Society's formation had been discussed, apparently, in the autumn of 1885, when Cooper, Charles Carmichael, and William Kelly, were out for a walk. Although the exact reasons that led to their desire to found such a society are not known, sufficient is known of each of these three friends and of their relative situations, to speculate that the founding of the Aberdeen Ecclesiological Society represented a clear manifestation of the Camden
Society's influence in Scotland. These three, and a Mr. James Watt of London, a painter, met on the 13th January, and drafted the Constitution and objects of the Society, which were then submitted to Milligan and Sprott for their approval and "blessing". In the letter to Sprott, Cooper wrote of the new Society:

It is some young architects and divines who want to learn, and, according to the Scholastic motto, to teach that they may learn. Dr. Milligan has given his approval; will you also give a word of encouragement? I was in Govan on Sunday, and like you was immensely delighted with the arrangement of the Church and the demeanour, at once intelligent, hearty and reverent of the worshippers... When a Church is rightly arranged, the whole service takes its proper place, and its meaning is made apparent to all. Men feel they have come to worship God and hear his message.

Sprott must have approved of the Society, for his name was listed among the "Corresponding Members" of that year.

A. L. Drummond has said that the choice of name, using the word "Ecclesiological", was unfortunate, for it necessarily suggested the example of "the pedantic and traditionalist Camden Society". But surely that was precisely the point of the new Society. Their relation to the English movement was clearly stated in Cooper's paper given at the very first meeting. Cooper, it should be noted, was named President of the Society at that meeting, "in consideration of the part he had taken in the formation of the Society". William Kelly was named Secretary, and Charles Carmichael, Treasurer.

Cooper's opening paper, entitled "Reasonable Service", pointed out the objects at which the Aberdeen Ecclesiological
Society should aim. He said that men were so constituted that their surroundings affected their whole being. A perfect sanctuary could not make a bad man good, nor was aesthetic emotion religion; but, he insisted, it was not right "to rear a mean fabric in God's honour, when better could be procured". He said that there was only too ample a field in Scotland for the Society's operations, and though their numbers were few, they might take courage from the great work that had been done in England by the Cambridge Ecclesiological Society, which, taking its rise among a few Cambridge undergraduates, had proved an important factor in the Revival, alike of religion and of architecture, in the Church of England.

It was clear from the outset that the Aberdeen conception of an ideal Church was going to be closely linked to that which Cambridge had enunciated - correct, medievalist, traditional; and that because it was conformable not only to the High doctrine and aestheticism entertained by Cooper, but also to its founding architects' training. Charles Carmichael and William Kelly both looked to Tractarian England for their guidance and inspiration.

Charles Carmichael (1864-1890) was apprenticed to Messrs. Mackenzie and McMillan, Aberdeen, and then to Messrs. Matthews and Mackenzie, for whom he continued to work. These formative influences were decisive, and clearly determinative of his architectural orientation. Messrs. Matthews and MacKenzie (as noted above), built for the Scottish Episcopal Church with "a Tractarian correctness not surpassed by St. Barnabas', Pimlico, or
St. Paul's, Brighton", and their execution of the Craigiebuckler Parish Church, on the same "Ecclesiological" lines, was one of the leaders in applying this English style and internal arrangement to Presbyterian churches in Scotland. This firm, in particular, quite obviously thought that difference in doctrine and in the style of worship did not require a different architectural expression. Ecclesiological Gothic was the correct style of a Christian Church: Pugin had said so, and the Camden Society had proved it.

Carmichael extended what he had been taught by his masters, and was himself a keen student of ancient architecture. He studied closely that within his reach - St. Machar's, Elgin Cathedral, King's College Chapel. He also made excursions to study buildings of interest in Fife, Tweedside, northern England, and sometimes those further afield. But he remained most enamoured with thirteenth century Gothic.

Carmichael's association with Cooper came by way of the East Church, which his family attended. He died a young man, however, and left little in the way of church building, except St. Margaret's, Barnhill, which was built to his design. Cooper had early detected the medieval spirit in Carmichael, and wrote of him after his death:
Unfeignedly religious, unfeignedly devout, he readily understood that in his art, as in everything else, he was to serve his Divine Master. He strove to serve Him in two ways - by the faithful discharge of his daily duties, and by 'giving tithes', as it were, of his special gifts for the adornment of the House of God. 37

William Kelly (1861-1944) was not dissimilar to Carmichael in religious spirit, but he enjoyed a far longer and more brilliant career. It has been said, in fact, that Kelly was "the last of her [Scotland's] heroic race of scholar architects, amongst whom are numbered David MacGibbon, Thomas Ross, William Galloway, Rowand Anderson, Hippolyte Blanc, John Honeyman, and MacGregor Chalmers". 38 He was apprenticed to the office of William Smith, the architect of Balmoral Castle, and, most interestingly, in view of his later associations with Cooper, one of his earliest jobs was the rebuilding of St. Nicholas' spire, which had been destroyed by fire in 1874. 39 After his apprenticeship Kelly spent several years in London, undoubtedly being indoctrinated more fully in the English ideal, and in 1885 he made an excursion to study in some detail various French cathedrals. 40 In 1886 he returned to Aberdeen, and after some time entered into partnership with his old master, William Smith.

Kelly was at home in the Neo-Classical style, but he was first and foremost a medievalist, and a master of Gothic styles. 41 He considered St. Ninian's Parish Church, Aberdeen, for example, his best effort, 42 and it in particular bears clear evidence of his medievalist orientation. It was built as a pure medieval building,
open and uncluttered, complete with chancel and elevated "altar-table".

It was Kelly's careful study and painstaking restoration of King's College Chapel, however, for which he is perhaps best remembered. He pleaded for the organ to go into a screen loft, he fought for the removal of Bishop Forbes' pulpit (1637) from its centred position, he restored the ceiling, he opened up the east-end and restored the east window, he removed the Professor's stalls from the apse so that it could be refurnished - "restored", says his biographer, W. D. Simpson, "to something of its proper function as the centre of worship and the seat of the altar and clergy". Simpson, in his "Memoir", goes on to record that Kelly "rejected absolutely the bad old idea, so hard in dying, that ugliness is a necessary or inevitable concomitant of a Presbyterian church, or that a church should be regarded as a preaching box, not a place of worship". He says that Kelly insisted that a Presbyterian church should be as beautiful as a Roman Catholic or an Anglican one; but perhaps more simple and restrained, "in keeping with the austere worship for which it is designed".

It is not surprising that it was to Kelly that Cooper turned to have his crypt chapel restored at St. Nicholas' East in 1898. The ancient quire of St. Nicholas', which formed the East Church, had been rebuilt in 1835, a thing much regretted by both Cooper and Kelly; but here in the crypt, in the ancient "Pity Vault", the former St. Mary's
Chapel was capable of "restoration". Kelly stripped out its brick partitions, removed the plaster, and restored the window tracery. Of it Kelly said:

The low bowed lines of St. Mary's, solemn and brooding, express the feeling proper for a chapel dedicated to the Lady of Sorrows. It was the 'Pity Vault', and no better name can it ever have.  

What a long way this young architect had journeyed from Archibald Simpson, the one responsible for the demolition of the medieval quire of St. Nicholas' in 1835 because, he had claimed, "the church is quite unfit for the purpose of an auditory". This assertion was supported by the then minister, who gave these reasons for its "renovation":

The unfavourable construction of the old church for seeing and hearing in consequence of the huge round pillars, behind which a great many of the seats were placed; the fact that such a building was never intended to be filled with fixed pews, and to have galleries; the superior accommodation for a large congregation . . . in which there would be no bad seats; and the necessity of drawing a large revenue from seat rents.

The change from Simpson's to Kelly's attitude is indicative of a new understanding of ecclesiastical architecture, and a new churchmanship - implicitly Tractarian affected. Kelly wrote, for example:

We all know what we mean by the words 'Religion' and 'Art'; although it is not easy to put into words all that we understand by these terms. Religion is knowing God, and obeying His laws in a spirit of love: in the fulness of time - for these nineteen centuries - the supreme Revealer of God is Jesus Christ, who is the supreme example of Sonship - the only example of perfect Sonship and complete obedience. Art is man's making of things meant to be Good, True, and Beautiful, as God has made His Universe and all that is in it.
If religion be the worship of God, the doing of His will, by His loving children, the things that we, His children, say, or sing, or make, in the spirit of Worship and Obedience and Service, constitute Art: but these things, whether they 'do' or 'say', either singly or both together, must be Good and True and Beautiful – all three – else they do not enter the Lordship of real Art, which is part of the Kingdom of Heaven. 'To labour is to Pray.' The Artist's Art is in a sense his Religion, for it expresses the attitude of the whole man, in body, mind, emotion, imagination towards God and His only begotten Son, and towards his fellow-men. So that the teaching of Jesus about God and our duty controls the Work (that is Art) of His disciples. If everyone and especially all artists were really Christian, there would be such a blossoming and bursting of true art as the world has never seen. Conviction, emotion, vision, perception, spiritual power, would issue in the most convincing overpowering, all-pervading, joyous spiritualisation of material things in our land, our cities, and all that in them is, transforming, and transfiguring everything made or sung or said.

It is unlikely that Archibald Simpson (or any other pre-Oxford Movement Scottish Protestant architect) would have defended his work in such words, or would have argued for religious art along these lines.

Kelly's medievalism had an important consequence: he was one of the first to draw attention to the fact that many of the humbler Scottish parish churches of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries evidence the medieval spirit in "sound construction and fitness of form". In his view the disaster in Scottish church architecture had come with early nineteenth century "heritor's Gothic". He thought that it was strange that they should now go to study those earlier buildings so recently despised, but gave credit for this re-awakening to better principles – not surprisingly – to "a school of English church-builders", and to their pupils, who "have studied every medieval style
of Europe". Kelly said that through such study "we gradually discover that even the commonest things are full of meaning . . . , if only they are touched with the character and individuality of an honest craftsman and a good time". Modern building, he said, should not be done by "copying any old work whatever: nor by producing of set purpose new archaic work"; but by accepting "the conditions of modern existence, harmonising our work with them, and applying the old principles". Kelly himself, however, tended to adopt old principles and copy old work, even though he was highly utilitarian.

There can be little doubt that by its very nature and programme, the Aberdeen Society formed by these three men was "Ecclesiological" in the technical sense, for it had a medieval orientation with no love of (what Kelly called) "Modernismus". It is indicative of the Society, for example, that Cooper in his paper to them, entitled "Principles of Christian Worship", at no point made reference to the peculiar nature of "Reformed Worship" as it had been or was now known in Scotland. In fact, he explicitly advocated the traditional Catholic setting. He said that "the place of honour in a church, the (conventional) east-end, should always be kept for something that sets forth before the mind of worshippers Him whom they come to worship". He said that the "Holy Table" should be there, and above, the stained glass, mosaics and frescoes should
draw attention to the key episodes of salvation represented in our Lord's birth, death, resurrection, ascension, and current role as heavenly High Priest. (In this regard he took exception to the Four Evangelists occupying the East Window of Glasgow's ancient cathedral.)

Cooper, in his paper, revealed that he had accepted the architectural symbolism of Durandus as made popular by the Camden Society. He said, for example, that the use of three aisles, or the use of the nave and the two transepts, was a strong witness to the Trinity, and he quoted with approval the words of Keble:

Three solemn aisles approached the shrine:
Yet all are one - together all,
In thoughts that awe but not appal,
Teach the adoring heart to fall.59

He said: "We ought to be reminded by the outside of the building, and still more when we enter it, that the church is set apart for the worship of the All-Holy." The Incarnation, said Cooper, is as essential as the Trinity, and affects our thoughts of God, His nature, His attitude to us, and our proper attitude to Him. It should, therefore, affect the building and the worship; it should "witness of God in mercy coming down to us to take us up to Him". Cooper was undoubtedly arguing for an informed ecclesiastical architecture with both symbolical and doctrinal intent; the problem was that with Cooper this intent was bound to be Catholic, not Reformed.

In the paper Cooper also contended for other things. He argued for kneelers, and said that their Society "could
do no greater service to religion" than to impress on all
concerned that these were desirable. He even showed
them what he called "an admirable pamphlet" on the subject
by the English architect, William Butterfield. He said
too that a place should be provided for week-day worship,
and be so arranged so as to be a quiet nook, "with
suggestions of God and Christ and Heaven, in which to pray".
He argued in favour of the font being placed at the door
as a visible reminder of one's entry into Christ. He said
that he personally admired the Greek ritual of kissing the
Gospel-book, and appreciated the lavishness of their
bindings and borders. The pulpit, he thought, should be
convenient, dignified, and high enough to be usable; but
he stated emphatically that although it was great, it
should never visually be the chief thing in the church.

Cooper said that he liked the rood screen, and thought
that it - surmounted by a crucifix - should be restored
to separate the chancel from the nave. Of the "Holy Table",
he said that it should be so covered, constructed, and
placed as to show that it was not for an "immolation"; but
that other than this, anything that could enhance its
dignity was desirable. He said that he himself liked a
plain cross on the table, and thought that all ornaments
should be chaste and not distracting. Cooper, speaking of
the table, referred to Raphael's painting, "Disputa" (which
portrays the altar with only a monstrance on it), and said
that it reminds us of the great Gift God gives us there;
that it tells us at a glance
that the Eucharist is the meeting-place of Heaven and earth. That is precisely the idea which the Holy Table in a church ought always to make manifest - the Holy Communion as a means of a real partaking, by us on earth, of our living and ascended Lord. The Eucharist is not only the highest act of the Christian's homage; it is also the sacrament wherein God communicates to us His greatest Gift. ... I always think that as Christianity is the way of salvation, ... so the innermost part, the 'east end' of a Christian church, arranged on ... the Catholic plan, - leading up, past the font, and through the choir, and by the pulpit, to the Holy Table, is the most sublime of conceivable terminations. ... In its inmost shrine the Table of Communion tells of a fellowship that never ends. ... 62

It is clear that the ideal of Cooper, Carmichael and Kelly, the ideal of the Aberdeen Ecclesiological Society generally, was that of J. M. Neale and the Cambridge Movement. And as the Camden Society necessarily drew toward Oxford's doctrinal position, so in Scotland the two naturally coalesced. Although Gothic revival had started in Scotland without doctrinal intent, it naturally drew to itself the doctrine and symbolism of a medieval Catholicism. This coalescence is not unusual. Drummond in his study of Protestant architecture, has noted that there is a close relation between a building constructed for Catholic worship, and Catholic Worship itself; that a Catholic environment makes a congregation receptive to Catholic ideals and Catholic conceptions of religion,63 even as Camden had hoped; that clearing away dividing walls and restoring ancient chancels or building new, inevitably leads to an east-end table removed to the farthest point and preserved from desecration - perhaps even by a Laudian altar-rail.
That this table had never before been so placed in
Reformed worship, and that the sanctity of the east-end
(or any other part, for that matter) is incompatible with
Reformed doctrine, was ignored. He says that by means of
a partisan use of history, the Anglicising tendency was
carried on. Referring to these developments, Drummond
has stated plainly:

In church architecture, as in worship, there was little
attempt to express Reformed ideals, still less to go on
from precedent to experiment. It was the fond ambition
of ecclesiological clerics to build Gothic churches
with deep chancels, cluttered up with choir stalls,
eagle lecterns, and prayer desks of the type standardised
by the Oxford Movement. No attempt seems to have been
made to learn from the Continental Reformed Churches how
dignity and simplicity could be combined. 64

Sir R. Rowand Anderson's church at Govan (1888) and
Sir J. J. Burnet's Barony Church, Glasgow (1889), are
perhaps the most outstanding examples of Scottish
"Ecclesiology" in the sense described. The Aberdeen
Ecclesiological Society, in fact, considered Govan Church
to be "probably the most magnificent reared in connection
with the National Church since 1560". 65 Of the Barony, to
its mind more sumptuous but less fine than Govan, 66 it said
that the internal effect was "magnificent and striking",
and the Society hailed it as another sign "of the better
day that has dawned for church building in Scotland". 67
"Evidently it has been arranged", said the Society's
"Transactions", "not for preaching only, but for worship:
with a view to the honour of God's service, and not merely
to the comfort of the congregation." 68 It continued:
"the prominence accorded . . . to the chancel and altar (features hitherto rarely and grudgingly admitted), points . . . to a revival of sounder views as to the place of the Eucharist in the church's worship". It reported that the chancel was to be adorned with frescoes, and suggested that the space between the table and the lancet windows, (placed high up in the wall), "evidently intended for a reredos", should receive a sculpture of "the Last Supper". The "Transactions" said that if this were done, and if the windows had "the Crucifixion" in stained glass, and the wall space above "a mosaic of Our Lord in a vesica-shaped glory, it would be a perfect pictorial ending of the grand vista".

That this is Cooper himself writing can be gleaned from the inside cover of his diary for that year, which shows a sketch of the east wall of the Barony and how it should be "correctly" completed. In the printed review he went on to say that it was unfortunate that the chancel was not groined in stone. He stated that the "Holy Table" at the east-end of the chancel, though raised, was not raised enough; that although it was of carved oak and costly, it lacked dignity, and that the two "large and meaningless prayer-desks, placed near it, one at either end, detract still more from its apparent importance". The choir stalls, said Cooper, are set, "as they ought to be, with their ends to the nave". Cooper commended the introduction of clergy-desks with two book-rests, one facing the congregation, the other choir-wise - so that the
minister, facing the same direction as the choir, "may say or sing along with his people the prayers and praises addressed to God". 72 "The reintroduction of this practice among us", said Cooper, "would help the much-to-be-desired abolition of prayers like that which the American reporter characterised as 'the most eloquent prayer ever addressed to a Boston audience'." 73 Cooper also commended the Barony's provision of a side-chapel, "suitable for weekday services and private prayer", and the kneeling boards in the pews. The font, however, he considered too small. Besides the building and its arrangement, Cooper commented favourably on the "Order of Dedication", which had included the congregation's standing to say the Creed, joining in the Lord's Prayer, chanting the Prose Psalms, and "singing the Amen after the prayers".

Such "editorialising" by Cooper was not unusual. Repeatedly in the "Transactions", his ideal was impressed upon the members and readers generally. They were to use all the influence they could bring to bear for the conservation of buildings of "ecclesiastical interest". 74 In building new churches, Decorated Scottish Gothic was the most acceptable style, 75 but a mixing of the styles of various periods was not unacceptable. 76 The ideal was the cruciform ground-plan, "orientated", with elevated chancel, the arch of which should be deliberate and exposed. 77 A chancel screen was most desirable, and a surmounted rood was commendable. Galleries should always be avoided; they should be removed if already present. The font should be
at the west end. The organ should be in a transept, or in the northern arcading, and since it too was a work of art, it was to have a fitting and beautiful exterior. Gothic architecture, said Cooper, delights in a long vista: "for that it marshalls its rows of columns on either hand of its solemn approach to the Holy Table". The proper use of the transepts and choir, he said, could aid in this respect, as could the judicious use of colour. The choir stalls should run east-west if within the chancel, and beyond them, and elevated still more and on a foot-pace, the altar-table should be set under the east window - the lights of which should be set high enough to allow of a reredos. This east-end sanctuary should be "jealously reserved" for the "Holy Table".

Cooper said that if Gothic was not to be used for some reason, then consideration might be given to Norman, with a semi-circular apse, which was also capable of particularly good effect.

It was obviously not a coincidence that in 1890 an Aberdeen publisher produced a reprint of Dr. Joseph Robertson's article, "Scottish Abbeys and Cathedrals", which was first published in the Quarterly Review for June, 1849. It represented a review of Billing's Baronical and Ecclesiastical Antiquities, and of some early publications of the Cambridge Camden Society. The probable reason for its republication was that Billing's
prints were still capable of good effect, showing how the medieval churches of Scotland could look; and that the Camden Society's publications were still relevant to the "ecclesiological" quest. In this regard, the Society's restoration of the Norman church at Birnie (1890-91), the project of Kelly, and more importantly, of A. Marshall Mackenzie, was a significant and far-reaching development.  

In the same year, 1890, the "Transactions" recorded with some pride and evident pleasure that at long last the quire of Glasgow Cathedral had received "what it greatly needed ... - an altar place of rich marbles, stalls, and a Holy Table, from designs by Mr. Honeyman, the architect to the Cathedral" 88 - and, it might have noted, a prominent member of the Society. This "editorialising" in the Society's "Transactions" was having its desired effect, as seen in the number of churches conforming to the Ecclesiological ideal, and in the number of special services of "dedication" of the new fabric at which Cooper himself was almost invariably asked to officiate. 89 The pressure brought to bear on St. Machar's, for example, against the proposed east-end location of the organ, and on Aberdeen to prohibit the demolition of the Greyfriars Chapel, 90 shows the considerable influence now exerted by the printed word of the Society; a Society which now became larger and - if possible - even more determined in its Camden approximation. 91

One reason for this advanced position was that the new members of the Society were not invariably Presbyterian.
For example, one of the brilliant young architects who associated himself with the Society's objects and programme in 1890 was J. Ninian Comper (1864-1960). The son of one of the most advanced priests in the Anglo-Catholic revival in Scotland (who also became a member of the Society in that year), a personal friend of Bishop A. P. Forbes and J. M. Neale, an alumnus of Trinity College, Glenalmond, and a devoted disciple of his master G. F. Bodley, Comper was to exercise a decisive influence in the Society and on Scottish ecclesiastical architecture generally. He himself was a fervent and advanced Anglo-Catholic, and has been claimed as the greatest church furnisher since Wren. His distinction in this regard derives from the fact that he, for the first time in the history of the Gothic revival, took the altar seriously. Comper believed that the function for which the church exists is as a roof over the altar; so he always built from the altar outwards. It is interesting to speculate that it was his early association with Cooper and John Macleod and Milligan that first impressed this function upon him; a function which was subsequently borne out by his study of medieval illustrations in the British Museum. Cooper was a convinced "Ecclesiologist". It is hardly surprising, then, to hear these words of his addressed to the Society in 1893:
I would make good my claim that the customs, which I have distinguished as Gothic, are the most reasonable and beautiful, on the very simple ground that they are the expression of that style of architecture which alone is adequately characteristic of Christianity, because it is the only purely original style that Christianity has produced. . . . The renaissance so-called of architecture, it ought not to be forgotten, began abroad as the expression of an affected paganism, only real in its disbelief in Christianity. 100

In that same year, 1893, Cooper was invited to address St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society in London on "Ecclesiology in Scotland." 101 After a historical review of its rather checkered past, and the usual references associated with him on the benefits accruing to the Scottish Church through the coming of St. Margaret, and the restored Episcopacy of 1610, he spoke of the more recent revival. He traced the new and better things to the Oxford Movement and Sir Walter Scott's literary influence. He said that the revival "naturally" affected the Scottish Episcopalians first (and in this regard mentioned Ninian Comper's chapel built for the Sisters of St. Margaret, Aberdeen), but he stated that the Establishment was not far behind, more especially in "restorations". He said that the earliest effort, Glasgow Cathedral, was not without its faults, and that he "drew a charitable veil over the 'restoration' of the Cathedral of Aberdeen by Sir Gilbert Scott"; but he indicated that more recently the work on St. Giles' was of a better standard, as was that of Dunblane Cathedral, St. Vigean's, Arbroath, and King's College Chapel, Aberdeen. Of new churches he was almost duty bound to praise the design of Govan, and the Barony, Glasgow,
"on sound ecclesiological principles" - and he did. Cooper noted in passing that these developments were not universally welcomed: that there was in fact considerable resistance to the programme, and that not so much from the common people, who were quite open-minded. The middle class were "stiffer", according to Cooper; "the nobility not always helpful".

The reluctance of the nobility to accept the Ecclesiological ideal was soon to end, and that more especially because of Royal involvement. The opening of the new Crathie Church (1893), designed by A. Marshall Mackenzie (an eminent member of the Society) for Queen Victoria, seemed to give Royal sanction to the Ecclesiological programme. The church was "orientated" east-west and was cruciform in plan. An apsidal chancel at the east-end, raised four steps above the floor of the nave, originally was the setting of an oak table, but this was replaced by a solid marble altar on a marble footpace, complete with a wooden reredos (1913) - the gift of King George V as a memorial to Edward VII. A brass lectern, a stone pulpit, the organ in a west-end gallery, all reflected the "correct" style. Interestingly, the font, of granite, was located not at the west-end, but at the foot of the chancel steps on the south side of the crossing - right in front of the Royal pew and transept.
This Royal Patronage of "correct" Ecclesiology obviously went a long way to confirm not only Gothic as the Christian style, and an "orientated" interior with the "Holy Table" removed from desecration to the sanctity of the extreme east-end as the acceptable arrangement, but also the Scottish Ecclesiological Society (as it now was)\textsuperscript{104} as the authority on such things. The erection of the "Thistle Chapel", Edinburgh, by Sir Robert Lorimer (1911), which won for him his knighthood and recognition as the National architect of Scotland, perhaps more than anything previous, linked Gothic and the Ecclesiological ideal to that which was considered to be regal, and noble, and faithful, and honourable, and national.\textsuperscript{105}

The rebuilding of St. Cuthbert's in 1894 apparently surprised the public by its Ecclesiologc al features: a chancel lavishly decorated in marble and mosaic, tacked on to a huge meeting house, and a solid altar-like Communion Table of marble.\textsuperscript{106} It might reasonably have been anticipated. Perhaps the alabaster reproduction of Da Vinci's "The Last Supper", and the font (1908), the largest and most elaborate in Scotland\textsuperscript{107} (which incorporated a large bronze reproduction of Michelangelo's Mother and Child - defended before the Courts of the Church as representing "Motherhood")\textsuperscript{108} were less obviously expected. The architect, Hippolyte Blanc, was quite certainly accommodating the ministers, Dr. James MacGregor and Wallace Williamson, but more especially the latter.\textsuperscript{109} The style probably would have been Gothic, except for the
rebuilding condition that the old tower - Early Italian Renaissance - be retained. There was also a need for gallery accommodation because of the limited ground plan. But within these limits, and with little space in which to work, Blanc produced a remarkable statement of Ecclesiological principles.

Interestingly, Drummond dates from this re-building of St. Cuthbert's the beginning of a reaction "against the renaissance in Worship and Church Architecture", as seen most clearly in the invigorated campaign of Jacob Primmer against this movement which was so definitely directed into High Church channels.

Drummond's contention is quite certainly correct in this matter, for Primmer took grave exception to the programme and intention of the Society. But in all fairness to "Pastor Primmer", there can be no doubt that he was right in seeing the Ecclesiological Society as an effective tool of Scoto-Catholicism, and, as such, basically subversive of Scottish Presbyterianism as it had been known. The "Transactions" of 1890, for example, (recording the words almost certainly of Cooper), had reiterated that their object as a Society was not only church architecture, but also "The study of the Principles of Christian Worship". It therefore quoted with approval this passage - as it said - "from the remarkable and splendid speech which one of our members, the Rev. John Macleod, D.D., Govan, delivered . . . at the Annual Meeting of the Church Service Society". Macleod spoke, he said:
of the priesthood of the people - but of the whole Church, clergy and people, as having a priestly vocation assigned to it by the LORD, in distinction from all those whom it had pleased GOD to leave outside her pale. What we need', he went on, 'is the restoration of ideas. It seems to me that there is room for the realisation of the fact that Sacerdotalism - if, for the purpose of emphasis, I may use that offensive word - is the most distinctive feature of the present work of Our LORD in Heaven. He entered on the eternal functions of His Heavenly Priesthood by His Resurrection and Ascension. The Epistle to the Hebrews is full of this one conception, and if the Church is really united with her LORD, if she is really His Mystical Body, partaking of His Life, and of His Anointing, and called to the fellowship in Him of one worship before the FATHER - then, I say, the priestly vocation (Sacerdotalism, if you will, in the right sense of the word) must be one of the distinctive features in the life of His Church. They, the people of the Church, have a vocation to fulfil, and that vocation is not merely to sit in a pew and be prayed for or preached at; but actively to co-operate with the LORD in the maintenance of one continual intercession at the one Heavenly Altar. The moment that we perceive this, then, it seems to me, all else follows. Then we see that, however important preaching may be, Worship is greater than preaching. Then we see that the Celebration of the Holy Communion is the highest form of intercession, for it is that in which the Church most realises, sacramentally, the presence of the Mediator, and her unity with Him, in presenting one intercession before GOD. Then, also, we see the necessity of Daily Prayer. We see that the intercession on earth should be as frequent as the intercession in Heaven, which is continual; yea, and that the intercession on earth should be commensurate with the intercession in Heaven, which embraces the whole Church; and we see that, in expression of these things, the duty of the people is to add the Amen of their fervent assent to the prayers which they are assembled as an holy priesthood to present, in the SPIRIT, through CHRIST, to GOD. When we get firm hold of these principles we shall then be in a position to make our work better understood by the people of Scotland. 113

Reading such things it is hard to believe that the Society included in its membership not only Episcopalians and High Church Establishment men, but some of the most
notable free thinkers of the day. George Adam Smith, for example, an eminent Free Churchman, was a member of the Society from its inception, and its President in 1928. An advanced Liberal in his theology, it has been said that in the period following on the Robertson Smith trial he took upon himself "to reconcile the outlook of an advanced scientific scholar with the spirit of devout reverence".\textsuperscript{114} His ministry in Aberdeen (1882-92) coincided with Cooper's time there, and - according to him - Cooper was very much his model parish minister. Even when Smith removed to the Chair of Old Testament at the Free Church College, Glasgow, and then in 1909 to the Principalship of Aberdeen University, he yet remained a close friend of Cooper.

In 1928 in his Presidential Address, entitled "A Retrospect",\textsuperscript{115} Smith spoke of Cooper as "the Man, our Founder and the chief inspiration of our Society". He said that of Cooper's piety and learning, everyone knew. Only one man, to his mind, excelled Cooper in swift readiness of memory and encyclopaedic knowledge, and that was Robertson Smith. He said that much of the suspicion and criticism which surrounded the Society at first was due partly to Cooper himself, for he was easily misunderstood. Smith said:

Compact, sincere and transparent as was his personality, it seemed to those whom he startled to be full of what at the time were novel and irreconcilable contradictions. An evangelical in doctrine and yet a high churchman, a loyal adherent to Presbytery and yet a believer in the possibility of uniting Presbytery with
Episcopacy and an earnest labourer for this; a liberal advocate of all the arts as the allies of faith and worship and yet an eager foe to reason's claims on religion, ... a prophet of the fundamental verities of our faith, intent upon the salvation of souls, and yet laying great stress on symbols and details of ornament in architecture and vestments ... the man was a paradox and a puzzle to many, irritating to those who did not know him at all, and amusing to those who knew him but a little.

In his speech Smith quoted with transparent delight A. K. H. Boyd's remark: "I have just been seeing James Cooper and he has been showing me all the curious things he has brought back from Greece, but of all the curious things James Cooper brought back from Greece the most curious is James Cooper himself." Smith also quoted with approval Professor A. B. Bruce's words to Glasgow University, supporting Cooper's candidacy for the Regius Chair of Church History: "We need Cooper. He is the salt in our Scottish Porridge."

In explanation of his own involvement in the Society, Smith said that Cooper naturally drew to himself in his Ecclesiological project two separate groups: first, ministers of various churches "whose learning and religious temper and taste were akin to his own"; and second, talented young architects, whose instructive essays and notes, and illustrations of plans and buildings, gave much to the Society. Smith said:

You can readily understand what such a fellowship, refreshed from month to month, and its generous and lavish gifts of scholarship, art and spiritual inspiration, meant to us youthful ministers. We were made acquainted not only with the rich architectural monuments and ecclesiological remains of our own
country, but with the Cathedrals and Churches of England, Holland, Cologne, Ravenna, Greece. . . . Ancient liturgies and confessions were opened up to us. While the truth was never forgotten that Christian character was more inspiring than Christian architecture, we learned how the Christian arts led back to the character and communicated its influence to the reverent worshipper. All this was at once a liberal and a spiritual education to us.

It is hard to believe that the Ecclesiological programme could have been construed as a "liberal" education, except in the sense that it widened the horizons of learning and helped to break down the more traditional Calvinistic orthodoxy. As seen in Smith's reflections, it was the traditionalist spirit that underlay Cooper's work, and that generally of the Society until after Cooper's death. Nowhere was this plainer than in Cooper's own address to the Society on "Christian Symbols".116 There all the traditional meanings were reaffirmed. He defined a symbol as not properly a representation, but a sign which is something greater than a representation; is something which suggests more than it properly sets forth.117 He considered Christian Symbolism under various heads: God - the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; the Church; the Sacraments; the Angels; the Saints; Graces and Virtues; and Human Life. A few examples will suffice to show his direction.

It is usual, Cooper said, to represent the Trinity by an equilaterial triangle. He continued:
This geometrical figure, with its unbroken area terminating in three points, expresses with wonderful exactitude the One undivided God in Three Co-equal Persons, Each the complement of the Other, and inhering in the Other. The Triangle itself might be itself sufficient; but it is sometimes enriched. It is set within the circle (which having no beginning and no end, is the appropriate emblem of Eternity) to remind us that the Three Divine Persons are co-eternal. Sometimes again, the Triangle is doubled to express infinity and certainty, . . . God is light. Therefore, not unfrequently, the Triangle is set in a Nimbus, or Glory, radiating forth on every side. 118

Cooper went on to mention that sometimes "the Eye of the Divine Omnipresence" is found looking out from the rayed Triangle, symbolic of "Thou, God, seest me." 119 He said that sometimes the symbol of the Father, the Hand, is irradiated by three bars or a three hued rainbow to remind of the Trinity; 120 that sometimes the Cross, the unique symbol of the Son, is set on three steps, "to remind us that He suffered by the determinate council and foreknowledge of the Trinity"; 121 that the dove, the traditional symbol of the Holy Ghost, should always have the three rayed nimbus "to mark Him one of the Three Divine Persons". 122 Cooper's symbolism was quite simply that of a medieval Durandus. 123

It is rather interesting to note that Cooper, R. Rowand Anderson (the architect of Govan parish church), and the Rev. Dr. E. L. Thompson of Hamilton, addressed the Scottish Church Society (founded in 1892 "to defend and advance Catholic doctrine as set forth in the Ancient Creeds") on church fabrics and their right arrangement, in 1895. 124 Cooper spoke of the purpose of the building without and within. The exterior, he said was to show the
Church's mission to the world. It should show grandeur; but even more, beauty. The cross should feature prominently: Cooper suggested that, as at Rheims Cathedral, "the figure of the Crucified" should be set above the great door. Spires should be used, and bells, and there should be a porch with stone benches open to the wayfarer so that "as the traveller sits down to rest on them, his eye should catch, in letters, or in imagery, ... the Divine promise of eternal refreshment for the soul. ...". The interior upon entry should first reveal the font, then pews with kneeling boards that invite us to pray. Beyond and in the place of honour should be the "Holy Table"; and, said Cooper, it might be desirable to restore its fencing by a screen or veil, to remind "ministers and people alike that the Supper of the Lord is not to be approached without preparation, and that HOLY THINGS ARE FOR HOLY PERSONS".

Dr. Thompson, who had joined the Aberdeen Ecclesiological Society in 1887, spoke disparagingly of many Presbyterian "preaching-houses". "In many of our churches", he said, "there is absolutely no outward sign that they are places of worship ... [and] no provision for those parts of the worship which are distinctively Christian, no architectural expression of the fact that the Church is beyond all other things a HOUSE OF PRAYER." He spoke against the "preaching-house" type of church, but more vociferously against "the cheap modern Gothic structure". Of it he said it was "a travesty of a church". He thought
that one of the things contributing to its development was the change in the manner of administering Communion. "No greater disaster", he said, "could have happened to the service of the Lord's Supper than the introduction of 'simultaneous Communion', a practice borrowed from the English dissenters." He attributed this to the common people who were undoubtedly wearied by the seemingly interminable "table addresses". "If the change had been delayed twenty or twenty-five years", he contended,

these addresses would almost certainly have been abolished or at least supplanted by the mere recitation ... of some 'comfortable words', and a form of administration would have been continued, necessitating a chancel not merely for the accommodation of the Holy Table, but also of the communicants, and for the orderly, reverent, and convenient distribution of the sacred elements.

Dr. Thompson said that the only remedy was a resuscitation of the "true ideal of Christian worship". Interestingly he argued for a long broad chancel that could accommodate successive companies of communicants, and, until this was possible, for a return to the old Scottish practice of "some extension, as it were, of the Table proper, covered by a fair white linen cloth, to which the worshippers can come up, singing as they come".

Rowand Anderson for his part, was not so "Reformed" as Dr. Thompson. After reviewing the "disastrous" effect upon art and architecture of the Scottish Reformation, and with a brief laudation for the "Restored Episcopacy's" efforts at Dairsie and Alloway, he dealt with the "church
of the future" with what was by now traditional
"Ecclesiological" devotion. It is clear from his account
that the principles he advocated were those he had
already formalised in the Govan Church described above.130
Of some importance, however, was that he based his
advanced Ecclesiological position on the "fact", that
(to quote him):

Presbyterianism is not by any means opposed to the
use of a liturgy, seeing that a liturgy compiled by
Knox was recommended in his First Book of Discipline
for use in Churches. This liturgy was actually used
up till 1645, and might have been in use still had it
not been for the attempt made by Charles I, in 1637,
to supersede the old liturgy, to which the Scotch
were attached, by the one compiled by Laud.131

It is quite clear that the three Societies - the
Church Service, the Scottish Church, and the Ecclesiological
- were moving in the same direction because they shared
the same ideals, and, to a large extent, the same prin-
cipal figures - most notably, James Cooper. Sprott's
historical "persuasion" was everywhere invoked to prove
the "Catholicity" through "historicity" of the Scottish
Church. The same determinative "facts" on the nature and
history of the Church of Scotland had by this point been
written and repeated often enough so as to command authority.

In 1905 Cooper, the now acknowledged and respected
ecclesiological authority, in an attempt to disseminate his
ideals more widely, addressed the Edinburgh Architectural
Association on "The Arrangement and Furnishing of a
All the old principles were there with renewed vigour: churches, cruciform in plan, should be "orientated"; spires are important symbols and should be used - if on the west end - to house the font; the "Sacrament Table" should be in the raised chancel at the east-end; choirs and organs should be in the west gallery or in a transept; the pulpit should stand aside; pews should be fitted with kneeling boards; side galleries and sloping floors should be rejected; vestries, "halls", and any other "excrescences" should be avoided; the reredos should have niches for vases of flowers; the lectern should be a work of art - "the eagle type may be finely treated, and brass well kept"; the "Holy Table" should be large and high enough, and should "be rich enough to show it the thing next honoured in the whole church".

Cooper was clearly reasserting Camden ideals with new conviction.

The Scottish Exhibition of National History, Art, and Industry, held in Glasgow from May to October, 1911, provided a unique opportunity for the advancement of the Society's objects, and good use was made of it. Not surprisingly, the name of the Rev. Professor Cooper, D.D., features prominently in the Committee of the Decorative and Ecclesiastical Arts Section. A glance through the "Official Catalogue" of this section reveals the type of thing the Society thought worthy of exhibit. "Chancel Decoration. Artist and Exhibitor - William Kelly, A.R.S.A." "Sketch for Decorating of Chancel. Exhibitors -

The list proceeds almost interminably, and contains Honeyman's statuettes of St. Matthew and St. Paul for the new pulpit of the "restored" Brechin Cathedral, 145 embroidered chalice veils; designs for altar frontals; altar crosses; etc. Interestingly, T. N. Adamson, one of Cooper's disciples and an advanced ritualist, only sent a chalice veil, a pulpit fall, and an illuminated book cover to the exhibition. 146 It must be assumed that he needed the other "works of art", including his five altar frontals, for his services at Barnhill. If he had them merely for their "artistic value", as he claimed, they would certainly have been exhibited.

In 1916, Cooper was still actively involved in advancing the objects of the Society, this time by anticipating the end of the war and the "memorials" boom that inevitably would follow. Writing in The Architect, 147
he suggested that thought should be given to "worthy memorials", such as - for the West of Scotland - the restoration of the two western towers of Glasgow Cathedral. He wrote that in smaller communities, "ornaments" should be carefully directed. Cooper said, for example:

It would do us no harm to think less of ornament, and more of line and of proportion, of adequate space not for pews merely but for central passage, and above all for chancel. Of ornament proper one fine feature may be all that we can afford. But one really fine feature - a graceful chancel arch or a really good chancel screen, ... .

The remainder of the article was occupied with his thoughts on church construction, furnishings and arrangement, and was word-for-word his address of 1905. It might have been reasonable to assume that the war would have helped Cooper to consider more seriously the peculiar needs of Scottish Worship, especially in the aftermath of the shock of the "war to end all wars". But he was to the last an "Ecclesiologist", and the Society he had formed was generally true to his lead.

In 1918 Cooper entered an Overture to the General Assembly through the Presbytery of Glasgow, asking that local Committees on War Memorials in Churches be recommended in order "to avoid their being flooded with trivial and unsuitable memorials", and that an Advisory Committee of Assembly be appointed to coordinate the action of these local bodies. It is clear from Cooper's writings what were in his mind as being worthy "War Memorials", and what he hoped would be the result of this guided venture.
The General Assembly approved of the Overture and appointed the Advisory Committee as suggested - with James Cooper as its Convener. On the Committee with Cooper, among others, were J. M. Kirkpatrick, J. F. Leishman, and P. MacGregor Chalmers. In view of this, it is hardly surprising that many of the Memorials took the form of chapels, chancels, permanent Communion Tables, lecterns, fonts, and other such things recommended by the Ecclesiological Societies. Nearly always the Memorials were in Victorian "Anglicana"; often they were stock items of church furnishers' Gothic.

When Cooper, Carmichael, and Kelly first contemplated the formation of an Ecclesiological Society for Scotland, they were considering the advantages to religion and architecture which might flow from such an organisation. Their inspiration, their ideal, their hope was the Cambridge Camden Society. It had proved an effective agent in England for rekindling enthusiasm for the Catholic inheritance of Christendom; it was hoped that it would have a similar effect in Scotland. The Ecclesiological ideal, therefore, was pressed with great urgency at every convenient occasion. The Aberdeen Ecclesiological Society did not conform to the Scholastic method as Cooper claimed: it did not teach that it might learn; it taught that it might advance its own predetermined position - it was an agent of Ecclesiological propaganda.
The beginnings of the Society were necessarily humble, but taking its lead from the Camden Society and its highly influential organ - The Ecclesiologist, it soon assumed to itself the position of the authoritative voice, and was not unwilling to flex its editorial muscle through its "Transactions". In this approach Cooper seems to have been the inspired leader; he was the man with the vision of the "restored" *Ecclesia Scotica* strong in the received faith of Catholic Christendom. He necessarily drew to himself those who shared his vision - those who could appreciate the medieval spirit and were anxious to restore its influence.

The restoration of ancient "Pity Vaults", and such like, was not about to be universally popular, but there was a new spirit at work which valued the seemly, the genteel, the ordered - regardless of its doctrinal implications and its social statements. It was perhaps an accurate reflection of this spirit that the new Govan Church, when it was built, was the foremost example of the Ecclesiological ideal. It owed much, no doubt, to the genius and character of John Macleod;\(^{151}\) but at a deeper level this "cathedral on the Clyde" represented the vision of another world which captivated the imagination of those who were sorely oppressed by this one. The Romantic and National spirits were at work too, given life and depth, again, not so much by Sir Walter Scott - although he was its most obvious exponent - but by the needs of an increasingly urbanised and industrialised and -
all too often - socially-deprived age.

Most interestingly, the Gothic statement with its "ordering" of rows and columns and arches and steps and furnishings, in fact, represented the "ordering" of Society, and reasserted the English Victorian status quo. For the Oxford Movement this was the whole ethos of their approach. In the age of the Reform Parliament and the breakdown of traditional forms and institutions, it was important to restate the hierarchy of life in its several public institutions; to reassert the natural and "proper" ordering of things from highest to lowest. The bishops' supreme office had to be reasserted, and under this the ordering of priests, and then the deacons, and then the laity - their secular ordering of right and necessity being carried into this ecclesiastical sphere.

In Scotland the social hierarchy had never been as rigid or as formalised as in the southern Kingdom, and this was reflected in Scotland's religion, in her Presbyterian polity. It had long since been a part of Scottish life that the humblest crofter was not only a servant of the Chieftain, he was his cousin. In many ways the Presbyterian religion reflected this dual affinity without undue tension; the Patron of the Parish might hold his office of elder with the local tailor or ironmonger. In England such things would not have been possible.

In the nineteenth century the extending English influence brought many changes to traditional Scottish institutions: the widening of the social gap was one of
these. The gentry, often now trained in English public schools, removed from the Parish Kirk, and joined the Episcopal Church where the ordering of life was implicitly acknowledged. Their move represented a social statement almost more than a religious one. The Parish Church still gathered round the pulpit, still taught - and to some extent lived - the basic equality of those incorporate in Christ. The movement toward the Ecclesiological ideal, however, altered all of this. The medieval arrangement, the ordered chancel, the elevated and removed "Holy Table" approached by only the chosen few, of necessity involved an hierarchical statement; bespoke a rigid and formal structure of gradation. It is peculiar, but not surprising in the light of the Ecclesiological ideal as advanced in Scotland, that many of the architectural expressions of Scottish religion and national life built and planned in the period under study, bear little relation to Scotland's social history and Reformed Christian polity. Crathie Parish Church, the Thistle Chapel, and the National War Memorial are eloquent statements of English national and religious life.152

The Aberdeen Ecclesiological Society and its branches in Glasgow and Edinburgh were effective in reforming the religious architecture of Scotland, and in encouraging the Church of Scotland to adopt furnishings and arrangements which were neither required by nor historically or doctrinally appropriate to her Presbyterianism. The Camden chancel arrangement became a fashionable and not
uncommon feature of Scottish churches - even though few ministers knew how to use it in the regular worship service. Even with a split chancel, a lectern and pulpit and prayer-desks, it was not unusual to find the whole service still conducted from the pulpit. But the Ecclesiological arrangement did encourage the development of a formal liturgy. The architecture in fact dictated the style of service: it was as Drummond has said - there is a strong relationship between a building constructed for Catholic worship, and Catholic worship itself.\textsuperscript{153} It was perhaps natural that\textit{The Book of Common Order} became explicitly Anglican-oriented in these years.

It is not important to the matter in hand to consider more than the Aberdeen Ecclesiological Society's Cambridge and Oxford origins and integrity, and to see it as representing a part of Tractarian reform in the Church of Scotland - through the person of James Cooper primarily. But it is interesting to speculate that it is this legacy which is still at work in some quarters - as evidenced by the recently published\textit{Book of Common Order} (1979).\textsuperscript{154} It is merely the logical continuation of Cooper's programme of "revival alike of religion and architecture", which he had derived from the movement associated with a few Cambridge undergraduates. Cooper rejected the title "innovator"; he claimed to be a "restorer". But he considered everything in the light of medieval Catholicism - and in that light he was probably not an "innovator". Had he ever entertained the Reformed position - even for a
moment - he might have had to acknowledge the justifi-
cation of the charge, for his "restoration" was conformable
to the medieval ideal associated with the Camden Society;
his "revival" was associated with adoption of the seven-
teenth century Anglican position as restated at Oxford in
the Tracts for the Times.
In Scotland, as in England, the movement towards church restoration was not initially associated with the movement towards High Church doctrine. Although much of the restoration undertaken between 1850 and 1880 was of a high standard of workmanship, most of it was theologically uninformed. It is not surprising to note that with the advance of the High Church position after 1880 many of the early attempts at "restoration" had to be "corrected"; which meant simply that they had to be changed into conformity with a new "Higher" ideal - an "Ecclesiological" ideal. More especially was this true of the former cathedrals and abbey churches of Scotland. St. Machar's, Aberdeen, St. Giles', Edinburgh, St. Mungo's (The Cathedral), Glasgow, and Paisley Abbey - to name but a few - each passed through the hands of several eminent architects between 1850 and the First World War, and in each case the final and decisive "restoration" was that which aimed at an explicit medieval conformity, visually oriented to the east-end centred and elevated "altar". In view of the fact that by the 1880s the antiquarians and church restorers were the same people who advanced "Catholic doctrine", this was hardly surprising.
In this architectural advance, but perhaps even more importantly in the ritualistic advance, the High Church tenets were clearly articulated. As in England, so in Scotland the ritualistic movement served to sharpen the doctrinal edge and bring into clearer focus the practical extensions and implications of High Churchism. It is in this realm of ritualistic advance where the Scoto-Catholic party's practical approximation to an Oxford affected Anglicanism was most clearly seen. Whereas there is a problem as regards identification of the exact origin of Scoto-Catholic doctrine, especially in the light of the conservative orthodoxy of some of the Reformers, there is no such problem with regard to the ritualism and Ecclesiology of the Scoto-Catholics. Their orientation in these matters was decidedly High Anglican affected.

The ritualistic and ornamental developments at St. Margaret's Chapel, Barnhill (Broughty Ferry), evidence with great clarity the practical approximation to an Oxford-affect ed Anglicanism by one of Cooper's most intimate disciples. The case is significant in seeing just how far Cooper and his disciples were prepared to conform to the Oxford ideal and introduce various features into the Church of Scotland which were - to most minds - unwarranted by her tradition and incompatible with her doctrine. It is also significant in seeing what was
considered to be normative Scottish Presbyterian usage, what was the extent to which the General Assembly had accepted High Church ideals, and what was the limit to which it could be pushed on ritual reform. It further serves to underline the difference of ecclesiastical orientation between Cooper, and those associated with the more general liturgical movement - most notably Robert Story, but also G. W. Sprott.

The Barnhill Case involved the Rev. Thomas Newbigging Adamson (1855-1911), an intimate friend of James Cooper. In fact, one of the conditions of Cooper's having accepted the call to the East Church, St. Nicholas, Aberdeen in 1881, was that Adamson (the son of the minister at Newton) should assist him. Adamson had been educated at Edinburgh and Leipzig, and had served as Assistant at St. Paul's, Dundee, before joining Cooper at Aberdeen. Cooper's biographer has said that Adamson was Cooper's "intimate and trusted friend, more than an Assistant - his counsellor and coadjutor - highly sympathetic to Cooper's ideas, a devoted and able worker, competent and instructed, but without his chief's native caution or flair for the possible". Cooper himself wrote to a relative:

I have the most useful and agreeable Assistant I ever had, a Mr. Adamson. He lives in the house with me and keeps me cheerful in many ways. But the work is more than enough for two. Aberdeen was always a High Church town, and many of the traditions of the place are on my side, but of course I have difficulties to contend with and must hasten cautiously.
Cooper did not, in fact, "hasten" cautiously enough, as seen in the "East Church Case". Adamson must have been at least partially responsible for this, for such an eager and sympathetic Assistant was not likely to be Cooper's best adviser. It has been suggested, for example, that it was Adamson who was responsible for Cooper's misjudging the support he enjoyed for those changes he had effected in the East Church.\textsuperscript{5} It is certain that Adamson could influence Cooper, as seen in his setting up the first woman's guild in Scotland,\textsuperscript{6} and in its being named after St. Margaret;\textsuperscript{7} but in most cases it would appear that Adamson was content to follow - and then advance - Cooper's original lead. Of importance is that throughout the ordeal of the Presbytery trial of Cooper, Adamson was very much Cooper's intimate, and in his witnessing Cooper's "vindication" of the High Church position in the Church Courts is seen the seed of the later confrontation at Barnhill.

Adamson's identification with Cooper's ecclesiastical and Ecclesiological position is further evidenced by his joining the societies publicly identified with Cooper. In 1885 Adamson joined the Church Service Society on Cooper's recommendation of him,\textsuperscript{8} and he was a founding member with Cooper of the Aberdeen Ecclesiological Society in 1886.\textsuperscript{9} Leishman at one point mentions Adamson as one of the "lesser luminaries" of the Scottish Church Society,\textsuperscript{10} a Society with which he shared a common "doctrinal basis".\textsuperscript{11}
In 1888 Adamson accompanied Cooper and two others on a visit to Russia. Cooper's diary records some interesting observations such as the square altars and the poor condition of the iconostasis and chandeliers, that there were no flowers on the altar or elsewhere, that the crucifix was rare in the Russian Church, even as a subject of pictures, that there was opportunity for daily prayer, and that the services for Sunday were obligatory for all believers. "Town priests", noted Cooper, "said to be well paid, and look as well as that hideous custom of beard and long hair will let them. On the whole, very favourably impressed with what I saw of the Russian church." Adamson must have been continually exposed to Cooper's ecclesiasticism, at home, in England, and abroad. Cooper was always articulate about what impressed him, and the models that should be adopted in the Scottish Church. It is undoubtedly the case that Adamson was more than eager to receive Cooper's teaching.

After Adamson's settlement at Barnhill, Cooper was a frequent guest preacher, and in 1902 Cooper even undertook summer supply during Adamson's absence. Both Cooper and Adamson were active exponents of a Church of Scotland/Church of England reunion, and a parishioner has recorded that Adamson, in fact, preached at one point a sermon "dead against Presbyterianism, advocating bishops" in the Church of Scotland. This total identification of Adamson with Cooper, and with his ideals and foibles, is fundamental to an understanding of the "Barnhill Case".
The chapel-of-ease at Barnhill, Broughty Ferry, opened in 1884, the sermon being preached by James Cooper. In 1881 (the year in which Cooper had been translated from St. Stephen's, Broughty Ferry, to the East Church, Aberdeen) a petition to the Presbytery, bypassing the Kirk Session of the Parish Church of Monifieth (in whose parish Barnhill lay), with seventy-four signatures appended, had asked for its creation. Of these signatories, fifteen were members of St. Stephen's and were attracted to Cooper's High Churchism. The principal figure in setting up the new congregation had been the founder of Cooper's St. Stephen's, also — a wealthy jute merchant, Thomas Taylor. Taylor was an "ardent admirer" of James Cooper, and it may be of significance that his wife was a practising Anglican. It has been suggested that the Barnhill Chapel was, in fact, founded explicitly to provide for High Church worship in the area, and certainly this interpretation seems to be supported by the opposition of the Kirk Session of Monifieth to the proposal on the grounds that the population did not warrant a new church, and also that it had been proposed on the basis of "church attraction" rather than "church extension". But in spite of these objections, the project went ahead, and the continuing ill-will of the Parish Kirk Session to the Chapel was another contributing factor in the Barnhill Case.

It was Cooper who was asked by the petitioners to suggest "a suitable person" for their new Chapel, a
practical demonstration of their respect. Cooper suggested Adamson, his own Assistant, and (in the words of Adamson's successor to the Barnhill charge in 1911), "no happier choice of an incumbent for the new parish could possible have been made".²² It is clear that the new congregation shared Adamson's High Church orientation, and was not unwilling to accept his peculiar style of ministry.

It is of some importance to note the nature of the service instituted by Adamson, and so readily accepted by the new congregation. This brief but insightful description of it is recorded in Cooper's diary:

4th July, 1886. Broughty Ferry. Prose Psalms, Te Deum, Magnificat, Gloria in Excelsis - congregation stand and join in singing Creed. Eastward position. Alms brought up to Holy Table. LAUS DEO.²³

Cooper was quite obviously overjoyed with the service adopted in the new Chapel. He also was encouraged by the fact that Adamson was allowed to institute quarterly Communion and a daily service without significant opposition. In 1894 he noted that Adamson had added a further early morning celebration, monthly²⁴ - a revolutionary step in that age.

On the 23rd November, 1884, at a meeting of the Aberdeen Ecclesiological Society, Adamson (at Cooper's request) described the little iron church at Barnhill,²⁵ and the changes he had made which rendered it - in Cooper's
opinion - "church-like and even beautiful". Adamson described it as a small oblong building, fifty-two feet by twenty-two feet, that could accommodate 180 people. In 1884 four plain glass windows on each side, and a rose window over the doorway, provided the light. On the west end was a porch, and on the east end a vestry which gave access directly to the pulpit, and which, when seen from the outside, "presented the delusive appearance of a small chancel". The building's exterior was painted stone colour, and the interior was fully lined with varnished wood. The seats occupied all but a narrow aisle, and were so close together that "kneeling at prayer" presented difficulties. The pulpit was "a hideous structure, ... six feet long by three feet deep, in Gothic (courtesy title), and it was raised two feet from the floor". An American organ stood where the precentory's desk had formerly. "All that could be said in its favour", continued Adamson, "was that it was in good repair, clean, and not offensively ugly." The chapel had provision for neither Sacrament, "there was neither font nor ALTAR" [emphasis mine], and the congregation owned no Communion-ware. The space for the Communion Table in front of the pulpit was so small that the "celebrant had perforce to stand before instead of behind it" - a position which Adamson subsequently retained in spite of changes which made it unnecessary.

Adamson went on to describe the alterations which he had caused to be made to the Chapel since 1884. He said
that it was the need for more room "above the altar" at the annual flower service that had encouraged him to make certain temporary changes. These included the removal of the pulpit, and the placing of the "altar" on the vacant platform with carpeted steps in front. This temporary arrangement was repeated at Christmas, Easter, and Thanksgiving, and it was finally "unanimously agreed to make it permanent, and carry it out more thoroughly".

The "permanent arrangement" Adamson then described was both Ecclesiologically informed and informative. The "altar" was placed "against" the east wall on a dais of oak (six feet by twelve feet), and raised two steps (which were returned to the wall on either side). Panelling stained a dark mahogany colour covered the wall on either side of the altar to a height of about ten feet. The wall space directly above the altar had a pilaster on each side which rose about one foot above the side panelling. In the square space so defined there was hung a "very costly" piece of French tapestry, "having a very rich but subdued tone - the colours chiefly blue and old gold". It was fixed on a stretcher and bordered with two inches of olive green velvet "with large brass nails". It did not touch the pilasters or "cornice" by about two inches, but was connected with them by short brass chains. On the centre panel on each side was placed an iron gas bracket, and above and in front of the altar hung an oil lamp suspended by an iron chain, "broken midway by a ball of open Venetian iron work". On the beam over the altar was
the inscription in red letters, **Gloria in excelsis Deo**.

The "altar" itself had a plain frame of teak with "the slab, or **mensa**, of sweet scented cedar, inlaid with five Maltese crosses in brass". Three frontals, all stretched on frames, were in use:

- one in plain green serge of good shade, with orpheys, etc., of velvet to match, and a gold cross with rays, for everyday use; a second, in Venetian red broadcloth and Francis I velvet, richly embroidered with mediaeval roses in silk and pomegranates in gold, and on the centre panel I.H.S., surmounted with a crown: this frontal is used on all Sundays except in Advent and Lent, and on all feast days; and a third of violet (or heliotrope) cloth and velvet with a plain gold cross. This is used during Advent and Lent, . . .

The "altar" steps were covered by "a rare old Persian carpet". A violet dossel was used to cover the tapestry in Advent and Lent, and there were coverings "for the lectern and prayer book" in green, red, and violet. The top of the altar was covered only with linen, and that on all occasions: a piece exactly the size of the top to which was attached "the lace"; and "a longer strip, falling nearly to the ground at each end of the altar".

A retable of dark stained wood held "two old jars of Coblentz ware, once the property of the Royal family of Württemberg", which were filled with flowers throughout the year. The congregation owned two chalices and two patens of silver-gilt, a cruets "of cut silver with gold stopper", and a wrought copper "alms dish". They also had "two chalice veils and two corporals of embroidered lawn and linen".
Since there was no room for a pulpit in this arrangement, a lectern served in its stead, and there was also a prayer-desk. Stained glass filled the eight lancet windows, of which Adamson gave this account:

The figures are - to right of altar: (1) S. Margaret with her rood [i.e. the "Black Rood" of Scotland]; (2) S. David, in dress of a knight with falcon (from the frescoe of Frederick II in the Römer at Frankfurt); (3) S. Kentigern in pontificals with his fish; (4) the blessed Virgin - the present chapel representing an old chapel of S. Mary which stood on a neighbouring island in the Tay, that has now degenerated into a sandbank, but retains her name - 'The Lady Bank'.

On left of altar - S. Andrew, Patron of Scotland; (2) S. Ninian, our earliest Missionary; (3) S. Columba, with a dove; and (4) S. Bride as a princess . . . . A space of about six inches is taken from the length of each window by a sloping board, on which is painted in red a simple Latin inscription.

Adamson completed his account by saying that St. Margaret's had a stone font, and that they had received just recently the gift of a "priest's stool" in stained oak and pigskin. He said that although it was still only a "simple iron church", it no longer needed "to apologise for its appearance", that it could even make some claim to beauty "when the gas is turned down during evening sermon, and the strong light of the lamp with the ruddy glow from its copper shade is concentrated on and around the altar with its rich cover and tapestry".  

At the April, 1896 meeting of the Aberdeen Ecclesiological Society, Adamson exhibited the plans of his new stone church, which had been dedicated on St. Margaret's Day (November 16), 1895. Although the building was not reviewed in the Transactions of the Scottish Ecclesiological
Society until the 1914-15 proceedings, the service of dedication was reported in considerable detail by the local press. The building was to the design of the advanced Aberdeen Ecclesiologist and intimate friend of Cooper and Adamson, Mr. Charles Carmichael. It was cruciform in plan, and fifteenth century Gothic in style. It had "an aisleless nave with similar choir, and transepts crowned at their intersection by a low tower, and a north porch, and a vestry and organ chamber on either side of the choir and chancel". Near the entrance door stood the font, the oak and iron cover of which was the gift in 1896 of the Rev. J. F. Leishman of Linton.

The inventory and arrangement of the stone church subsequently reported was very much that of the iron church described above. Several new acquisitions, however, were reported: a "chaste and beautifully wrought Cross" on the "shelf behind the altar"; a fourth altar frontal "of white and gold . . . for use on great Festivals, and at Holy Communion"; a series of small oil paintings of the heads of the Apostles above the choir stalls; an octagonal stone pulpit with panels on which were the "emblems of the Four Evangelists"; a brass eagle lectern; brass candelabra; a brass "altar desk"; and an altar Gospel-book. In an article some time later, Cooper referred to the Chapel at Barnhill as having "a system of folding kneeling boards . . . so easily worked and so perfectly suited for its purpose that the whole congregation may be seen every Sunday 'meekly kneeling on
their knees' at the time of prayer". 35

From even such a brief review of these accounts it is clear that Adamson had a considerable understanding of Ecclesiological matters and was giving practical expression to a particular doctrinal position. But even more than in his building and arrangement of furnishings, this expression was found in his various liturgies and in his ritual.

Adamson's "Dedication Festival Office for the Holy Communion" [APPENDIX F], for example, shows some liturgical skill, but makes no attempt to follow any Reformed liturgy. Instead, Adamson chose as his pattern the liturgy of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI (1549), a liturgy that followed very largely the Mass order and had no history whatsoever of use in the Scottish Church. 36 It is hardly surprising that it was the press report of this "Dedication Festival" which brought Adamson to the notice of the Church Courts.

The course of the Church Court investigation was often complicated by procedural wrangling; so complicated, in fact, that the main points of contention were often obscured. The initial complaint about Adamson's ritual excesses did not come from within the congregation itself, but from a fellow minister, the Rev. Neil Mackenzie, of Lonforgan, 37 who had read a report of the dedication service in The Dundee Advertiser. 38 He stated that the
service as reported was subversive to Presbyterian "purity of worship" in that it followed an Episcopal order and consisted of collects, the chanting of psalms, and a litany. Presbytery decided to hear Mackenzie's motion, but a successful appeal was made to Synod to stop the hearing. Presbytery made appeal against this Synodical decision to the General Assembly of 1896, and this appeal was sustained. In its subsequent review of the original motion, however, Presbytery decided that no case had been put forward for its interference: no complaint had been received from the congregation. Presbytery had no option but to declare that no action was to be taken.

In 1898, the matter was taken up by the Rev. Jacob Primmer, minister of Townhill Church, Dunfermline, the self-appointed protector of Protestant Presbyterian purity. His attention had been drawn to Barnhill not only by this instance of inaction by the Presbytery, but also by the report of Adamson's address, "How to make something of an Iron Church", referred to above. He sent a circular letter to all Presbyteries and Synods of the Church of Scotland drawing attention to the "awful Popery, including the sacrifice of the Mass, which was tolerated at the Barnhill Church. In April, 1901, he sent a letter to the Presbytery of Dundee intimating that he would bring Adamson's "'unsoundness and heterodoxy' in doctrine and his 'divisive courses'" before their notice at the next meeting. He enclosed with this a copy of a letter published in The Evening Post (Dundee, (March 6, 1901,
under the heading "Popery in Broughty Ferry", which stated that Adamson had prayed and celebrated Communion with his back to the people, had "genuflected", and had communicated the people kneeling at the altar.

The Presbytery resolved not to hear Primmer, but he appealed against this decision successfully to the General Assembly of 1901. Assembly ordered Dundee Presbytery: "to hear the petitioner upon the complaint referred to . . . and thereafter to proceed as may be just and according to the laws of the Church." On 12 June, the Presbytery complied with the order, and heard Primmer's complaints.

Primmer's statement to the Presbytery dealt primarily with "the celebration of mass", a "fasting Communion" as he called it, which had been witnessed on 3rd March 1901 at 8.30 a.m. [APPENDIX E]. Although it represents a highly coloured account, it provides further insight into Adamson's ritualistic advance, and shows how clearly and deliberately he approximated an advanced Anglicanism.

Primmer said that the congregation consisted of fourteen people: "nine young ladies, two elderly ladies, three men". The service began with Adamson entering and ascending the altar steps, and there, "with his back to the people facing the altar, . . . [he] mumbled a prayer which was almost inaudible". Other prayers, "almost secret", followed, to which the congregation responded "Amen" in each case. The versicles and responses were
"intoned", Adamson facing the altar throughout. At the "absolution" all stood, and Adamson with right hand raised, said "in the following or like words, which are to be found written in Mr. Adamson's Book of Common Order, fifth edition, wherein is also found written 'this Absolution is to be used by Presbyters only'":

Absolution: 'Almighty God, who hath given his Son, Jesus Christ, to be the Sacrifice and Propitiation for the sins of the whole world, grant unto you, for His sake, full remission and forgiveness, absolve you from all your sins, and vouchsafe to you His Holy Spirit, through Jesus Christ our Lord.'

After this, Adamson facing the altar said the Collect:

O God, who seest how destitute we are of all strength, preserve us both within and without, that our bodies may be free from all adversity, and our souls purified from all evil thoughts, through . . .

The Epistle and "The Holy Gospel" followed, and thereafter all recited the Nicene Creed. Next came the Lord's Prayer and then the hymn, "I am not worthy, Holy Lord" (The Scottish Hymnal, 317), during which Adamson prepared the Communion elements. The Offertory followed, a "collection bag being sent round". Facing the altar, Adamson intoned Psalm 119: 41-46; the people making the appropriate responses. Still facing the altar, he said the "Offertory Prayer", and then "the prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church", in which he made reference to the "most Holy Virgin Mary", and the dead in terms "Grant them mercy and forgiveness and eternal rest". The Sursum Corda was followed by "The Canon", during which "nearly
the whole time Mr. Adamson was on his knees with face to altar. He would rise and then flop down again, . . 
"The bread and chalice were veiled", and "at the conse­cration he stood, and bending over the elements, prayed in a whisper, after which he got on his knees before the altar, and elevated the cup above his head."

Adamson then partook himself, and after continuing "a short time on his knees before the altar", rose, and taking the paten, communicated the people "on their knees in front of the altar", with "a small piece of bread", saying the "very body" and "very flesh". Then he gave them the cup, saying the "very blood". The bread and wine were then covered up with a white cloth and placed on the altar. The chanting of the Agnus Dei followed, and further responses. Facing the altar, Adamson repeated the "Post Communion Collect", and then pronounced the benediction accompanied "by raising his right hand, showing the thumb and two forefingers".

Primmer also noted that on another occasion, Adamson, after having communicated the congregation, had "returned to the altar, . . . and drank the wine that remained in the cup, after which he poured water into the cup, and rinsing it, drank the dregs. . . ".

In Primmer's statement several further Ecclesiological details were given. He mentioned, for example, that in a niche above the doorway was "a large image of St. Margaret holding a cross to her bosom, and standing on the head of the Devil, who has wings like a bat and flames instead of
hair". He stated that on one Sunday a "black frontal with V.R. upon it" was used. He described the altar cross as "a large elaborately carved brass cross covered with embossed figures". The two candles were about two-and-a-half feet high, and were one inch at the top and one-and-a-half inches at the bottom in diameter, half of each being "dummy".

After hearing Primmer's statement, the Presbytery unanimously agreed to "appoint a committee with power to make due inquiry into the whole subject". This Committee was convened on five different occasions, and met not only with Adamson, but also with other interested parties. The Committee, most interestingly, consisted of two active members of the Scottish Church Society and five members of the Church Service Society, most of whom were friendly toward Adamson and three of whom Cooper later spoke of as the "good men" of the Presbytery. It also numbered one minister and one elder opposed to Adamson's practices. This Presbytery bias cannot be overlooked, for it provides a reason for Adamson's explanations being accepted at face value without any attempt at cross-examination, and also explains the moderate tone and terms of the subsequent report.

Under examination by the Committee and with reference to Primmer's "Statement", Adamson denied that he had ever used the term "fasting Communion". He acknowledged that
there was a statue of St. Margaret, but said that he
"was not aware" that the other figure was the "image of
the devil". He said that he recognised "no difference
between a Communion table and an altar", and, as
regarded the suggestion that the five brass crosses
embedded in the altar "slab" represented Christ's five
wounds, he stated that he had never heard this interpre-
tation before. He said that he attached "no special
significance" to the candles, and that he did not
consider them to be "essential to the celebration of the
Lord's Supper". He stated that the altar was not "close
to the wall", and that it was a "moveable table". As
regarded the cross and its figures, he said that Primmer's
observations were "substantially correct", but that he
attached no special significance to them; the cross was
"a piece of antique and valuable work".

Adamson said that Communion was celebrated four times
a year at 11:15 a.m. (of which Easter Sunday was one) and
monthly at 8:30 a.m. He said that the service he used
derived from the First Prayer Book of Edward VI, "as far
as he [remembered]". He denied that all stood for the
Absolution, but said that the Absolution charged was
"correctly quoted" from Dr. Sprott's book The Worship and
Offices of the Church of Scotland, and admitted its use.
He denied that he "mumbled" prayers, and stated emphatically:
"I interpolate no silent prayers during service." He
admitted using the "Prayer for the whole state of Christ's
Church" which derived from the "General Intercession" of
Edward VI's First Prayer Book and which included in the prayer of thanksgiving the words: "... the wonderful grace and virtue, declared in all Thy saints, from the beginning of the world; and chiefly in the most glorious Virgin Mary, Mother of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, ..." It also included in the prayer commemorating the saints departed the plea:

Grant unto them, we beseech Thee, Thy mercy, and everlasting peace, and that, at the day of general resurrection, we and all they which be of the mystical body of Thy Son may altogether be set on His right hand, and hear that His most joyful voice, Come unto me, ... 65

Adamson denied that "forgiveness" for the dead was here prayed for, however. He denied having used a prayer ending "May through the power of the Holy Ghost be very partakers of His body and blood with all His benefits, to our salvation". It must be noted, however, that Adamson (as seen in the "Oblation" of the Liturgy for the Dedication Festival) did use the words:

And we humbly entreat Thee, Almighty God, command these things to be carried by the hand of Thy holy angel, to Thy altar on high, before the sight of Thy Divine Majesty, that as many of us as shall be partaking at this altar receive the most sacred Body and Blood of Thy Son, ...,

and in the "Prayer of Humble Access" said:

grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the Flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His Blood in these holy mysteries, ... 66
Adamson denied Primmer's charge that he "elevated the cup above his head", but after statements by the residenters to the effect that he raised the cup and the bread, he clarified his position to the extent of saying that he raised them, "so far, but not above his head", and then only when he used the Lord's own words and during the _epiclesis_ - the choice of these two places betraying a further example of his High "sacrificial" orientation. He said that at the forenoon services the communicants sat in pews and that he was assisted by elders, but that at the early morning services he himself served each person. He stated that at the 8:30 a.m. services "communicants are not asked to go down on their knees", though he admitted that he had instituted the practice ten years previous. He said that he "would not refuse the Communion to a person who did not kneel".

As regarded his adoption of the east-ward position at prayers and during the consecration, he admitted it, but said that he attached no significance to the action, and that he had "always celebrated the Sacrament in this way for seventeen years". He denied that in giving the elements he ever represented them to be either the "very body and very flesh" or the "very blood" of Christ. He admitted "consuming all the wine in the chalice", and defended this practice as "the most respectful way of disposing of the wine". He also admitted using the mixed chalice.
The seatholders and residenters who gave evidence before the Committee were generally of the opinion that the service was "differently conducted from the usual way". One said that the form was "purely Episcopal"; another that he personally disliked "The reading of prayers, and intoning or singing of prayers", another that he thought the service was "very high-class Episcopalian". Some thought the altar-lamp had nothing to do with lighting the church; that it was "lighted for all ordinary services" and was "a symbol". One said that he often had seen lit candles on the altar, and that it appeared as if this was "because the Communion was going on". One stated: "As to the vases of flowers on the Communion table, I do not object to them; but I object to the cross being on the table."

Adamson was given opportunity to reply to these allegations. He denied intoning or singing prayers. He stated that he attached "no symbolical meaning to a paraffin-lamp", even though it is clear from records of the Chapel that it was intended as an altar lamp. He said that in giving the elements he used the words of Edward VI's First Prayer Book:

(1) "The body of the Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life;" and

(2) "The blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life."
As regarded the flowers, lights, and cross, Adamson said that he did not consider them to be "symbolical of the real Presence"; but that he considered the cross to be "a symbol peculiarly suitable to a Christian church, the flowers and lights "peculiarly suitable [to] the greatest of all earthly feasts". He said that he had not lit the candles on bright summer mornings "as a concession to popular prejudice", a rather strange statement in the light of his earlier testimony to the effect that he attached "no special significance" to them.

The Presbytery received the Minutes of the Committee on 2nd October 1901. In speaking to the report Dr. Colin Campbell, whose motion was ultimately carried, told Presbytery that for many years he had assisted Mr. Adamson, but that some years ago he had ceased to do so because it looked as though he countenanced Adamson's practices. He said that they were in a crisis in connection with the growth of many tendencies that were "certainly not Presbyterian". He said that Adamson, in his administration of the Lord's Supper, was doing it in a mode condemned by the whole country in the time of Charles I. He argued that as for the candles on the Communion Table,"all who used them knew quite well that they had a symbolical meaning."

Dr. Watt gave the severest condemnation of the Barnhill developments. He regarded them as part of "a conspiracy to revolutionise the worship of the Presbyterian Church". He said that Adamson was not alone;
that the Ecclesiological Society, the Scottish Church Society, and the Church Service Society, contained some sacerdotalists whose ambition, he supposed, was "to get the Presbyterian Church in line with the Anglican, and to go hand-in-hand with them to the Pope for ratification of their orders, and so realise the great principle of the unity of Christendom".

Mr. Adamson, said Dr. Watt, had pleaded for freedom for growth, but that his growth was taking the Church back behind the Reformation into medievalism. "Discreetly calling himself a Presbyterian", Watt continued, "he acted the sacrificing priest. He had an altar where he celebrated what, to all intents and purposes, was the Popish mass. There was no suggestion of Protestantism, far less of Presbyterianism, in the whole furniture and ritual. The pulpit ... was conspicuously shabby, and was out of keeping with the other furniture which appealed to the superstitious sense." He said that some brethren might sympathise with Adamson, "not from any practical sacerdotal intention, ... [but] through an idea ... that to mimic Anglican manners was a gentlemanly thing to do". He felt that they should now cut at the root of the matter.

The Rev. W. Mason-Inglis said that when he visited Barnhill he was "staggered, dumbfounded". He said he looked in vain for a pulpit, but found only "an altar with shabby pictures around of saints round it, and all the paraphernalia associated with high sacerdotalism - what was called the Real Presence". "An intelligent man who
had read and seen something in this day", he went on, 
"were they to believe that these things had no meaning, 
and that these symbols were of no consequence whatever?[sic].

On 6th November the Presbytery adopted - by a narrow majority - a rather moderate resolution to the effect 
that many of Adamson's practices were "not in conformity 
with the laws and settled usages of the Church of Scotland", 
and that he was thereafter to conduct Communion services 
"and to administer the Sacrament from behind the Communion table"; to refrain from elevating the cup, to use the 
words of administration found in the Directory, "or a 
similar formula taken from the Scripture passages in which 
the institution of the Lord's Supper is recorded"; not to 
communicate kneeling; to use at least two elders when 
administering Communion; and

to discontinue the use of candles on the Communion table, and, in general, all forms of prayer - for example, intercession for the dead, and other forms of worship which are inconsistent with the doctrine, spirit, and history of the Church of Scotland as by law established.

Primmer protested this judgment as not going far enough and appealed to the Synod on the grounds that 
because of the gravity of the violations, Adamson should 
have been served with a libel and evidence taken on oath, 
and also that the judgment had not touched on the 
ornaments and fittings. In his contention, Primmer was 
quite right - libel should have been the course taken.
But in 1901 the Church Courts were not in a position to undertake "heresy" trials; the Robertson Smith case was still very much in everyone's mind. The Synod dismissed the appeal and sustained the judgment of the Presbytery, so Primmer made further appeal to the General Assembly.

In his "Reasons of Appeal to the General Assembly", Primmer not only quoted a large extract from Adamson's "How to make something of an Iron Church", noting in passing that Adamson referred eighteen times to his "altar", but also suggested that the five inlaid brass crosses in the "altar slab" had a sacrificial significance. In this regard, Primmer quoted from Cooper's translation of the "Pontifical of David de Bernham" to show that in consecrating an altar it was to be "signed" with five crosses, one in the middle and one at each of the four corners. He also quoted a report in The Courier (Dundee), in which Adamson maintained that his methods of conducting public worship are not contrary to the laws of the Church, the only thing in the service proper which will appear different to a stranger entering the Church will be the absence of the candles on the altar.

Primmer concluded his appeal with reference to an article in The Evening Telegraph (Dundee) which indicated that Adamson had defied Presbytery's injunction to discontinue those "modes of worship which are inconsistent with the doctrine, spirit, and history of the Church of Scotland as by law established".
Primmer recorded the reception he received at Assembly on 26th May, 1902. "My appeal on the Barnhill Case came before the Assembly ... [which] was crowded from floor to ceiling, it being a case of greatest moment and consequence. ... I felt that I had the whole Assembly and the occupants of the galleries with me." 86

In his "Journal" he noted:

Principal Story and Drs. Scott and Mair gave excellent speeches in support of the motion to clear out the whole Ritualism. Mr. Millar, seconded by Dr. Cooper, moved dismissal of the appeal, but only some fifteen voted for this. ... The Assembly was almost unanimous for Dr. Scott's motion against the Ritualism at Barnhill. 87

It was strange that Primmer should be found commending Story, for he had just libeled him for his part as Principal of Glasgow University in sending a pious and complimentary letter in Latin to the Pope on the occasion of the University's 450th anniversary. 88 Story's speech on the Barnhill Case was remarkable in that it tried to protect the more general liturgical movement and at the same time condemned Adamson's ritualism as having a definite doctrinal intention. Story could not share Cooper's attempt to dismiss the appeal, for he did not share Cooper's doctrinal orientation. Story was a Broad Church Liberal, not unlike Lee of Greyfriars. Improved ritual to him was aesthetic, not doctrinal.

Primmer recorded Story's words with approval: 89
If they were to regard it [that is, Adamson's type of Ritualism] simply as the vagaries of an individual minister it would hardly be worth much attention, but if it was only one symptom of a whole general movement among the clergy of the Church of Scotland, then, he said, it was a movement which should be arrested without loss of time, and without any dubiety of purpose. There had been in the discussion to a certain extent confusion of things that differed. The gentleman who spoke from the bar compared what was going on at Barnhill to the general movement for the improvement of ritual, in which he and some others had taken an interesting part for years. The cases were entirely different. Here they had not a question of improvement of ritual, but a question of doctrinal intention. It was that that made the case significant, and if it was to indicate a general movement it was to his mind a danger to the Church.

He said deliberately if the Church of Scotland was to forget its history and its testimony, and go back to the doctrine of the real presence - a doctrine to his mind most monstrous and abhorrent - then, he said, there was no chance of either spiritual or intellectual development in the days that were before them. When he thought of what he had been told about Barnhill - the mixing of the water and wine, the rinsing of the cup, the lighted candles, the kneeling worshippers, the Communion table, with its cruets and all the rest of it - he must say he felt inclined to say to the Presbytery what they might say to Mr. Adamson: 'Take these things hence: make not our Father's house a den of superstition.'

The speech by Dr. Scott apparently received the solid support of the Assembly. He said that at Barnhill it was "not a question of beautifying the church", it was rather a case "of the disfiguration and the degradation of a church by the introduction of what, without offence, he would call the tawdry, meretricious finery of churches against whose ritual and doctrine the Church of Scotland was a standing protest". 90

Wotherspoon has said that at the Assembly, Adamson's friends "were in a dilemma" in that it was "hopeless to plead for such liberty as he had assumed". 91
suggested that Cooper did not become actively involved in the proceedings out of "consideration for Adamson", fearing that his support of Adamson might be misinterpreted as part of a concerted movement, in which case the Assembly might have been "sharper" in its dealings with him. Wotherspoon said:

The choice was between two motions, neither of which was lenient - the one instructing the Presbytery of Dundee to visit St. Margaret's and to take order with proceedings there - the other affirming a finding of the Synod which directed the cessation of such practices which seemed most extreme; with the anomalous result that Dr. Sprott was found supporting the former motion and Dr. Cooper seconding the latter . . . [which] was carried.

Cooper's biographer is here found vindicating Cooper by distorting somewhat the facts. He suggests - and quite rightly so - that a gap had emerged between those who favoured aesthetic improvement of the bald and rude services that had characterised the Church of Scotland earlier in the century, and those who were giving practical expression to High Church doctrine. But there were, in fact, three motions tabled. The first was that of Dr. Scott, seconded by G. W. Sprott, which by "an overwhelming majority" became the decision of the Assembly:

Find that the documents submitted disclose very serious innovations upon the law and usage of the Church; therefore enjoin the Presbytery of Dundee . . . to visit the parish . . . with the view to bringing the internal equipments of the chapel at Barnhill, the forms of worship, and specially the arrangements for, and the order of administering, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper therein, into conformity with the general usage and practice of the Church, . . .
The second, as mentioned by Primmer, was moved by Dr. Andrew Miller and seconded by Cooper, and stated "Reaffirm the decision of the Synod and dismiss the appeal". The third motion was to sustain the appeal and the deliverance of the Presbytery, and to summon and admonish Adamson "to be careful to observe the laws and settled usage of the Church". 93

A review of Cooper's personal copy of the Assembly Papers reveals that he was unhappy with the progress of the case in that whereas initially it was "unsound doctrine charged", 94 this was never dealt with. It was just such a charge which he had defeated in the East Church Case, and it appears that he here again wanted to challenge the charge of "unsoundness and heterodoxy", 95 especially as regarded the "General Intercession" sentences extracted from the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. 96 The Barnhill Case came before the Assembly, however, in its administrative, not in its judicial capacity; that is, it came by way of petition from an inferior court, not by way of "libel" or "Overture". As such the Assembly had to fulfil its pastoral duty, not determine orthodoxy or enact competent and binding laws. In its discharge of its pastoral role, Cooper and Adamson had no hope of success, for Adamson - in the words of Wotherspoon - "had certainly exceeded the standard of ornament (in the technical sense of the word) and of ritual, which on any reckoning was known or practised in the Church of Scotland". 97 It is not surprising that
Cooper thought that the Presbytery's decision had been "a judgment of policy not of law". He seems to have underlined certain clauses of the printed finding with which he took exception: "refrain from elevating the cup"; "to procure the assistance of at least two elders for the administration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper"; "spirit, and history of the Church of Scotland". To the first of these he wanted added: "for purposes of adoration"; he saw no warrant for the second; the third was indefinite. He also marked the statement by the Kirk Session of Monifieth that "no complaints had been received by them as to any ritualistic practices in the chapel of Barnhill". He appears to have been ready to defend Adamson's wording of the epiclesis, "bless and sanctify these thy creatures of bread and wine THAT THEY MAY BE UNTO US THE BODY AND BLOOD . . .", as compatible with Reformed doctrine. In this regard the same passage in the "Office" for the "Dedication Festival" is similarly noted. The reference in the "Post-Communion Collect" to the Sacrament as a "Memorial" is underlined, as if it could have served to witness against the charge of the "real sacrifice".

On the back page of Cooper's copy of the relevant minutes and extracts, is written in his hand several comments preparatory to his speech seconding the motion of the Rev. A. Miller (Bluevale, Glasgow) who had said that the appeal should be dismissed because it was not the solitary case of Mr. Adamson, "but of a whole general
movement which was a legitimate movement within the Church of Scotland". This would seem to indicate that Wotherspoon was misguided in thinking that Cooper's "withholding himself from more active intervention" was out of consideration for Adamson. It is more probable that Cooper considered the whole matter to be improperly conceived; that whereas the Assembly could censure the ritualistic practice, the High Church doctrine, if considered, would be found to conform to the orthodoxy of the Church of Scotland's Standards. Cooper noted that the speeches against ritualism "should have come after a libel that had been proved". He thought that the Assembly was ready to condemn practices which they would not particularise. The repeated reference to "general usage" was to Cooper's mind quite unsatisfactory, for it meant that ritualists were to "be condemned not by law but by common sense". "I claim for myself", he wrote, "and for every other minister of the Church of Scotland, to be judged by the law of the Church of Scotland." As though referring to Dr. Scott's speech on the architectural progress he wrote: "Would he say it of St. Giles?" With reference to the same speech he has written: "tawdry and meretricious are the last words that could be used of S. Margaret's". Cooper's final cryptic note sums up his High Church position and indeed his reaction to the Assembly's consideration of the case: "Make our service popular: Mr. Adamson thought only of God's glory." Here the differing orientation becomes most acute, and in the
"furiously Protestant House" with both "Dr. Scott and Dr. Story virulent" (as Cooper diarised the 1902 Assembly),
the High Church position had no hope of success.

Cooper was at Barnhill for most of June, and "carried on the duty there in accordance with the Assembly's Deliverance". On 1 June there was the early morning Communion, recorded in Cooper's diary as:


The change from the service diarised in 1886 is striking.108

In July the Presbytery visited Barnhill to carry out the terms of the Assembly's deliverance. Adamson asked to be heard through a lawyer, but this the Presbytery refused. Adamson said he would appeal this decision and withdrew. The Rev. H. M. Davidson said he would appeal against Presbytery's refusal to sist procedure until Adamson's appeal was disposed of. Again there was confusion regarding due process. Cooper, himself present, recorded the incident in his diary.

9th July, 1902. Visitation of S. Margaret's by the Presbytery of Dundee.

Mr. Adamson craved to appear by an agent: this was refused and no reasoning allowed. The good men of the Presbytery having appealed, took no part, and a fanatical and ignorant majority made havoc of all that was fine and good. 'The worse the better' let us hope.109
One of the problems which led to appeal was that the Assembly's terms had not touched on certain features which the Presbytery had ruled on. After the Presbytery's initial ruling, for example, the font had been removed from the door to near the pulpit. Since Assembly gave no ruling on the location of the font, however, Adamson had it returned to its former place. Now in its "visitation", Presbytery again decided that the font should be "placed near the pulpit in front of the congregation". It also decided that the altar, with its cross, candlesticks, frontals and other appurtenances, should be removed from the Chapel, for they gave it the appearance of a "Puseyite Chapel", and not of a Presbyterian Church. Other motions were also moved and adopted: that Mr. Adamson was to conduct worship at all ordinary services from the pulpit; that the liturgy was to be discontinued; that the Communion was only to be dispensed at times specified by the Kirk Session of Monifieth; that there should be a table for the minister and elders in dispensing the Communion elements, covered only with white linen and having no symbols on it except the bread and wine; that only bread and wine were to be used and "that the practice of mixing the wine with the water to symbolise the blood and water which came from our Saviour's side" was to be given up; that Mr. Adamson was to face the congregation and not turn his back to them at the Sacrament; that all genuflexions were to be given up; that the elements were not to be elevated; and that "all artificial lights were to be dispensed with".
One conservative Presbyterian magazine, in its review of the Presbytery's visitation of Barnhill, referred to Primmer's having called Adamson one of Cooper's "dupes". It insisted, however, that Adamson was no dupe. "Had Mr. Primmer said", it went on, "that Mr. Adamson was under the guidance and inspiration of Professor Cooper, he would perhaps have been nearer the truth, for we believe the Barnhill congregation owes its existence to Professor Cooper, and that it has been fostered and cared for by him more than by any other, Mr. Adamson excepted."

In the ensuing debates in Presbytery and Synod, Adamson defended the placement of the font near the door as implying no false doctrine nor violating any law. He said that rather it brought the law and usage of the Church together in that when the congregation turned round, the Baptism was both "public" and "visible". Presbytery replied that such placement was contrary to the expressed law of the Church; Baptism was to be done in the face of the congregation, not behind their backs. They referred to the Directory's statement that Baptism is to be administered "in public, in the face of the congregation; and not in the places where fonts in the time of Popery were unfitly and superstitiously placed".

Presbytery stated that both a crucifix and a cross were "out of place" on the Communion Table, and that the cross and candles were "hindrances rather than helps to the spiritual worshipper". They thought "frontals" were
a "novel" practice, and should not be allowed.  

Adamson denied that leading worship from the pulpit was the law of the Church of Scotland, and said that it varied in practice. He said that there was a theological reason for his praying with his back to the people - that he was praying to God by leading his people's devotions. Adamson held that his altar was a Communion Table of the "plainest possible" kind, having four plain wooden legs and a wooden top, and that it was not Popish in that it had no "mensa", no relics, and no tabernacle. The Presbytery replied that it might be so except for the ornaments which make it "inseparable from the altars of churches not connected with the Church of Scotland", and that the question was not as to whether Adamson's altar was Popish, but whether it was like those generally seen in the Church of Scotland.

Adamson's appeal to Synod as regards the law agent was successful, and Presbytery appealed to the 1903 General Assembly. But here again due process was becoming so confused that the matter of ritualism was obscured.

Whatever "havoc" had been made during Presbytery's visitation of July seems to have been undone very quickly, for in August Primmer attended service in Barnhill and recorded that he "was shocked to find that the decision of the General Assembly, as well as the instructions of the Presbytery, were set at defiance by the minister". At the close of the service Primmer tried to protest, but was seized by one of the managers of the church - a joiner -
and by a grocer, and by about half-a-dozen of the congregation, who cried: "Out with him". After a struggle, he was thrown out! Adamson clearly had some ardent supporters in the congregation, and, as it turned out, he also had a friend at Dundee Sheriff Court.\textsuperscript{117}

The case came before the Assembly of 1903 first on the question of Adamson's right to be heard through an agent. It was decided that Presbytery,"while engaged in parochial visitation are not bound, unless they see fit, to allow any of the parties cited to appear by an agent".\textsuperscript{118} The Assembly then decided to sist procedure and appoint a committee under Dr. Norman Macleod (Aberdeen) to confer with Adamson and report.\textsuperscript{119}

Adamson submitted a statement to the Committee in which he stated that "he was now acting in accordance with the deliverance of the Assembly", and that he agreed:

- to conduct the Communion service from behind the table; to elevate the cup only as is the use and wont of the Church of Scotland . . . ; to use in the administration of the Sacrament the formula given in the Directory for Public Worship; to make all necessary arrangements for the communicants being seated at the reception of the Sacrament, and to avail himself of the assistance of elders at the administration of the Lord's Supper; not to place anything symbolical upon the Communion table except the elements; to omit from the intercession the petition for the holy dead; and to forego the annual use of the dedication festival liturgy.\textsuperscript{120}

The Committee was pleased with Adamson's statement, and also with his declared loyalty to the Church of
Scotland and his denial of "Popish leanings". They therefore recommended that the deliverance of the Presbytery be upheld "so as to prevent the recurrence of those objectionable practices which had been discontinued". In speaking to the report Norman Macleod said that the Scottish people did not want "priestlings" for their ministers, that they wanted "earnest, faithful, manly, Christian men". He said that surely it was possible for a man to be all that without imitating practices which were quite different from their own; that they were bound to act and speak so as not to alienate their people by changes which, though trifling in themselves, "caused a very considerable amount of irritation and suspicion". The decision of the Assembly was in line with the Committee's recommendation. In putting the matter forward, however, the Assembly thought it expedient to be more specific than the Presbytery's deliverance had been - "deeming it desirable themselves to formulate the directions which in the circumstances of the case require in their opinion to be given in regard to the conduct of Public Worship and the administration of the Lord's Supper in the said chapel, ...". The judgment said that they had "learned with much satisfaction that in all material respects the injunctions given by the Presbytery of Dundee to the Minister of the Chapel at Barnhill had been complied with by him", but that they wanted to go further.
The reason for this can probably be found in the degree of Adamson's compliance with the earlier injunctions of the Presbytery. On the surface, Adamson's statement to the Committee of the General Assembly would have reasonably led one to assume that he now conducted worship and administered the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in much the same way as in other Church of Scotland parishes. The facts were conceivably quite different.

The Evening Telegraph (Dundee) of December 2nd, 1901, had reported its visit to Barnhill which showed that Adamson had evaded Presbytery's decision of 6 November:

Vases, flowers, and the large brass cross, with frontals and super-frontals, still occupy places at the altar. The chancel lamp burned brightly. . . . The Introit (Psalm XXV) formed the opening part of the Communion service, which was repeated by Minister and communicants. Then the General Confession and Absolution were uttered conjointly, the rev. gentleman sometimes in a kneeling posture. . . . The Creed was recited by the worshippers. While engaged in singing a hymn the offertory was taken. . . . The Rev. Mr. Adamson then proceeded to consecrate the communal elements at the altar-table, breaking the bread and tasting the wine, afterwards veiling the chalice. The Lord's Prayer and the canon, again recited by minister and communicants, preceded the dispensing of the Sacrament, and then those in the church were invited by the pastor to come forward to the communion-table, three at one time. This table, covered with a white cloth, had been placed in front of the altar-table, where stood the Rev. Mr. Adamson. Mr. Peddie [an elder] approached and took the Communion elements from the hands of the rev. gentleman, giving these to the communicants in turn. In an audible tone of voice the Rev. Mr. Adamson uttered these words before the Sacrament was dispensed to the worshippers at the communion table, 'Take ye, eat ye, this is the body of Christ which was broken for you', and 'Drink ye, this is the blood as in the New Testament which Jesus Christ our Lord shed for you, for the remission of your sins.' The chalice was then put back on the altar-table and veiled by the rev. gentleman. With the pronouncing of Post-Communion Collects and Blessing an impressive service terminated.
With such a "degree" of compliance to the "letter of the law" it is not surprising that the Assembly should want to be more specific. Their final deliverance stated:

1. The minister of the said chapel shall not replace on the Communion Table the cross, candlesticks, frontals, and other appurtenances which gave it the appearance of an "altar";
2. The Communion Table shall be so placed that the minister can stand behind it facing the congregation, as he is hereby enjoined to do, when administering the Lord's Supper, and at such administration it shall have no covering other than the customary white linen cloth;
3. In administering the Lord's Supper the minister shall use no other elements than bread and wine, and shall employ the formula indicated in the Directory for Public Worship, or a similar formula taken from the Holy Scriptures. He shall not himself partake of the Communion kneeling, and shall make suitable arrangements whereby the communicants may partake seated;
4. The use of the special offices printed in the papers submitted to the General Assembly of 1902, and of all similar offices, is prohibited;
5. The minister's language in prayer shall be so guarded as to avoid the appearance of praying for the dead, and he is enjoined to be careful to avoid all postures and phraseology which are calculated to be misunderstood or to expose him to suspicion, and so to be detrimental to the peace of the Church; and
6. The Communion shall, in accordance with the general law of the Church, be celebrated in the said Chapel only at the times fixed by the Kirk-session of the parish.

The General Assembly further enjoin the Kirk-session of Monifieth to be more careful in the discharge of their legal obligations in connection with the Chapel at Barnhill than they have been in the past; and they strongly recommend them to meet, as far as practicable, the reasonable desire of the minister and congregation of the said Chapel for more frequent opportunities of Communion, and also to consider the desirability of setting apart some elders from the congregation of Barnhill for special service at the Chapel.

The Assembly left certain matters undecided, however. They did not rule on the location of the font, the place from which worship should be led, the elevation of the cup, nor on the use of an absolution. But in the main points of the Deliverance, the Assembly was definite and decisive -
it left no place in the Church of Scotland for the "English altar" and its appurtenances; it left no room in the Church of Scotland for the Sacramental priestly pretensions which had engulfed the English Establishment; it reasserted the authority of the Directory and the competency of "general usage".

It was reported that Adamson complied with this deliverance of the Assembly, but the report in 1905 of the gift of a white and gold "frontal" would seem to indicate their restored use. The fact that the case continued at Presbytery and Synod level over Adamson's continued veiling and elevation of the elements, and over there being no provision made for the elders to be seated at the Communion Table, would suggest a degree of reserve in Adamson's compliance with the order to conform to general usage and to resist ritualistic innovations. Also, in 1910, Cooper noted in his diary that Adamson had encouraged him to adopt his practice of "signing with the cross" in Baptism, a practice inconsistent with the general law and usage of the Church of Scotland.

Many Presbyters probably agreed with Primmer. He was "by no means satisfied with the finding of the Assembly". He did not think it went far enough. He objected to Assembly's recommendation "for more frequent opportunities of Communion", and thought that the 1903
Assembly had completely reversed the 1902 deliverance. The reason for this shift is hard to determine, but the system of "rotation" often leads to inconsistency. It may in fact have been the 1902 Assembly that was unrepresentative of the new attitude of the Church. Regardless of the reason, however, it is obvious that Assembly was not so rigid as some should have liked. The activities of the Church Service Society, the Scottish Church Society, and the Scottish Ecclesiological Society, clearly were contributors to this development, but maybe even more important was the more general interaction with England, the growth of a churchless population, and the general social instability - features dominating the end of the Victorian era.

Adamson was a good minister; quite apart from his ritualistic preoccupation he worked hard in his parish and had the loyalty and respect of the majority of his congregation. Yet his ministry was continually disrupted by judicial inquiry from without. Although Adamson denied the importance of his ornaments and furnishings, denied the theological extension of his ritualism, he fought with great ardour for his freedom to change the common usage of the Church of Scotland. Of importance was that he did not want to change the common usage to conform to the law of the Church, but rather to conform to Anglican usage. The objectified worship he instituted at Barnhill
had nothing to do with Reformed standards. An example of this is found in the Transactions of the Aberdeen Ecclesiological Society for 1886. There Adamson made a report on an ancient manuscript, the "Litany of Dunkeld". It was one of a few relics of service books of the Celtic period in the Church of Scotland, which Bishop A. P. Forbes had printed in his "Kalendar of Scottish Saints". Adamson indicated that he had adapted it "for modern use", and had printed it and set it to plainsong, and that it was sung in Barnhill Chapel every Friday. "In the adaptation of this Litany for modern use", said Adamson, "the Invocation of Saints and Angels are replaced by petitions for Angelic ministerations, and for the Second Advent in answer to the prayers of the Saints (Rev. VI. 10). . . . The whole sings well and is very much liked."  

The Barnhill Case was of great importance, especially as related to sacramental practice. Mair's "Digest of Church Laws" is peppered with references to the deliverances in the Barnhill Case. How often the Lord's Supper is to be celebrated is to be determined by "the legally constituted Kirk Session of each Congregation"; practices at variance with the doctrine and usage of the Church as regards the Lord's Supper "were severely condemned by the Assembly (1902.6) and were specifically forbidden (1903.8, Barnhill)"; "there must be no elements but bread and wine (1903.8)"; any other covering on the Communion Table "than the customary white linen cloth is
illegal, also the placing on it of a cross, candlesticks, frontals, and other appurtenances giving it the appearance of an altar (1903.8, Barnhill)"; "the minister must stand behind it facing the communicants, and use only the formula indicated in the Directory, or a similar one taken from Scripture. He is not to partake kneeling, and provision is to be made for the people to partake seated (1903.8)."\(^\text{134}\)

It is clear that, despite Adamson's denial, the ritual, ceremonial, and Ecclesiology which he helped to advance had doctrinal intent. His association with Cooper had confirmed him in this position. The doctrine that Cooper claimed had been vindicated in the East Church Case, was at Barnhill given its natural practical expression. But this expression the General Assembly forbade. Neither Adamson, nor Cooper, however, were to be so easily stopped in their purpose of Tractarian reform in the Church of Scotland. They were both devoted to the Oxford Movement's definition of Catholicity and its programme of Reform - "Remind them that you take the National Church, but only you do not take it from the Reformation. In order to kindle love of the National Church and yet to inculcate a Catholic tone, nothing else is necessary but to take our Church in the Middle Ages."\(^\text{135}\)

A review of the subjects in the stained glass at Barnhill will reveal Adamson's acceptance of this, Newman's programme for a revived Church of England; a review of his approach to the Sacraments will reveal Adamson's implicit
sacerdotalism; a review of his reserve in complying with the deliverances of the Church Courts will reveal Adamson's "Catholic consciousness" in the sense that he, like Pusey, appealed to what was for him an infinitely higher authority - Catholic Antiquity.
PART V

THE DEFENCE AND ADVANCE OF CATHOLIC DOCTRINE
CHAPTER X

THE SCOTTISH CHURCH SOCIETY

THE EMERGENCE OF A HIGH CHURCH "PARTY"

It was a decade before the sundry thoughts of Sprott and Milligan uttered in 1882 issued forth in a formal doctrinal statement of the Scoto-Catholic position. This is not to suggest that suddenly doctrine became important where it had previously been ignored; quite the contrary, Catholic doctrine had always been at the very heart of the movement. The received deposit of Catholic Christendom was implicit in the various moves to approximate practically an Oxford-affected Anglicanism; it could be seen in the forms of worship and the liturgical expressions adopted, in the Ecclesiological ideal, in the advanced ceremonial. But to this point the Catholic doctrine had been assumed and implied rather than stated systematically. Even in the celebrated East Church Case, Cooper had used great "reserve" in stating Catholic doctrine, and had shied away from pressing his position upon the courts of the Church as that alone which could be held by faithful priests of Christ's Holy Mysteries. With the formation of the Scottish Church Society, however, a new aggressive spirit pressed itself upon the notice of the Church, a spirit which hardened into an uncompromising and self-
righteous rigidity in the Committee charged with preparing a statement on the Constitution of the Church of Scotland which was to serve as the basis for reunion talks. Catholic doctrine was advanced by this new Society with a boldness and zeal which was to be expected of those who considered that failure in this enterprise would result in the Church of Scotland forfeiting her claim to be a true branch of the Church Catholic.

The Scottish Church Society's formation followed upon the General Assembly of 1891, at which an amendment to the Report of the Church Interests' Committee had been proposed by Wallace Williamson and J. H. Crawford of Abercorn to the effect that "the General Assembly, while rejoicing at the prospect of Presbyterian reunion, accepts such union only as a step towards the complete unity of the Church of Christ". The consciousness that motivated this amendment soon drew to itself others of a similar orientation, and a meeting, presided over by Dr. John Macleod of Govan, was held to consider how best to proceed. Cooper, though not a member of the Assembly that year, was soon involved, and in May, 1892, Cooper, Sprott, Macleod, and a few others, agreed "to unite into a society for [the] defence and propagation of Catholic truth". A Committee was named to prepare a draft constitution for the Society, of which John Macleod was made Convener, and Cooper, Secretary. Macleod's programme for and constitution of
the new Society were soon ready, and the Society was formally instituted in June, 1892.\textsuperscript{5} Professor Milligan was elected its first President, "in right", says Wotherspoon, "of his seniority, his theological distinction and his long testimony to the views which the Society designed itself to advocate".\textsuperscript{6}

The Society's chosen motto, "Ask for the old paths and walk therein",\textsuperscript{7} was indicative of the general orientation of the new Society. Its stated purpose was:

\begin{quote}
 to defend and advance Catholic doctrine, as set forth in the Ancient Creeds, and embodied in the Standards of the Church of Scotland; and generally to assert Scriptural principles in all matters relating to Church Order and Policy, Christian Work, and Spiritual Life, throughout Scotland.\textsuperscript{8}
\end{quote}

Among the twenty-two "special objects" of the Society were the "affirmation of the divine basis, supernatural life, and heavenly calling of the Church"; the fostering of a sense of the historic continuity of the Church "from the first"; the maintenance of the necessity of "valid ordination to the holy ministry"; the assertion of the "efficacy of the sacraments"; and the restoration of Holy Communion to its rightful place in the worship of the Church and in the life of the Baptised; the revival of daily services; the observance of the Christian Year; the encouragement of open churches, and the deepening in the laity of a sense of their priesthood; the advancement of a higher spiritual life in the clergy, and the promotion of an effective pastoral training for the ministry; the restoration of the Offertory; and the promotion of
evangelistic work and social action on "Church lines". There were three further objects: "The reverent care and seemly ordering of churches and churchyards, and the preservation of ancient ecclesiastical monuments"; "The deepening of a penitential sense of the sin and peril of schism"; and "The furtherance of Catholic unity in every way consistent with true loyalty to the Church of Scotland".9

Wotherspoon has said that it was "a spacious programme, but in nothing . . . disputable as divergent from the standards of law of the Church".10 That was a matter of opinion, however, and the Society was soon assailed from many quarters. Wallace Williamson has recorded that misrepresentation flowed like a flood around - what he termed - "the modest work" of the Society.11 "Accusations of treachery, popery, sacerdotalism", says Williamson; "gibes about man-millinery and aping of Anglicanism, were freely bandied about".12

J. F. Leishman, in his cursory review of the Society's beginnings, has said that it "was no mere offshoot of the Tractarian movement, but a native product of Scottish soil".13 A more recent commentator, Dr. A. K. Robertson, has spoken of the Society as the "Oxford Movement of Scotland",14 in the sense that it was a "parallel" movement. These assertions obviously reflect an element of truth, but they tend to detract from the more immediate connections between the two movements. The fact remains that, as D. M. Murray - the most recent investigator of the Society's
development - has written: "Cooper and others in the Society looked to the earlier Tractarians for inspiration. . . ." The formal link with the Oxford Movement may not have been as direct as it had been in Scottish Episcopacy, but it was there, none-the-less, in its leading personalities. It could hardly have been otherwise. It was natural that, in Wotherspoon's words, "the like threat should evoke a like alarm and should drive men back within their defences - the Bible and Catechisms". The men who associated themselves to form the Society could not help but recognise Oxford's achievements in opposing unbelief and in reviving the Catholic inheritance in the Church. Cooper was perhaps the more obviously affected by Tractarianism. He saw that it had been the agent of restoring the preaching of the two great truths of Christianity - the Incarnation, and the Catholicity of the Church; and had been the vehicle through which the doctrine of the Church as a divine institution and organism had been revived. But all the members of the new Society felt its impact, and seemed not unwilling to accept certain features of the Tractarian programme.

The similarities between the Scottish Church Society's programme and that of the Tractarians were so readily apparent that warnings were quickly expressed. Inevitably there was Pastor Jacob Primmer, but there were
others who were given more serious consideration by the Courts of the Church. One such man was George Jamieson of "Oldmachar", Aberdeen, who took strong exception to the stated programme of the Society.

In a pamphlet entitled "Neo-Catholicism in the Church of Scotland", Jamieson carefully and methodically went through the programme and objects of the Society, and showed them to be part of the contemporary stress placed on externals, and — what he termed — "the sensuous department of our religious life" which delights in "punctilious show". He accused the Society of taking the Church back, not to the Scriptures — which would have been acceptable, and in basic agreement with Reformed principles and standards, but to the unenlightened "antiquity" of the Fathers. He said that in their understanding of "Catholicity", the Society was assuming the definition of the High Church party in the Church of England, and that they were, in fact, consciously or otherwise, accepting as theirs the entire programme of the Anglo-Catholics. Jamieson recounted the simple beginnings of Tractarianism, and the developments that naturally accrued to it by extension of the belief in the "catholic external church": the church conceived as "the only channel of grace, the only witness to the truth, and the highest authority in matters of faith and life"; the Church's Sacraments seen as the way in which she secures the means of salvation; the Church viewed as the guardian of Christ, corporally present in the elements.
The movement in England, said Jamieson, was accompanied by changes in the externals: in accessories to worship, architecture, music and ceremonial. He said that it was the same thing that was now proposed for Scotland, for the movement they were evidencing was on the same lines and in basic agreement with the English movement. He said that it was "essentially subversive of the Scottish rule of faith", and that because of its location of "authority". He said that it was impossible for the Scottish Church to accept the Tractarian definition in this regard, for it employed another "point d'appui which the Church [of Scotland] refuses to recognise as a source of authority". It would make the Scottish Church "retrogressive", he contended, and not "progressive", as it had always been, and should remain.

Jamieson concluded his pamphlet by drawing attention to the fact that the famous Tracts for the Times, though concerned exclusively with "Catholic dogma", were naturally succeeded by the "Catholic exactness" of the Cambridge Ecclesiological Society, and this by the "Catholic observances" of the Ritualists. For Jamieson, it represented a clear progression with serious and unexpectedly sinister repercussions. "Can we doubt for a moment", asked Jamieson, "that the same tendency is being now diligently and unremittingly fomented by the enthusiastic and persistent secretary of 'the Scottish Church Society', who is also president of an Ecclesiological Society in Aberdeen, . . .?" In a "postscript" Jamieson considered
that Professor Milligan and John Macleod were probably guiltless as initiators of the Society, and he re-emphasised his earlier conviction as to Cooper's involvement: "I do not, I believe, go far astray when I ascribe the movement very much to my devoted, earnest, self-denying co-presbyter, Dr. Cooper, or possibly Dr. Sprott, or both."\(^{29}\)

This note of Jamieson, exonerating Milligan and Macleod, followed upon their respective defences of the Society's programme, and their elaboration of its objects.\(^{30}\) That they were very much one with the basic design of the Society cannot (in the light of their defences) be seriously questioned. But as to the interpretation that could be attached to that design, in the sense of removing it from anything resembling the "High Presbyterianism" of Calvin and the early Scottish Reformers, more especially by Cooper, and other even more advanced individuals - like Adamson, and John Charleson of Thornliebank,\(^{31}\) Jamieson was probably quite accurate in his observations. This only became obvious after Milligan's and Macleod's deaths, however, in 1893 and 1898 respectively. In 1895 the Society was still very much concerned with the revival of certain ignored or forgotten features of Christianity. Wallace Williamson, for example, gave this statement of its high ideal:

To revive in our countrymen that fast waning sense of a living body of Christ, to restore to them the conviction that they are not left in this world to the
groping uncertainties of individualism, but that to the visible Church has been committed the ministry, ordinances, and oracles of Jesus Christ for the gathering and perfecting of its members in this life until His coming. To revive a truth of such infinite value is surely a work loudly called for by the circumstances of our time. The central aim of such a movement I cannot doubt to be in harmony with the mind and purpose of our Lord.

It is for this purpose, my brethren, and because I cherish these convictions, that I have found myself, with many of my brethren, in the Scottish Church Society, with whose objects, though they have been greatly misunderstood, I do most heartily sympathise. We have come to a time when it is a solemn duty to ask ourselves whether we are members of a voluntary religious society or of the historic Church of Christ; whether we are not united to Him in baptism and by conscious faith; whether we have or have not been thereby called into a holy priesthood; whether the ordained ministers of Jesus Christ are not stewards of the mysteries of God. 32

Milligan's influence on the Society is readily apparent. It was primarily theological, and even after his death the Society continued to make reference to his work on the priesthood of Christ and of the Church, on the nature of Christ's union with His Church, and on the Church as the extension of the Incarnation. 33 He was also, however, the official figure-head of the Society. In much the same way as Pusey had himself brought a sense of legitimacy and depth to Tractarianism, so Milligan gave "almost an official sanction" 34 to the new Society. He was - it must be remembered - the Principal Clerk to the Assembly, a former Moderator, and, besides being one of the more respected scholars in Scotland, was perhaps the Scottish theologian best known to English critics and writers. 35 It is significant that W. F. Moulton, for
example, wrote to Milligan indicating that he should have been anxious about the possible implications of the Society's programme were Milligan not its President.\textsuperscript{36}

It is important to note how closely the Society followed Milligan's theological understanding, particularly of the Trinity and the Incarnation, for there was never a problem in the Society on these issues. As Wotherspoon has written:

\begin{quote}
belief in a real Incarnation depends on a belief in the eternal and necessary Sonship within the Godhead; and . . . that belief can stand only as belief that the Son is of a Trinity, in which the Holy Spirit is necessarily and eternally the Bond.\textsuperscript{37}
\end{quote}

It is precisely this fundamental position of the Society which led to such trouble in the Committee charged with preparing the "Articles Declaratory of the Constitution of the Church of Scotland".\textsuperscript{38}

After Milligan's death, it seemed obvious that John Macleod of Govan would assume the mantle of leadership. J. F. Leishman has written that John Macleod was "the Mercurius of the Society". "Full of Celtic fire", says Leishman, "he was, till prematurely cut down by death the great orator, organiser, practical statesman, and real inspirer of the movement."\textsuperscript{39} It was Macleod who had drafted the programme of the Society,\textsuperscript{40} although even here his debt to Milligan was inestimable.\textsuperscript{41} In a sermon eulogy, Macleod said that Milligan was, beyond doubt, "the most enduring influential Scottish Churchman of our time".\textsuperscript{42} Certainly Macleod's own addresses on the
Sacraments, as published by the Society, reveal how fully Milligan's statements on the risen humanity of Christ had been received by him. Macleod's writings on the significance of the Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of Christ as regards Baptism and the Communion, were similarly representative of Milligan's teachings. But Macleod was not to be the new leader of the Society. He had barely entered on what was expected to be the great work of his life, when he too died.

In recounting the story of this period, J. F. Leishman has said:

... by general consent, the original foster-fathers of the movement were Thomas Leishman of Linton, and George Washington Sprott, who each occupied the chair of the Society in immediate succession, after the death of Milligan, its first president.

Certainly both these men were actively committed to the Society's programme. Sprott was already active in retracing the roots of the Church of Scotland into the Church Catholic, providing thereby not only a consciousness of a real continuity within the Scottish Church, but also a weighty argument for Christian unity. This continuity was fundamental to the Society's programme, and it was pressed with great effect. In addressing the Society's fourth annual meeting, for example, Sprott said:

The truth is, we are Scottish Churchmen as our fathers were. Like them, we believe that our Lord founded a Church as well as taught a religion, and that we are bound to obey Him in all things, in the things pertaining to the government and ordinances of His House, as well as in the precepts which He has given for the regulation of our private conduct.
Now this is not new in Scotland; what is new is the extent to which the whole subject of the Church is now-a-days neglected.

Many of the people have lost all idea of churchmanship, and love to the Church has grown cold.

It is with lowering the doctrine of the Sacraments that unbelief has usually begun. This missing link in much that is called evangelical religion is the link of vital union with the Second Adam, including that bodily nexus with His glorified humanity, as signified and sealed in the sacraments, which Calvin held as dear as his life, and which has been so emphatically asserted in every standard of our Church since the Reformation.

We need something more than a religious Society. We need a Church.

It was just such a "Church" in Scotland which Sprott laboured to create and authenticate historically.

The other foster-father, Thomas Leishman, defended the Society's existence by stating that there was nothing in the Society's programme but "Scripture, Reason, and the Fathers". It is interesting, but not surprising, that he made no reference to "the Reformers". His primary contribution to the Society's ultimate aim - which was, according to his son, that of "Catholic reunion on a large scale and retention of the ancient Faith in the strictest sense of the word" - was his "interpreting in a Catholic sense the Westminster standards". This undertaking has not unreasonably been compared to Newman's interpreting in a Catholic sense the Thirty-nine Articles; in many ways Leishman's task was far more difficult than Newman's.

In addressing the second conference of the Society, Leishman again defended the Society's programme, and answered the charge of "Romanising" in these words:
We know our own minds. We disown all Roman doctrine, all, that is, which originated with Rome. Doctrine that Rome inherited, and the Reformers reasserted, we adhere to, as they did, not because it is Roman, but because it is apostolic and divine. . . .

In a further statement he defended the more general movement in terms of "restoration" to the Higher practice of a better day - the early days of the Scottish Reformation:

Our desire is that she [the Church] may retain and, where need is, restore the best features of Scottish Christianity as it appeared when it emerged from the inevitable turmoil of reform . . . We shall better understand those times if we remember that in the eyes of our fore-fathers, more than in ours, unity was the normal condition of national religion.50

A further reason for the Society and justification of its programme was implicit in Leishman's noting that the tendency of Calvinism to lapse into Socinianism was attendant chiefly upon a lack of instruction in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, and in Calvin's Sacramental teaching which closely followed these. Commenting on this, Dr. Yancey, in his recent thesis on the development of Milligan's theology, has written that like Milligan and Macleod, Leishman had come to the belief that "at the bottom of the Church's weakness and the narrow view held by so many members of the Church, was the lack of belief in the risen Christ, through whose risen humanity communion with His Church is established by the Holy Spirit".51

After the death of Milligan and Macleod, however, it was neither of these "foster-fathers" who assumed leadership of the Society's theological direction or public
image; these roles fell to Henry J. Wotherspoon and James Cooper respectively. "Following Milligan", says Dr. Yancey, "H. J. Wotherspoon was the theologian of the Scottish Church Society and one of the foremost of the Church." 52

Wotherspoon has been characterised as "a hard-working, devoted parish priest"; "a man of profound religious convictions, a ripe scholar, a profuse writer, and a fountain of ideas". 53 He, like Milligan, had discovered the significance of the risen humanity of Christ and consequently the importance of Pentecost, and his book, What happened at Pentecost, 54 was very much an expansion of Milligan's theology. 55 So too, his work, Religious Values in the Sacraments, 56 was but a development of Milligan's sacramental theology in the light of the Society's programme, and was (according to Yancey) "an earnest attempt to set forth the sacraments in their organic relation to the continued self-offering of the Lord to the Father and of His Church in Him". 57 His other important work, A Manual of Church Doctrine, written conjointly with R. S. Kirkpatrick, showed a similar influence and concern. 58 But Wotherspoon, though the natural theological successor to Milligan, was not recognised as the Society's most outstanding representative until after Cooper's death. 59
The Society was clearly full of eminent men. "But, in the eyes of the world", records J. F. Leishman, "the best known and most beloved member of the Society was Dr. James Cooper, who acted as secretary from the outset."\(^6^0\) Wotherspoon, most interestingly, has written that Cooper was not only representative of the Society membership, but that he was "almost peculiar" in the Society, and that because of his personal emphasis on Christian reunion.\(^6^1\) He says that nearly all the other members of the Society were traditionally Presbyterian in emphasis.\(^6^2\) Cooper, however, valued episcopacy in general, and, also according to Wotherspoon, saw the importance of the Scottish Episcopal remnant to Scottish religion. Wotherspoon has written further that the Church of England was the embodiment of everything Cooper valued, and this led him "to a friendliness which amounted to a frank admiration" for her.\(^6^3\) Cooper alone of the Society's office-bearers, explicitly advocated reunion of the two National Churches.\(^6^4\) Wotherspoon, again trying to vindicate Cooper, has noted: "I should not myself say that he inclined to Anglicise - I should rather say that he approved the Church of England because in so much it agreed with himself, and because alliance with it was necessary to his life-long dream of a restored *Ecclesia Scoticana*."\(^6^5\) In view of his personality and schemes, however, there can be little doubt that Cooper's "inclination" was to Anglicise.
From the beginning, Cooper gave himself fully to the programme of the Society. It has been said that the aims of the Society were precisely expressive of his mind; that he was in fact the spokesman and representative of the Society. Certainly he was the leader of the Society in several points, more especially in opposing the admission of ministers into the Church who did not have a "valid" presbyterial or episcopal ordination, in opposing unfermented wine and individual cups in Communion, and in opposing the Government's "deceased wife's sister" marriage bill. It was, however, in his seeking "adequate securities" for the faith within the Church's subscription requirements, and within the Articles of the reunion talks, that he showed himself most clearly as the leader of the Society. He also assumed leadership in more practical ways. In 1893, for example, he himself took direction of the Society's retreat, and gave the addresses. The retreat consisted of constant prayer, and periods of silence, meditation and fellowship, with Communion being celebrated each morning.

Cooper's theological position, as expressed in the Society's conferences, reveals that he too was heir to Milligan. But of importance is that Cooper was more of an historian than a theologian, and more of an Ecclesiologist than an historian. Even so, he was still a theologian to be reckoned with. He was a theologian with a difference, however; he tended to state doctrinal
truths rather than give an exposition of them. He was more often to be found editing ancient texts and chartularies than providing profound doctrinal tracts. The faith, for Cooper, was an historical reality, and as such had certain readily discernible and totally unalterable historical truths. To him the fundamental truths of the faith were:

The Trinity; the Eternal Father; the Deity, Incarnation, Death, Resurrection, Ascension, and Second Coming of our Lord; the Deity and Presence with us of the Holy Ghost; His inspiring of the Scriptures; His real working in the Church and Sacraments; the Communion of Saints, the tremendous realities of heaven and of hell. . . .73

These, said Cooper, "supply the essential foundation alike of Christian ideas, of Christian sanctity, and of Christian worship".74 He said that Christ had summed up his teaching in the Trinitarian formula: in the three-fold name "into which He requires every single member of His Church to be baptised".

Cooper said that Christ Himself is the centre of the Church's existence. "He is our Lord", said Cooper, "our Head, the Priest for ever who stands, and feeds His flock in the majesty of the Name of the Lord His God."

"We know whom we worship", he continued; "for we live in Him, we receive out of His fulness."75 The relationship of Christ to those who are members of His body, is a fact of experience, said Cooper, it implies as its foundation all the truths preached concerning Him. Cooper reaffirmed that Christ had built His Church upon the rock
of faith in His Deity and Sonship. He wanted to lay stress on Christ's Divinity; but even more on His Humanity. He said, for example:

There is nothing in us that is truly human which is not in Him - the heart of man, the mind of man, the flesh of man - every tender feeling, every holy affection, every heroic thought. He shared in all human sorrow. He glows with all human sympathy. It is there, above, in Him, our Lord and God. He was laid a human babe in His mother's arms. He appears our Human Intercessor at the right hand of the Majesty on High.

As regarded the historic Creeds, Cooper told the Society that he agreed with Charles Gore that the Disciples had belief in the divinity of Christ, and had made an overt confession of faith in Christ; that the New Testament was written with the Apostolic faith already formed; that the Creeds were simply reproductions of the original Apostolic teaching, and were expansions of the primitive Baptismal formulae of the Church.

Although Cooper was not partial to the Calvinism of the "Westminster Confession", he realised that the Confession was a formal link to the Catholic Faith contained in the Creeds. In an age when Confessional Standards were under attack, Cooper thought that it was crucial that this link should be safeguarded. His position, and that of the Society generally, was evidenced in the attempt to have the 1903 resolution by Dr. Archibald Scott on the subscription question withdrawn, and in 1904 to have it repealed. It was seen again following on the Lords' decision in the Free Church Case in 1904, at
which time the Church of Scotland resolved to approach Parliament for a relaxation in the Confessional subscription. Cooper expressed his anxiety that this might leave the Church "practically creedless". He told the Society that if they were defeated in their opposition to this measure, the Church of Scotland could be no home for them. He argued that subscription could not remain undefined; it must require assent to "the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith as set forth in the Nicene Creed".

When the Act of Parliament finally passed, Cooper, through the Society, wanted to ensure that any new formula of subscription would have explicit reference to the Nicene Creed. The formula agreed upon by the 1910 Assembly, however, made reference only to the Confession, but added these words: "and that I believe in the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith contained therein". Cooper approved of this wording in the 1909 Assembly, but must have had reservations, for he voted against it when it came before the Glasgow Presbytery under the Barrier Act. His diary records that he thought it might be more of a snare than a help, for those who favoured it refused to define what are the fundamentals of the faith. In the 1910 Assembly, Cooper, supported by Wotherspoon, tried (unsuccessfully) to have the word "as" inserted between "faith" and "contained", to link the "Confession of Faith" more firmly with the fundamentals of the faith. This early campaign by Cooper, to have the Creed fixed
immutably in the law of the Church of Scotland, was re-assumed with a vengeance in the Reunion Committee. 89

Cooper often represented a unique view in the Society. Members of the Society generally, for example, spoke of the Church as "the extension of the Incarnation"; emphasising that the Church is the body of Christ and is, therefore, united to the life of Christ in heaven. 90 But Cooper, alone in the Society, went a step further. He, following the Tractarian lead, said that not only the Church, but also the Sacraments have been called, not untruly, "the extension of the Incarnation", for they are the means by which Christ and the benefits of the covenant are represented and sealed and applied to believers. 91 To Cooper, both the Church and the Sacraments followed the same principle as the Incarnation, and were dependent upon it. It is of some importance that Wotherspoon did not favour this use of the phrase with reference to the Sacraments. 92

Cooper considered "National religion" a most important principle, and, like others in the Society, he fought hard against "disestablishment". He was particular, however, that what he wanted was an "establishment". To him, the "national recognition of the Christian religion", that which was the more general view of the nature and merit of the Scottish Establishment, was deficient and unacceptable. Cooper wanted State recognition not of the Christian religion only, but also of the Church. 93 In this he differed from many in the Society who were
agreeable to the national recognition of religion interpretation of the establishment.

Cooper's unique contribution to the Society, however, and the area of his most important work, was in the quest for Church reunion. It is clear that this was for him a matter of practical theology. He, like Milligan, thought that the Church on earth had to realise the unity of God in heaven; that the Church must reflect the objective unity which all Christians already have in Christ. But it is probable that Cooper's fond desire for reunion with the Church of England anticipated and required this particular doctrinal allegiance. A larger Presbyterian reunion, for example, did not much interest him; in fact, he wrote that a merely Presbyterian reunion in Scotland was a thing he had dreaded all his thinking life.

For Cooper, the Scottish Episcopalians had to be included in any scheme of union, for they - to his mind - represented not merely three per cent of the population, but "the concensus of ages and the practice of the Church wherever its practice had been continuous". He thought that the precedent of the First Episcopacy (1610-1637), therefore, supplied a "capital basis" for reunion talks. He said: "a United British Church, sound in faith, Catholic in order, full of good works, friendly with and helpful to the ancient Churches of the East, would be able even to make terms with the great Roman Church". He knew that this unity could only be achieved with the acceptance by the Scottish Church of the historic Episcopate; but he
had convinced himself that the particular type of Episcopacy he envisaged would be "the crown and completion", and not the destruction, of her present system. 100

There could be no union whatever for Cooper that was not based on the Establishment principle, and that did not guarantee the "fundamental doctrines" of the Christian faith as presented most clearly in the Nicene Creed. It was precisely this unalterable position on the "fundamental doctrines" which was to make the subsequent talks with the United Free Church so difficult. Doctrinal continuity with the Catholic Church became almost a slogan for Cooper and the Scoto-Catholic position. 101 In this they were merely reasserting the primary purpose of the Society, which was to defend and advance "Catholic doctrine as set forth in the Ancient Creeds and embodied in the Standards of the Church of Scotland". That most contemporary churchmen were afraid of defining the fundamentals of the faith contained in the Confession too narrowly and too rigidly, was ignored by the Society. The first purpose of the Society seemed to be twofold: firstly, to loosen the rigidity of subscription to the "Confession" by viewing it as a safeguard of the deposit of the Catholic doctrine contained in the ancient Creeds; and secondly, to show what the "Confession" and the Creeds have in common, and thereby to ascertain what is the irreducible minimum of that deposit of Faith once delivered to the Saints. 102

This was quite clearly the position assumed by Cooper. The Church had, by some means, to protect her
status as a true branch of the Church Catholic through a guarantee of commitment to the "fundamental verities". It is hardly surprising that Cooper, with his Tractarian orientation, should have followed Newman's lead in defining the "essentials" of the faith as those contained in the Creed. Cooper saw the whole question of ministerial subscription in this light:

[How] shall the Church, while giving to her ministers a real measure of liberty in regard to 'matters which do not', by her own acknowledgement, 'enter into the substance of the Faith', continue to secure their distinct adhesion to the fundamental verities?  

The resolution of the question posed by Cooper represented the beginning of a new era for the Society. Cooper's concern to secure the continued adhesion of the clergy to the "fundamental verities" was a logical enough one, given the situation in which he and the Society found themselves after Parliament had freed the terms of Confessional subscription. The Society, which had been formed originally to "educate" the ministers and laity of the Church of Scotland in Catholic doctrine, might have offered some insight. Instead it issued an ultimatum. This was indicative of the significant change that had overtaken the Society; a change from a "teaching", doctrinal society, holding High Church principles, to a "party" within the Church. Jamieson had foretold that this Society, formed on the same inherently laudable and
innocent lines as the Oxford Movement, would follow it
to a position of power and strength within the Church;
to the position of a "party", with influence out of all
proportion to its numbers, and essentially subversive of
Presbytery. He now seemed to be proved right.

It is obviously difficult to follow such a change of
role. It was sometime before the end of 1837 that the
Oxford Movement was seen as a new party in the English
Church. It was sometime before the end of 1904 that the
"Scoto-Catholics" were seen as a party in the Scottish
Church. They were, in fact, the advanced wing of the
Scottish Church Society, and it is impossible to ascertain
how many were of this school. Certainly there were two:
James Cooper, and A. W. Wotherspoon (the brother of
H. J. Wotherspoon). There were probably others.
T. N. Adamson, for example, would almost invariably have
followed Cooper's lead. Although H. J. Wotherspoon,
G. W. Sprott, and R. S. Kirkpatrick - to name only the
more important - were far more traditionally Presbyterian
in emphasis, they too probably would have followed Cooper's
lead on the matter of protecting the Church's "Catholicity"
through allegiance to the ancient Creeds - here seen as
the deposit of Faith. One who refused to accept the
Society's adoption of the role of "party" within the
Church was A. Wallace Williamson, and it is his testimony,
therefore, which is fundamental to consideration of the
Society's subtle change of role.
Wallace Williamson, though a High Churchman by temperament, was not wholly comfortable in the Society. His biographer says that this was because he was never wholly within the exclusive "brotherhood" of the "inner circle of the Society" — that advanced wing associated with Cooper. Since the days of the "Disruption", says Lord Sands, the Church of Scotland had not known party, and the idea of party, or being identified with one, or being expected to be loyal in all matters to one, was not agreeable to Williamson. Williamson, according to Lord Sands, "was of a different type from men like Sprott or Cooper, tinged no doubt with their ideas, but not absorbed in them".

It was the question of the formula of subscription in 1904, which brought matters to a head for Williamson. The 1693 statute required that every minister of the Church of Scotland must declare his acceptance of the Westminster Confession as the confession of his own faith, and in such terms as to indicate his acceptance of every article and particular of the Confession as the truth of God. Parliament was to legislate in the Free Church affair, to try and redress the situation caused by the decision of the House of Lords which, because of the law of trusts, had found with the tiny minority of "wee Free's" who had stayed out of the Free Church—United Presbyterian reunion. Lord Balfour of Burleigh summoned the Church Interests' Committee, a Standing Committee of the General Assembly, to have it consider approaching Parliament at
the same time to secure the much desired relaxation of the subscription. Of interest is that the Scottish Church Society at the time had eleven members on this particular Assembly Committee, including Cooper, Wallace Williamson, R. S. Kirkpatrick, and H. J. Wotherspoon. The Council of the Society, being basically those aforementioned, was alarmed by the proposal, and at a special meeting of the Council, which Williamson was unable to attend, resolved to ask certain questions of the Church Interests' Committee, more especially as to whether there would be security for the fundamentals of the Faith. These questions were then to be followed by this resolution:

That the Committee disapproves of any relaxation of the present formula of subscription which does not (besides conforming to the Act of 1690) secure explicit assent to the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith.

Williamson, upon receipt of Cooper's letter intimating this plan of the Society's Council, immediately sent Cooper his resignation from the Society. He said:

I confess I have never liked the idea of going from a meeting of the Church Society with a prepared motion to a meeting of a Church Committee. It is quite a different matter, of course, to talk over things in a friendly way. But I cannot myself feel satisfied to go to a Church Committee as representing the Society. Indeed I have felt for a good while past I have begun to doubt whether the Society may not be now more of a hindrance than a help. As a matter of fact it does tend to prejudice our individual action, and what we say or do is largely discounted. I have no doubt there may be many in the Society who do not hold this view, but personally I hold it very strongly, so strongly indeed that I have come to the conclusion that I ought to resign my connection with the Society. ... I therefore ask you to accept this letter as conveying my resignation of membership of the Society. In taking this step I do not cease to recognise the value of the work which the Society has done. ...
The death of John Macleod, his "spiritual father", and the new direction taken by the Society under Cooper preeminently, were obviously contributing factors to Williamson's resignation. But following the Perth Conference, the fifth of such, at which Williamson himself had presided, it was clear to many that there had been enough large scale "propaganda" as regarded Catholic doctrine. By that time the Society's High Church principles had been publicly expounded, and those sympathetic to the stated purposes had been clearly identified.

According to Lord Sands, after the death of Macleod it was Williamson who was the most prominent man in the Society, for, he says: "Dr. Cooper had few popular gifts."

Putting aside Lord Sand's personal prejudices, the fact remains that the Society's loss was great. Although Williamson never explained publicly his reasons for resigning, it marked quite clearly the change in the Society, for with the death of Thomas Leishman earlier in the same year, it became even more completely the party vehicle of Cooper and his collaborators.

The Scottish Church Society was formed to defend and advance Catholic doctrine at a time when it looked as though this aspect of the Church's inheritance was likely to be obscured by the advance of Modernism. Initially it was a teaching agent; it acted as a sort of witness to the Catholic deposit which had been received by the Scottish
Church no less than by the other main branches of Western Christendom. Under the influence of William Milligan and John Macleod, the Society developed a strong Incarnational and Sacramentalist identity, and although it found inspiration in the revitalised Church of England, it strove to conform to a pattern of High Presbyterianism which arguably could have encompassed John Calvin. The deaths of these two men allowed of new influences, and Cooper in particular became the new public spokesman. Even though he was unique in the Society in actively pressing for reunion with the Church of England, the Society in its wider programme seemed to be one with Cooper's mind. His Tractarian ideals and definitions now became publicly identified with the Society, and with its gradual assumption of the role of a party within the Church, the Society under Cooper's leadership started to play "power politics".

The critics of Tractarianism had been proved right in their assertion that the programme advanced was, or could prove to be, subversive to the English Church; it might be equally stated that George Jamieson's assertion was also proved correct. He had accused the Scottish Church Society of entertaining a different source of authority from that which was integral to the Reformed doctrine of the Scottish Church, a different "point d'appui", as he called it, which was explicitly Tractarian-affected, and was "essentially subversive to the Scottish rule of faith". The emergence of the Scoto-Catholic party within
the several committees of the courts of the Church under-
mined the integrity of the Reformed system by destroying
the fundamental parity of Presbyters, and by allowing an
exclusivist club with particular objects in mind to not
only have a voice through its members, but also - by
coeersion - to exercise an influence out of all proportion
to its numbers. In this case the object was clear: it
was to have the Church of Scotland more closely conform
to that which had been deemed Catholic by the Tractarian
fathers; to have her stand strong in the immutable "faith
once delivered", to the exclusion of all modern influences.
Whether this Tractarian definition was accurate, or
accorded with the Reformed standards of the Church of
Scotland, was not a major consideration for the Scoto-
Catholics. What was of importance was that the reassertion
of Catholic doctrine had proved effective in the fight to
save the English Church from Liberalism, and might now
prove to be equally effective in Scotland.
CHAPTER XI

THE DRAFT "ARTICLES DECLARATORY" OF 1914 AND 1918

SECURITY FOR THE "FUNDAMENTAL VERITIES OF THE FAITH"

In 1898 Cooper became Regius Professor of Church History at Glasgow University \(^1\) (reading himself into the Chair by reciting what were to him the "fundamental verities" - the Nicene Creed!). His application for the Chair had been supported by some thirteen past or future Moderators of the Assembly, ten Professors, several eminent dignitaries of the Church of England, and various influential laymen. \(^2\) In all, some fifty-three testimonials had supported Cooper's candidacy. \(^3\) The Chair had been vacated through the elevation of R. H. Story to the Principalship of the University. Story's sympathy with many of Cooper's projects of reform was well known, and it must not be supposed that Story was without influence in the matter of Cooper's appointment. For Cooper, even in his own mind, was aware of his inadequacies. He wrote after his retirement: "I was always rather the pastor taking up Church History than a historian pure and simple - I was always a bit of an amateur, though I think that I saw the universality of our subject." \(^4\)

The appointment gave Cooper far more influence and far greater scope for the dissemination of his particular
type of Churchmanship. He took full advantage of the opportunity to preach at "special services" of all kinds, and made full use of his status as Professor on various committees of the Church and the University. His classes at Glasgow were representative of his understanding of the ministerial training programme. They each began with devotions - with a Psalm and Scripture reading. At first the students joined in audibly only at the \textit{Gloria Patri}, but later they recited the Psalms with him responsively. He gave everyone in his class the gift of a Revised Version of the New Testament. He arranged for Holy Communion to be celebrated at the end of each session. He took his class to Glasgow Cathedral, and there, using a formal liturgy, indoctrinated them into his High Churchism [APPENDIX H]. It was not without effect. "As professor", summarises the Dictionary of National Biography, "Cooper exercised a remarkable personal influence over pupils and students by reason of his sincere and pious character; his cultured mind, varied interests, and affectionate nature brought him also a large circle of friends." Cooper's professorial "pulpit" seems to have borne remarkable similarities, both in the pious nature of its occupant, and in its capacity to exert a powerful influence over its hearers, to Newman's pulpit at Oxford: "Here was no vehemence, no declaration, no show of elaborated argument, ... The Local, the temporary and the modern were enabled by the presence of the catholic truth belonging to all ages that pervaded the whole."
By 1896 the disestablishment campaign was dead, but, to Cooper's mind, the matter of Creed subscription posed a new and even more serious attack on the Church's life. His first years at Glasgow were fully occupied with this matter which came to a head in the Assembly of 1903. In that Assembly, which approved of Dr. Scott's resolution, it seemed that the whole content of the Confession was referred to the private judgment of the subscriber. This resolution was challenged unsuccessfully in the subsequent Assembly by a "conspiracy" of High Churchmen and Evangelicals, according to Dr. Scott, although he withdrew this phrase on Cooper's protest.

The 1905 Assembly gave consideration of the matter to Lord Balfour's Church Interests' Committee. In the same year Parliament legislated to allow the Church of Scotland the right to alter her relation to the Confession, a significant contribution to subsequent reunion talks with the United Free Church.

Cooper was anxious about the whole question of formulas and subscription, and feared that there would be a general move to accept a recommendation of extreme relaxation of confessional ties. This, to his mind, was a clear test of the Catholic claims of the Church of Scotland, not unlike that known by the Oxford Movement in the years to the Gorham judgment. Accepting Oxford's position that Catholicity involves the fundamentals of Christian Tradition, Cooper thought that if the Scottish Church relaxed her adherence to the three Catholic Creeds.
she was thereby necessarily relaxing her attachment to the Christian Faith, and this meant forfeiting her claim to be the true branch of the Church Catholic in Scotland. The matter of Creed subscription was, for Cooper, the test of orthodoxy. Cooper could not trust Archibald Scott in this matter, for, as his diary records, Scott had spoken slightingly of the ancient Creeds, had deprecated a revision of the Confession, had sneered at those who were careful about Orders, and had defined "faith" as "fiducia". It was the thought of the Scottish Church practically Creedless that made Cooper consider whether she could still be home for him and his Scoto-Catholic party. He wrote to Lord Balfour in 1905 to the effect that unless the Creeds were expressly made a matter of subscription, he and his party would oppose any tampering with the statutory relation to the Confession. He feared, he wrote at another point, that Unitarianism would be made lawful in the Church. As indicated previously, the matter came before the Assemblies of 1909 and 1910, and the new subscription became that exacted thereafter.

It was the Union talks with the United Free Church that reopened the matter with a new sense of urgency. For Cooper and the Scottish Church Society, union had to be based on certain "Catholic Principles". They enunciated four such principles: security for the Church's witness to
the Faith; security for the continuance of the ministry; security for the recognition of the Church by the State; and security for the conservation of the Church's proper patrimony. In a 1907 circular sent to all ministers of the Church of Scotland, the Scottish Church Society intimated that two fundamental requirements were necessary to reunion: the maintenance of the faith, and the maintenance of the Church-State connection. In this the hand of Cooper is readily apparent.

The 1907 Assembly received several Overtures on the matter of reunion. Cooper submitted one (unanimously approved of), through the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, in favour of a "comprehensive union" of Episcopalians and Presbyterians. Of it Cooper wrote:

It is important to emphasise the point that the Church of Scotland holds its property for the service of CHRIST in Scotland, and cannot make private bargains according to its own fancy for this one and that. At the Revolution they excluded the Episcopalians (1) because they themselves held the Divine right of Presbytery; (2) because many of the Episcopalians were, and all of them were suspected of being, Jacobites — enemies of the Protestant succession. We have given up No. 1: there is no ground for No. 2. But with the Episcopalians we must be careful to include all Presbyterians who will unite in a National Church, and especially the Highlanders, where (a) this principle has always been held, and (b) where the absolute need of endowments has been demonstrated. ... What we want is clear evidence that (1) a comprehensive union is desired by the Church, and (2) would be welcomed by Episcopalians.

Cooper's Overture, on which he had placed so much hope, found little support in the Assembly, possibly a result of "the Perth incident" of 1901. That particular incident had involved the Christian Unity Association, which had
been formed at the instigation of the 1897 Lambeth Conference to advance Presbyterian-Episcopal reunion. Dr. Archibald Scott of St. George's, Marshall Lang, Wallace Williamson, and James Cooper were the Church of Scotland's representatives to the Association. The project foundered when Bishop Wilkinson of St. Andrews, a leading Catholic Evangelical who well represented the narrow sectarianism of Tractarian principles, declined an invitation for himself and his clergy to participate in a special service of intercession within St. John's Kirk, Perth. Dr. Scott immediately resigned from the Association, as did Bishop Wilkinson. Although the incident was not mentioned, it was evident that Dr. Scott did not consider the Episcopalians were yet ready to speak of formal union. In addressing the Assembly upon the whole matter, Lord Balfour, Norman Macleod, and W. P. Paterson stated that more divided the Church of Scotland from the Episcopalians than from other Presbyterian bodies, and therefore it was suggested that the Episcopal Church should be excluded from the terms of the remit. Dr. Scott's motion to the effect that the matter of union with the Free Church and the United Free Church be referred to a special committee, became the one adopted by the General Assembly.

Cooper was obviously troubled by this development. Only a month earlier he had written on the dangers of a merely Presbyterian reunion: it would not be safe in the interests of the Catholic Faith, or "of such remnants
of Catholic order" as had been retained; it would mean the surrender of the establishment "principle"; it would deepen the ditch between Presbyterians and Episcopalians, and would add to the "present misery of class distinctions in the Church"; it would strengthen the ranks of Nonconformity throughout the Empire; it would proceed on the principle that the Church's supreme law "is not the declared will of Christ, but the (supposed) inclinations of the Scottish people - and they who are "the least attractive part of the Scottish people". In a letter to John White, Cooper stated that union with the United Free Church would mean "the abandonment of Establishment-National Religion; great insecurity to the Faith; a big sect instead of a National Church, and the leadership of all dissenters throughout Christendom".

The subsequent report of the Special Committee of Assembly (1908) stressed "cooperation" as a desirable approach toward union, but Cooper presented a "Minority Report". In it he held that union was required; that cooperation would be tantamount to establishing schism by law. Cooper had already formalised his position in terms of doctrine: "There is one Body and one Spirit. . . . It is impossible to apprehend this sublime conception without seeing that it involves at once the fact of the Church's unity, the 'obligation on Christians to agree', and the sinfulness of schism." In his Minority Report he sought to have the union principles made primary, and to have excluded an unrestricted and unguarded programme.
of cooperation until these primary principles were formally resolved. He wanted as a precondition to any union talks "adequate security for the Church's witness to the Faith, effective recognition by the State of the Church and not merely religion, and conservation for the Church of its proper Patrimony". In this, Cooper was supported by G. W. Sprott, R. S. Kirkpatrick, and H. J. Wotherspoon, and in the Assembly debate itself, he was joined by John White and William Mair in favouring direct union negotiations.

The "cooperation" Report of Norman Macleod, however, was overwhelmingly received; but the United Free Church's reply (1909) rejected this in favour of unrestricted union talks. They made it clear, however, that they were still committed to their policy requiring the dis-establishment and disendowment of the Church of Scotland. Although somewhat ruffled by this, the Church of Scotland was not deterred from her primary goal, and indicated that she was ready to proceed with the union talks. The other Church in the remit, the Free Church, rejected all union talk out-of-hand.

It was clear to all that the decision of the Church of Scotland to enter into discussion with the United Free Church meant that the Church of Scotland accepted "establishment" as a matter open for discussion and possible modification. It is hardly surprising that Cooper and like-minded men were alarmed by this development, for they saw the profound difference between "establishment"
and "national religion"; they were unwilling to give up "establishment" for they saw it as part of the substance of the Faith received. Establishment bound the Church of Scotland to the Confession, and through it to the ancient Creeds and the Catholic Faith therein contained. Union with the United Free Church, which demanded the right to alter its Confession, might mean the apostasy of the Church from the received Catholic Faith. As Cooper said in a letter to The Scotsman: "The need and duty of reunion is very great: but an immediate and partial reunion may be purchased at too dear a rate. It cannot come by the sacrifice of revealed truth: it ought to be a step to realisation of the larger hope."  

Both Churches selected committees of about one hundred members to confer on the reunion question. For the Church of Scotland, Norman Macleod (who died in 1911 and was replaced by Wallace Williamson) and Lord Balfour of Burleigh, were named joint conveners, and John White (who was considered by many to be a High Churchman, and who had a certain intimacy with Cooper) was appointed clerk. Sprott died in 1909, but Cooper and A. W. Wotherspoon represented the Scoto-Catholic party on the Committee, Cooper being one of the four professors on the Church of Scotland's Committee. Augustus Muir, the biographer of John White, has written that Cooper "stood forth as the leader of a minority whose insignificance in numbers was
in inverse ratio to its passionate sincerity and its
determination to convince the majority of the serious
errors of their ways". Rolf Sjölinder, the historian
of Presbyterian reunion in Scotland, has written that
Cooper and Wotherspoon represented a High Church "pressure
group" who made their presence felt in no uncertain way
during the course of the negotiations. He says:

It is a very common error to estimate the influence
of any given group by its numbers. Should such be
the case here, it should be well to point out that
the very enthusiasm with which [Cooper and
A. W. Wotherspoon] championed their cause ensured
that their influence, in fact, stood in inverse
proportion to their numerical strength.

According to Lord Balfour, the method of Cooper and
Wotherspoon was to adopt the attitude of being the "sole
watchers on the walls of Zion", looking with horror on
the remainder of the union Committee busy organising a
Church without faith. It is hardly surprising that this
attitude annoyed many who were equally convinced of their
own orthodoxy, more especially Lord Balfour himself.

The problem was that they defined "orthodoxy" differently.
As Sjölinder has said, there was no substantial difference
of opinion in matters of fact between Cooper, and those
who represented the "almost old-fashioned orthodoxy", such
as Lord Balfour and Norman Macleod. In the 1910
Assembly, for example, Norman Macleod proposed the
Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as an acceptable expression of
fundamental doctrines. But Sjölinder suggests that this
group chose to act separately from Cooper because of
Cooper's tendency to assume the role as the only guardian of the Faith. Lord Balfour, indeed, thought that Cooper's too challenging attitude might encourage "the average, sensible, old-fashioned, conservative Presbyterian" to side with the extremists on the matter of spiritual independence.

For Cooper, orthodoxy required that the Church must formulate an explicit statement of the facts and truths which are to be "reckoned fundamental", worked out on the basis of the Nicene Creed. It was this attitude which he had assumed in discussions on the new formula of subscription; it was this attitude he maintained in the Union Committee. It was explicitly Tractarian affected in that Cooper considered that the Oxford position on essentials and fundamentals had saved the Church of England from the "Liberal" aggression. Now, in the face of "Modernism", Liberalism's daughter, and in dialogue with the United Free Church, which was to Cooper's mind, tending toward apostasy, the same appeal to an indefectible deposit of faith had to be made, more especially since he held that Presbyterianism lapses into Socinianism and heresy more readily than does Anglicanism. For Cooper there had to be some guarantee of that indefectible deposit. The Church's right to alter doctrine could never extend to those doctrines which enter into the substance of the Faith; these could only be considered with reference to the rest of the visible Catholic Church. It is not surprising that Cooper, in line with his Tractarian
masters, continually made reference to "the Catholic Faith" and to the "branch theory" of the Church. Because of his aggressive advocacy, however, both of these terms developed narrow definitions, and became distasteful to the majority of the Union Committee. 40

It was not until 1913 that sufficient preliminary progress had been made to allow the preparation of draft articles for the constitution of a reunited Church of Scotland. Three versions were prepared and presented to the Church of Scotland's Committee. One was produced by its Secretary, John White, one by William Mair and Lord Sands, and one by James Cooper. Sjölinder says that this was entirely typical of Cooper and his particular views, for (in his words), "[Cooper] was certainly not afflicted with false modesty when it came to advocating his own theology: that of uncompromising insistence upon 'the Catholic Faith ... summed up in the Nicene Creed' and a clear statement of the doctrine of national religion". 41

It was the first Article of the constitution that was to contain a credal statement, and it was here that Cooper's position was most clearly and most uncompromisingly expressed. According to Sjölinder, it was necessary, for certain constitutional and parliamentary reasons, that the Church declare her position as a Reformed and Presbyterian branch of the Catholic Church, and that she accompany her declaration of the Church's liberty in
matters spiritual with a declaration of her faithfulness to the fundamental truths of the Christian Faith. John White, in his draft, had simply reaffirmed that the Head of the Church is the Lord Jesus Christ, from Whom all the Church's power derives, and that her doctrines are set forth in the Westminster Confession. He thought that a credal statement beyond this was unnecessary and probably impossible of formulation and general approbation. He considered that the opening Article could state the relation of the Church of Scotland to the Church Universal, however. Mair and Lord Sands, for their part, had simply stated that the Church of Scotland is a branch of the Catholic Church, holding the faith once for all delivered to the saints. Cooper, not surprisingly, was far more explicit. "The Church of Scotland", he said, "confesses unalterably the Catholic Faith summed up in the Nicene Creed, set forth by 'the four first and most excellent Councils', embodied in the chief of its subordinate standards, the Westminster Confession of Faith."

From this declaration linking the fundamentals of the Faith to the Nicene Creed, Cooper would not be moved. He wrote Lord Balfour to the effect that if the first Article was left in White's present "meagre, dangerous, and deceptive form", without a clear statement of the fundamentals, he considered himself at liberty to take whatever steps seemed right to keep himself clear of the charge of complicity in this matter, and to defend and maintain the "capital interests of the Church". The Committee gave
in, and accepted that a larger statement of essentials should be given.

Muir has recorded that no sooner had Cooper gained his point on fundamentals than he claimed another: the statement of fundamentals in the first Article must be made unalterable for all time future. Muir says: "On the one side was the majority who wondered how far they might dare to go in conciliation: on the other was a minority - a very small minority - who were convinced beyond any doubt that they were in the right and the others in the wrong." Cooper and A. W. Wotherspoon held that no branch of the Christian Church could exercise any authority over the Faith; that the Faith had not been "created", but "received". In this regard Wotherspoon, (using the material of his brother's Macleod Lecture for 1905) drew the distinction between "confession" and "creed": creed is built into confession and provides the unalterable basis of all doctrine; confession depends upon racial and national peculiarities, and distinguishes the various branches of the Church Catholic. These several branches have the right to alter their particular confession, but no branch has the right to alter the Creed, for it is the common inheritance of Christendom.

The majority arrayed a host of arguments against this position, more especially that it showed a lack of trust in the Divine guidance of the Church, and was a serious departure from the Reformed position. But Cooper and
Wotherspoon remained unmoved; the doctrinal essentials must be unalterable. The Committee gave in for the second time, and inserted in the eighth Article (that concerning the Church's right to interpret and modify the Articles) the words: "The Church, as a branch of the Catholic Church, unalterably adhering to the declaration of faith and duty set forth in the first Article hereof."

It was thought that this would pacify Cooper. It did not. He wanted the words "This Article is unalterable" added at the end of the first Article. The Committee, having given in twice already, refused to be pressed further on this issue. This was hardly surprising, for it must be remembered that the actual statement of essential doctrine to be contained in this first Article had not even been considered as yet!

The split deepened, and when the draft of the first Article eventually emerged, it was almost inevitable that Cooper would again register his protest. The draft Article read as follows:

The Church of Scotland is a branch of the Holy Catholic or Universal Church, believing in one God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ His only Begotten Son Incarnate for our salvation, and in the Holy Ghost, three Persons in the unity of the Godhead; owning obedience to its once crucified, now risen and glorified Lord, as the sole King and Head of His Church; proclaiming the forgiveness of sins and acceptance with God through faith in Christ, the renewing of the Holy Spirit, and eternal life; and labouring for the advancement of the Kingdom of God throughout the world.
Cooper and A. W. Wotherspoon protested that this did not properly express the delivered deposit of faith, especially that of the Trinity and the Incarnation. They looked in vain, they said, for the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, of the person and nature of Christ as Saviour, of the Incarnation and the Atonement, of the persons and mission of the Holy Ghost. They noted that there was a doctrine of the Trinity, but not that which was Catholic and Orthodox; that there was but a mere mention of the Incarnation. Wotherspoon said that from these doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation, all others derive, even the Atonement. Cooper was vocal in his support of Wotherspoon's contention that the proposed statement of essential truths, if approved by the Assembly, would cut the Church of Scotland off from doctrinal unity with the Catholic Church.54

Cooper and his "party", now numbering some fifteen, having failed to get their way in the Committee, resolved to prepare a Minority Report for presentation to the General Assembly of 1914. It contained their version of how Article I should read:

The Church of Scotland is a branch of the Holy Catholic or Universal Church, believing and confessing that there is one living and true God; that there are three persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, and that these three are One God, the same in substance equal in power and glory; and that the Lord Jesus Christ, being the eternal Son of God, became man for our salvation by taking to himself a true body and a reasonable soul, and so was, and continueth to be God and Man in two distinct natures and one person for ever, owning obedience. . . . [as above] 55
The Minority Report also suggested that National Religion, because of its profound spiritual implication, should be included in the Articles, accompanied by a declaration that the Church holds it to be her duty to seek the aid and support of the State, and that she maintains her ancient statutory connection with it.

The Assembly of 1914 was not with the minority, but most interestingly it did allow that the Minority Report could be sent down to the Presbyteries with the Committee's Report. This concession seems to have represented personal gestures of good-will on the parts of Lord Balfour and John White toward Cooper.

This personal affection for Cooper must not be overlooked, for the fact that he was held in high esteem by the Joint Convenors and by the Secretary of the Union Committee is fundamental to an understanding of why they continually gave in to his peculiar position. John White, for example, spoke of Cooper as "that most loveable and unique personality". He characterised Cooper and Wotherspoon as "both keen men and, apart from theological controversy, splendid fellows". In Committee, he found them to be troublesome in asking for all of their views to be embodied in the Articles, and thought that they would push their unique position until union became impossible. White's impatience with them is evidenced by an incident in which he had named eight men to act as a sub-committee. Wotherspoon protested that no one from his school had been chosen. White, already late for his train,
immediately suggested that the sub-committee should be augmented to number ten, and so "put on the whole school". 59

Even here, however, though the incident is amusing, is seen the way in which the Scoto-Catholic position became of such importance within the various Committees of the Church. Inevitably there must have been impatience with their tactics, but it almost invariably was tempered by a concern that their unique position be heard. The piety of Cooper, his "saintliness" and his gentle pastoral image, won for him concessions from all traditions and beliefs; while he, for his part, remained resolute and intractable. It would appear that it was as much Cooper's romantic medieval spirit as his tenacity in holding to his position, which led men to pamper his whims and allow for his idiosyncrasies.

With the outbreak of war, the union drive lagged, but in 1917 a small meeting of the Committee was held. The General Assembly of that year, of which Cooper was the Moderator, renewed the Committee's commission, and asked for revision of the 1914 Articles in the light of proposals received from the Presbyteries and from the United Free Church. In March 1918 the Committee met, and, as Muir has recorded, "Professor Cooper arrived, charged with zeal for his own case." 60 His year as Moderator had clearly given him new life and a more determined resolve
to save the Church from apostasy. He pressed for revision of the draft Articles in terms of his 1914 Minority Report. He went so far, apparently, as to state that he would prefer that union be deferred, or given up altogether, than that it should be carried on the Committee's present terms. 61

White was exasperated; it seemed as though there would be no end to Cooper's proposals. In a bid to cure Cooper, White moved that all of the first Article that dealt with doctrine be eliminated. All that was to remain was a general reference to the fundamentals of doctrine in the Westminster Confession. 62 The motion was carried, the majority being in no mood to waste more time in unproductive and - to most minds - unnecessary wrangling.

White had certainly silenced Cooper, but this virtual censure of Cooper's obnoxious behaviour in Committee took on a more drastic nature than White had anticipated or intended. White had made the proposal, of his own admission, "with the simple object of ending an interminable discussion", 63 but Cooper took the matter grievously to heart. White received a letter the next day from a minister who had travelled back to Glasgow with Cooper. "He is furiously angry over the exclusion of the doctrinal statement", he wrote, "and if the majority insist on the position now arrived at, he will certainly secede from the Church and carry all of like mind with him." The correspondent added that in his opinion, however, the majority should proceed without trying to conciliate the minority,
and leave their vindication to the country at large.  

The thought of Cooper seceding caught White off guard. He might reasonably have known, however, how passionately Cooper valued the essentials of the received Tradition, as he understood them. It was inconceivable that Cooper could remain in a branch of the Church which, to his eyes, refused to guarantee the "deposit of Faith". As long as the Faith remained inviolate in the Church of Scotland's formularies and Confession, Cooper could remain within her, and strive to have her better understand her true Catholic nature and inheritance. But if the Faith was compromised, its fundamental dogmas considered open to interpretation and reformulation, then the Church whose faith it represented could no longer claim to be the true branch of the Catholic Church.

That Cooper's position in this was that of his Tractarian master, Pusey, cannot be seriously doubted. Identification of the Church with a static credal formulation of immutable dogma had never been the Reformed position. The Scottish Reformers had always reserved the right to have their formulations challenged in the light of Scripture and of deeper understanding. But Cooper here, as elsewhere, represented the Tractarian revolt from Protestantism; represented the romantic attraction of an indefectible Catholicism. The Faith, as an historical reality, was not open to interpretation; it was to be received and transmitted in its original integrity with loving fidelity.
In a letter to Lord Balfour, Cooper made his position perfectly clear:

... if this Constitution is to be accepted - which I shall fight to the last, in Church courts, and if need be in Parliament - I can only wash my hands of her [the Church of Scotland], and leave her as no longer what she was.65

To Lord Sands, the Procurator, Cooper wrote:

The first Article as it left the last meeting of Committee is a thing I never can or will agree to, regarding it as I do as wholly unworthy of the Church of Scotland, and as leaving the door open, as on purpose, for the most serious inroads of heresy, and the denial of the faith.66

Cooper had some time earlier written to Lord Sands to the effect that he and his party would be satisfied if an explicit confession of the Catholic Faith in the two cardinal doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation were inserted,67 and it was on this basis that Lord Sands and Lord Balfour now tried to effect a reconciliation. Lord Balfour asked White in private to have the doctrinal statement restored, fearing apparently that Cooper would split the Church by saying that they had "jeopardised the Faith".68 White, reluctantly, agreed, but on the condition that it was to be accepted now as "the finished Article".

Another doctrinal statement, therefore, was drawn up in private, and presented to Cooper. Cooper accepted it as providing the essentials for which he and his party had contended.69 But this was a private arrangement. The Committee majority to whom it had to be referred, proved
more difficult. They were not in favour of rewriting the first Article on which so much time and trouble had already been spent. But once again, they gave in. In Muir's words: "they gave way to Cooper so far as to adopt some of his modes of expression, particularly about the Trinity, 'the same in substance, equal in power and glory'." A compromise had been effected, and although Cooper undoubtedly would have preferred to have seen accepted the strictly orthodox words he had set down in his 1914 Minority Report, he accepted the new draft Article. It now read:

The Church of Scotland is part of the Holy Catholic or Universal Church; worshipping the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory; confessing the Eternal Son our Lord Jesus Christ, made very man for our salvation; glorying in His Cross and Resurrection, and adoring Him as the Head over all things to His Church; trusting in the promised renewal and guidance of the Holy Spirit; proclaiming the forgiveness of sins and acceptance with God through faith in Christ, and the gift of Eternal Life; and labouring for the advancement of the Kingdom of God throughout the world. The Church of Scotland adheres to the Scottish Reformation; receives the word of God which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as its supreme rule of faith and life; and avows the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith founded thereupon and contained in its own Confession.

It is quite clear that Cooper substantially had won. White himself still thought that his own original draft of 1913 had been sufficient: "The Westminster Confession of Faith . . . shall be, in so far as it sets forth the sum and substance of the doctrine of the Reformed Churches,
being the fundamental doctrine of the Catholic faith, the public and avowed Confession of the Church." It was clear to him, however, that this would never have been acceptable to Cooper, and he could not afford an extended domestic fight. White wrote afterwards:

Cooper, the dear man, was always on the look-out lest we should do hurt to the 'Catholic faith' in our statement. The Articles, the first chiefly, were a nightmare to him. That first Article did not embody the Nicene Creed in the form he loved. (The Athanasian he would, I am sure, have put in as well.) One phrase was on his mind - the same in substance, equal in power and glory - and he pled for it. If we gave him this, we wondered, would he promise not to ask for more? He was very angry because I tried to tie his hands in this way, but I knew that if I didn't we should never finish the Articles. They had taken far too much of our time. They had aroused unnecessary debate. And this first Article was not really necessary to the Articles Declaratory of our freedom in spiritual things. . . . But Cooper would not be satisfied.

On the matter of the first Article being made unalterable, Lord Sands sought to be conciliatory by inserting into Article VIII (on the Church's relation to the Articles) that the Church's right to interpret, add to, or modify the Articles was always to be consistent with the provisions of the first Article, which are essential to the Church's continuity and corporate life. This statement was later softened, however, by the insertion of the words "as interpreted by the Church" - a concession to the United Free Church.

As regards the national recognition of religion, nothing was conceded to the minority apart from the use of the term "national Church" in Article III. None-the-less,
Cooper was satisfied with the concessions he had wrought, and he stated publicly that the Articles provided the clearest possible witness to the Faith of the Church. He urged his fellow High Churchmen to accept the concessions they had won in the Articles as "the best we can get". It is clear that Cooper considered the first Article to be the most important, and was unwilling to jeopardise it by pressing his claims on national religion.

The matter of the Establishment was taken up by others, however, most notably by Dr. Donald MacMillan of Glasgow, the biographer of George Buchanan and the Aberdeen Doctors. He had been an ardent supporter of Cooper since 1912, and thought that the final draft Articles represented a conspiracy, the result of which would be the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church of Scotland. His attitude was indicative of his particular historical allegiance. MacMillan, not unlike Cooper, championed the cause of the Aberdeen Doctors - the royalist and constitutionalist theologians of the reign of Charles I. These "doctors" had been active supporters of the episcopal system introduced by James VI, and were overthrown by the Covenanters - described by Cooper as "the powerful men of 1637, who persecuted their king and their bishops rather than were persecuted by them" [sic]. Both MacMillan and Cooper were convinced that these Caroline divines were essentially correct in matters of doctrine, worship, and church government. MacMillan held that there had always been a
fanatical section in the Church of Scotland, since the
days of Andrew Melville, who had contended for spiritual
freedom, but that they had left the Church at the
Disruption. He was unwilling that the National Church
should again fall into this error. He noted that the
Articles left it possible for the majority to alter the
Constitution to suit themselves, and saw that in future
minorities would have no recourse except secession. He
said that instead of a united Church continuing
strong and solid there was a probability that it would
be broken up into fragments as outraged minorities
either seceded or were driven out.

It is clear that this reference to history, and more
particularly to the "golden age" of the Scottish Church
at the beginning of the seventeenth century, represented
a fundamental and deep-seated point of divergence between
the majority and the minority. They read their history
differently: they looked to different ages for inspiration;
they read the same incidents with different conclusions;
the one's heroes were of necessity the others' villains.
It is impossible to consider that Cooper's positing of a
"golden age" in the Church of Scotland during the reign
of Charles I and Laud was merely coincidental to Oxford's
fond reflection on the same period. Cooper had Jacobitism
in his veins, and it infected everything he touched.
Primary to Cooper's attempt to convert the Church of
Scotland to his Catholic understanding was having her
look at her history anew, and from a very different
vantage point from that traditionally used - the "glorious revolution of 1688". The Church must see that her greatest years were those of the "first episcopacy" of 1610. Cooper's attitude in the Committee charged with the preparation of the Articles Declaratory was but an extension of his devotion to the historiological mythos he had helped to devise. It was another manifestation of his acceptance of Oxford's definition of Catholicity in terms of Laudian religion and static indefectible dogma.

Cooper's appointment to the Chair of Church History at Glasgow had provided him with a new avenue of influence and greater respectability. He entered the several committees of the Church to which he was appointed from a point of strength, and the unique position he represented, though not invariably welcomed, was generally received with good will. His leading role in the emerging Scotocatholic party enabled him to have greater say and wider impact than he might otherwise have had, and he became, in fact, a very powerful man in the courts of the Church, even though many regarded him as a rather humourous and medieval character. His gentleness and piety were well known, his learning was wide and varied, his interests were uninhibited by artificial national frontiers. Cooper's fondness for the English Church, and his hearty desire to have Scottish Episcopalians brought back into
the Church of Scotland fold, coloured all his thinking, and his allegiance to this position led him to adopt positions and definitions which were not always in basic accord with the Reformed polity of the Church of Scotland.

Cooper's greatest fear was that the Church of Scotland, through her own action, would become a big sect, the leader among all dissenters. His Tractarian masters had impressed on him the fulness of Catholic principles, and had unfolded to him the fundamental verities of the faith. The Nicene Creed represented that indefectible deposit of faith which must be believed by all orthodox Christians; adherence to the Creed, therefore, had to be unalterable. Union of Churches had to be on this fundamental statement of faith: any union not so based was purchased at too dear a price, for it came by the sacrifice of "revealed truth".

Cooper and his collaborators assumed to themselves the role of guardianship of that "revealed truth" in Scotland. They looked with horror at the fluid doctrinal position of the United Free Church, and as a party they demanded security for the Catholic Faith as it had been received in Scotland. Their threat that they would split the Church was not idle; it was based upon the righteousness of their position, and it was taken seriously as such. But it was in itself bad theology. All their loud protests against the heresy of schism here seemed to be set aside. All their noble talk of the Church as the revealing presence of Christ, the guarantee of His
continuing action in the world, the agency through which he transmits His Holy Spirit, was forgotten: it was now their party in the Church which claimed to be the sole guardian of the Faith. But the Faith they guarded was that of static indefectible dogma; it left no room for development; it represented a profound distrust of the leading of the Holy Spirit. In this regard, Cooper's demand that the first of the "Declaratory Articles" must be "unalterable" for all time future was a radical departure from the Reformed position. It represented that same "fundamentalist" spirit which underlay the original Tractarian position, and which had to be corrected in the "Liberal Catholicism" of Lux Mundi. But Cooper as an historian and an Ecclesiologist saw the Faith as formal deposit, which, as such, had to be rigidly safeguarded. It was a false position both historically and doctrinally, and when foisted by his party upon the Scottish Church, represented yet another aspect of Tractarian reform in the Church of Scotland. The movement to defend and advance Catholic doctrine, begun in the formation of the Scottish Church Society, had here developed into a party committed to the rigid restatement of historic credal formulations.
CHAPTER XII

APOTOLIC SUCCESSION, VALID ORDINATION, AND THE "HISTORIOLOGICAL MYTHOS"

The Church's teaching with regard to Apostolic Succession, said G. D. Henderson in his Baird Lectures (1955), must be studied carefully, for "it reveals one of the ways in which the Church has sought to further the redemption of mankind by providing a sense of security through a dogmatic claim to authority".¹ This sense of security in the Church of Scotland's ministerial Order (not Orders, since there is only that of Presbyter in the Church of Scotland), became a matter of grave concern to the Scoto-Catholics. The late nineteenth century theological and social transition had left many uncertain about their faith, and about the institutional Church as they had known it. Historical Criticism was making even that most sure of all Protestant authorities - the Scriptures - appear less than certain. The movement to relax the Confessional tie, and to broaden the theological base of the Church, was gaining momentum. The Anglicans, having heard that their Orders were not valid according to Rome,² were vocal in defence of their ministerial commission; they had retained the historic episcopate, the three-fold ministry, the Apostolic rite of the laying on of hands. They argued that unlike the Independents and
Presbyterians, who had departed from these received traditions of the Apostolic Faith, they had guarded faithfully the original deposit; they boasted their true Apostolic Succession guaranteed through the unbroken chain of manual transmission.

The Scottish High Churchmen, not surprisingly, were anxious to refute the statements linking them to Non-conformists and Independents, and to those who had fallen from the delivered faith. They saw that their goal of ultimate re-union with the Anglican Church depended upon their proving convincingly that their Ministerial Order - though irregular in not having the historic Episcopate - was not defective. It was impossible that the Church of England would consider union with a body whose standards, worship, doctrine, and ministerial commission were not as pure or as valid as her own. It was, therefore, of greatest moment to prove to Anglo-Catholics that the Presbyterian Order was not merely lawful, but also valid, and at least as pure as theirs as regarded the continuous historical transmission of the divine Apostolic Commission. It was hoped that the proof might also have the added benefit of instilling a new sense of confidence into the ministry of the Scottish Church - not unlike that given to the Anglican ministry in Tract I - by affirming that their authority for ministry rested not upon the State, nor upon popular acclaim, but upon their unbroken historical succession to the Apostles, and the divine commission granted to them. In the aftermath of the abolition of
Patronage it was important to state that the ministry was not dependent upon the popular will for its commission; in the face of Modernism and Historical Criticism it was imperative to show that there was yet a higher source of ministerial authority.

It seems to have been Dr. Cumming, of Crown Court, London (through whom so much of the Tractarian wave of revival was mediated to the Scottish Church), who "reminded" the Scottish Church of her doctrine of Apostolic Succession. In a sermon preached before the Queen at Balmoral (1850), and subsequently published, he spoke in Oxford's romantic terms of the ministerial vocation. "The Minister", said Cumming, is glorious only in the reflected light of his Master. A true minister will try to hide himself in the shadow, lest he should intercept one ray of light and love, streaming from 'the brightness of the Father's glory'. It is his grand effort to turn every heart from himself to Jesus - to be content to be nothing that his Lord may be seen to be all. By so doing he proves his unction from on high; he carries credentials visibly authenticated, and souls won by his ministry are its fruits and proofs.

His language... - 'Look not to me; behold the lamb of God; He only is the Christ the Saviour; He only has the words of eternal life'. So taught the Apostles; and so teaching, we vindicate ourselves to be their successors.

Although Cumming here spoke of Apostolic Succession only in terms of faithfulness to Apostolic teaching, his sermon called forth the publication of a pamphlet denying that Apostolic Succession was retained in any
form in the Scottish Church. It was claimed by the pamphleteer, "Presbyter", that the Scriptures continue to present the Christ; that He comes to mankind Himself uniquely through His Holy Spirit; that there is neither the possibility nor the necessity of "Apostolic Succession"; that ministry is not held in succession, but derives from Christ directly.

The matter did not end here. The aggressive Anglo-Catholic claims with reference to the "Transmission Theory" - more especially in Scottish Episcopacy - and the defiant assertion of the "validity" of their ministerial Orders over and against the exclusivist "Series Succession" claims of Rome on the one hand, and the "Scriptural Succession" claims of Independents on the other, made many in the Church of Scotland uncomfortable. They were concerned about the "validity" of their Order: they did not have the "three-fold" ministry; no bishops to effect ordination; no catalogues of lineal succession tracing back ultimately to the Apostles.

The High Churchmen's concern for the validity of their Order of Ministry came into public prominence at the General Assembly of 1882 when there was a heated debate on the subject between Principal Tulloch and Dr. Sprott. The matter arose over the Report of the Committee on Admission of Ministers of other Churches, and in particular, over the application of a Congregationalist minister
(Rev. William Horne) to be received into the Church of Scotland not as a Licentiate (as the Committee had recommended) but as an Ordained Minister.

Tulloch had no problem accepting the terms of the application. He stated that any "dogma" of ordination was incredible and superstitious, and could not be consistently held outside of the Church of Rome. He said that ordination in the Scottish Church was simply a question of order; it involved the lawful calling to a public office in the Church. He said that it conveyed no secret virtue or any special grace. The position of the Church of Rome, and of the High Church advocates generally - "That a man because he was ordained stood in a different order from others, a supernatural order" - was to Tulloch the grossest superstition in the world, and to him was of such a grave character that, if it were accepted into the Church of Scotland, there was no saying what the result might be. Quoting from the "Directory", he argued that it was perfectly evident that the essential idea was that there was to be a lawful call, and that this call was to be marked, designated, and noted by the public as a solemn setting apart to a particular church office.

Although Tulloch was willing to admit that ordination was ordinarily to be through an assembly of Presbyters, he maintained that this mode was not exclusive. He argued that where the essential "facts" of ordination were present - that is, the lawful calling, and the recognition of the
required qualification - the "accidental form" of the ceremony was of little consequence. He said that he would feel ashamed if the Church of Scotland was now to maintain that the mere external laying on of the hands of any number of Presbyters or Bishops was essential to a lawful calling; that he would be bound to consider his place in the Church of Scotland if this "superstitious dogma" of manual succession, which cut at the very root of Protestantism, was deliberately accepted by the Assembly. He therefore moved that the said minister be received as ordained.

Professor Charteris, in seconding this amendment, stated that any body of Christians, duly associated, had the right to choose their office-bearers, and to ordain them by such ceremony and ritual as commended themselves.

Sprott challenged the amendment. He spoke at length in defence of the Committee's recommendation, basing his position on the ordination requirements of the Church - that is, by the laying on of hands of the ministers of Presbytery orderly assembled. He held that Congregational ordination did not satisfy this requirement. He rejected Tulloch's contention that there was no ground between the position which he had presented and that of Rome, and stated that the middle ground was precisely that of the Reformed Churches. He said that many of the things Tulloch called "superstitious" he believed were essential portions of those doctrines firmly embedded in the Confession of Faith which the Church was bound to hold. He described
Charteris' position as pure Independency.

Story, a member of the reporting Committee, supported Sprott, and said that the personal eminence involved in this particular case was no reason for departing from the law of the Church. He argued that Tulloch's word "superstitious" was misapplied; it was inappropriate for those who, like himself, wanted only to adhere to the defined rules of the Church. Story said that his plea was "not for the preservation of a sacerdotal office, but for the orderly perpetuation of the Christian ministry in this national branch of the Church".

Professor Dickson, speaking in defence of the Committee, stated that there had been practically no discussion on the matter, it being their assumption that they should proceed according to the precedent of former years. Mr. Griffen, another of the Committee, added, however, that their recommendation was "in deference to a very strongly expressed feeling on the part of a section of the Committee that the Assembly for a number of years had proceeded in a particular line".

The final decision of the Assembly (to which Sprott and others dissented), was that Mr. Horne should be enrolled as a Licentiate until

placed in the circumstances in which the Church grants ordination to her Probationers; but that then he shall be appointed unto the benefice or cure of souls to which he has been appointed, in the same manner as an ordained Minister.
The Assembly adopted this deliverance in the case of an English Congregational minister also. It was guarding the "lawful calling", and with it the several constituent elements of qualification and examination as the essence of Ministry in the Scottish Church; the actual ordination ceremony, so long as it had taken place in some orderly form, was determined to be of relatively little importance.

The High Churchmen denounced these decisions of the 1882 Assembly, and over the next few years stated repeatedly that it had not only gone against the decisions of former years, but had violated the purity and continuity of the Presbyterian Order; that the decisions represented a radical departure from the law and tradition of the Church of Scotland in not holding as essential "the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery"; that it was condoning an "unlawful ministry" by abandoning the express law of the Church.

A review of earlier cases, however, and those of 1874 and 1875 in particular (which also involved Congregational ministers being received into the ministry of the Church of Scotland), indicates that the 1882 deliverances were not such a radical departure as Sprott and his colleagues wanted to contend. The 1874 deliverance, for example, had stated simply:
... instruct the Presbytery of Glasgow to receive Mr. Mackay as a licentiate... it being understood that, in the event of his being thereafter appointed to a regular charge, he shall be ordained, after usual examinations, UNLESS HE SHALL PRODUCE SATISFACTORY EVIDENCE TO THE PRESBYTERY THAT HE HAS ALREADY BEEN SET ASIDE TO THE MINISTRY BY HIS BRETHREN OFFICIATING AS INDIVIDUAL MINISTERS [emphasis mine].

This deliverance, and that of 1875 (which was essentially the same), reserved the right to ordain to those already in the office, but did not consider the "validity" of the ordaining ministers' own ordinations. It was enough that the act be done by those who were themselves recognised to be in the office of ministry. The 1882 deliverance did not even require this evidence, however; it was concerned only that the received "Licentiate" should gain the necessary "lawful call" to the particular office.

Sprott thought that this definitive emphasis on the lawful call was to undermine the traditional imposition transmission-succession doctrine of the Reformed Church. As early as 1873, in a sermon preached before the Synod of Aberdeen (and subsequently published), Sprott had presented his understanding of Presbyterian ordination. Against the polarised positions of ministry as "priesthood", and ministry as a "wornout piece of superstition", he had defined the Reformed ground as something in between. The Reformed position, said Sprott, involves: (1) "the necessity of Mission, or lawful ordination to the Ministry", and (2) that "ordination properly belongs to the office of Presbyter."
Defending Presbyterian ordination against the quips of Anglo-Catholics, who considered the historic Episcopate essential to the valid transmission of Orders, Sprott stated the High Presbyterian version of the transmission-theory:

We ... maintain, that there never has been, nor can be any other than Presbyterian ordination, ...; that Presbyters are the successors of the Apostles in as far as they have successors, that they form the backbone of the Church, and the channel through which power is transmitted, that they can give what they receive but no more [emphasis mine], and that all offices and grades above them, from Prelate to Pope, are mere matters of canon law and ecclesiastical arrangement.13

The transmitted "power" to which he referred, was that of the original divine Apostolic commission, without which ministerial acts are not guaranteed effectual. It was simply a variation on the "Transmission Theory" of Apostolic Succession as advanced by the Tractarian apologists.

As restated by the Tractarians, the "Transmission Theory" of Apostolic Succession involves the mechanical transmission of the grace first given by Christ to His Apostles, through the agency of the repeated imposition of bishops' hands from the Apostolic time to the present. This transmitted grace not only makes the Sacraments effectual, but also provides the agency through which the Church continues to live, and her people continue to find salvation. Any break in the succession would invalidate
the transmission; without the transmission the Church would ordinarily be non-effectual - it would lack the grace necessary to fulfil its divine purpose. The historic succession is essentially the guarantee of the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church. Only through this agent do people become incorporate into the Body of Christ. They are sustained in this condition through the Sacraments rightly administered by those validly ordained at the hands of a bishop - himself in attested orderly descent from the Apostles. The Ministry, in this system, remains anterior to the Church.

Bishop William Beveridge, a seventeenth century High Churchman whose works were reprinted in the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology (1842), gave this description of the theory:

The first that were ordained into the [Apostolical] office were ordained by Christ Himself. . . . The Apostles, being thus ordained and instructed by our Lord, took special care to transfer the same Spirit to others. . . . And when they found it necessary to have Deacons in the Church, . . . [and then afterwards Presbyters] upon these also they laid their hands, and by that means communicated so much of the Spirit unto them as was necessary for the due and effectual execution of the said office. Thus, therefore, it is, that the Apostolical office hath been handed down from one to another, ever since the Apostles' day to our own time, and so will be until the end of the world, Christ Himself being continually present at such imposition of hands, thereby transferring the same Spirit, which He had first breathed into His Apostles, upon others successively after them, as really as He was present with the Apostles themselves, when He first breathed it into them. Insomuch that they who are thus ordained are said to be made Bishops by the Holy Ghost Himself, as well as the Apostles were. By which means the Holy Catholic Church always hath been, and still is, truly Apostolical, as it is called in the Nicene Creed. And the several parts of the Apostolical office are now
as effectually performed by their successors, and others ordained under them, as they were while the Apostles themselves lived.14

This position had underlying it the motive to produce confidence in the Ministry, to declare valid its official acts, to instil authority and authenticity into its message. It necessarily involved a sacerdotal conception of the Ministry. It represented a counter-argument to the "Series Succession" doctrine of Rome;15 that is, that valid succession is only through the holder of the episcopal chair which is in "series" to (i.e., in full Communion with and under the authority of) the Chair of St. Peter. It should be noted, however, that this Anglo-Catholic "Transmission Theory" had not even been thought of at the time of the Reformation; English Reformers based the lawfulness and the validity of their Orders on the Royal Supremacy, and explicitly rejected "succession".16 The theory was Laudian, and had political overtones. It was intended to strengthen the "Divine Right" church and king. It was revived by the Oxford Movement to counter the rampant Erastianism of the reform Parliament; to provide a new ground of authority with which to fight Liberalism.

Sprott tried to extend the Anglican theory of legitimate transmission through bishops, to allow of an equally legitimate transmission through the ministers themselves. He sought to accomplish this by seeing bishops
as essentially Presbyters who had, through the genera-
tions, taken uniquely to themselves that which was not theirs by right - the power to ordain. It was precisely this position which he had expressed in his sermon to the Synod of Aberdeen.

In *Worship and Offices* Sprott developed this position more fully. Speaking of "The Ordainers", he said that it was the assertion of the Church at the Revolution Settlement that the Church had been reformed not by the laity, nor by Prelates, but by Presbyters - by Knox and "other Priests".17 He said that it was the doctrine of the Church that "Presbyters are the successors of the Apostles in all the ordinary functions of the ministry", and that this "Order" was instituted by Christ Himself.18 Of bishops, Sprott said that they were but a phase of Presbytery, and that "there never has, nor can be, any ordination to the ministry except by Presbyters".19 He said that at the Reformation the English Church had also held this position, as seen in the 1582 incident in which Archbishop Grindal accepted and licensed a Scottish minister who "had been admitted and ordained to sacred orders and the Holy Ministry by the imposition of hands, according to the laudable form and rite of the Reformed Church of Scotland".20

Sprott contended that at the Westminster Assembly the fundamental difference that developed between the Scottish Divines and the Independents was "that they [the Scottish Divines] considered all church power to be
vested in the office-bearers, not in the body of the Church". He said further that they had maintained "that Ordination makes the Minister as Baptism makes the member of the Church; that notwithstanding the corruption of Rome, her Ordination was no less valid than her Baptism, and that if this were not so, the continuity of the Visible Church would be destroyed". He said that in the Westminster testimonials of Orders they were careful to state "the doctrine of succession".

Defending the validity of the Church of Scotland's succession against the Anglo-Catholics who - according to Sprott - placed the Church of Scotland clergy in the same position as the Independents - "who have neither the intention nor the power to ordain", or Wesleyan Methodists - "who do intend it, but who [have not the power to ordain]", Sprott stated:

In Scotland there were some irregularities after the Reformation, . . . but these were not sufficient to break the chain. Nearly all the old Clergy became Reformed. . . . The first Protestant Ministers, with few exceptions, had been priests. . . . The laying on of hands was probably omitted at first in some cases in the setting apart of new Clergy, as it was in the induction of old Priests to the charge of Reformed congregations. But if so, this ceremony was restored while the ranks of the old Clergy remained almost unbroken by death. We read of it being practised in 1572, . . . Archbishop Grindal speaks of it . . . ; and the Second Book of Discipline, drawn up in 1577, asserts it to be necessary. One of the first who wrote in defence of the validity of the Scottish ministry - the illustrious Patrick Forbes of Corse . . . - says that their Romish adversaries were more than impudent to deny that the Reformed clergy had a lawful ordinary calling.

But there is another and conclusive answer. . . . In 1612 Episcopal ordination was introduced from England. . . . From that time till 1638 all who were
admitted were ordained by Bishops of the Spottiswoode line, . . . Thus the great body of the Clergy who reintroduced Presbyterian ordination after 1637 were Presbyters who had been Episcopally ordained, and no one disputes the regularity of the succession since.23

Arguing against the more specific statement of High Anglicans that the only way Episcopal functions could revert to Presbyters was through the bishops "consecrating" all Presbyters to their own higher office, with all the powers unique thereto, Sprott said:

... we can point to ordinations after that time [1638] when a Bishop was the consecrator, and when, in his intention and that of the Church, the whole powers of the ministry were conferred.24

In a subsequent bid to dispel once and for all the embarrassment caused to Scottish High Churchmen by the explicit rejection of the imposition of hands in The First Book of Discipline, Sprott sought to discredit the authority of that book. "The First Book of Discipline", said Sprott, "says that the laying on of hands was not necessary in ordination, but that book was never law, civil or ecclesiastical."25 Thomas Leishman, too, sought to eliminate the problematic testimony of another Reformation document. He had discovered that the "Form and Order of the Election of Superintendents . . . " (1560-1), omitted reference to the laying on of hands. Leishman explained that this did not necessarily imply rejection of imposition, however, for the "Form" had been specifically prepared for the admission of Spottiswoode to the office of Superintendent. As Spottiswoode was
already in English Orders, the imposition rite was unnecessary.26

Apostolic Succession seems to have become a most important doctrine for speculation, for even the conservative Presbyterian publication, The Catholic Presbyterian, was forced to consider the subject. In May, 1881, having stated that "the matter has been . . . gravely and earnestly urged upon our attention", it considered "Apostolic Succession and the Catalogues of Bishops".27 It thought the historical tracing of the ministerial succession through these "catalogues" was "sheer delusion". It rejected the Anglo-Catholic transmission claims on the grounds that: (1) "there is no proof whatever that the first link in the episcopal chain was forged in apostolic days"; (2) "there is no proof whatever that the first link in the Episcopal chain was forged earlier than a hundred years after the death of the last of the apostles"; and (3) "that even supposing all the names . . . [in the catalogues of bishops were] names of professedly 'diocesan bishops', the documents are altogether unreliable".

In the December issue,28 and with a more positive approach, it stated: "There is no doubt that Scotch Presbyterians have held, what in some sense, might be called a doctrine of Apostolic Succession." But it was quick to point out that this had nothing to do with a
mechanical rite of transmission. It stated that Ordination was simply installation to an office; that the Succession was that of Divine truth and Divine ordinances - a succession of the Church and the ministry (in the sense of a continuous succession of office-bearers); that Apostolic Succession in the Scottish Church meant the "transmission of what the apostles [had] taught and instituted in the Christian Church". Against the Anglican-type of transmission-succession posited by the Scottish High Churchmen, it stated emphatically:

whatsoever high and stringent views of Church authority and Church order were held by Gillespie, Rutherford, Dickson, Wood, Durham, and others, we think they cannot be charged with any sympathy with a doctrine of orders such as is developed in our times out of apostolic succession.29

The matter seems to have been of continuing interest. for in 1884 Cooper addressed a letter to The Scottish Guardian (the magazine of the advanced wing of the Scottish Episcopal Church) repeating Sprott's High Church transmission theory of Apostolic Succession and vindication of the Presbyterian Order.30 He assumed much the same position as he had in the East Church Case, and stated that an increasing number of Church of Scotland ministers believed "that they have the Apostolic Succession (through Presbyters), and consider the possession of it essential". He stated that in this position they were supported by the law, the Standards, and the practice of the Church, just as the leaders of the Oxford Movement had been supported by the Prayer Book "when they revived among you
the belief in this and other truths, which at the time were too generally denied". Cooper quoted from the "Form of Church Government" to prove his contention, and also from Principal Hill. He further made reference to the "Solemn Charge" included in the "Ordination Service", as found in the fifth edition of *The Book of Common Order* (which he had helped to prepare):

The first ministers were the Apostles, who were called and commissioned immediately by Jesus Christ Himself. They in turn ordained and set apart other suitable men as pastors and teachers over the churches which they had gathered and established in different places; and these, again, in the same way, appointed and set forth others to carry onward and forward still the true succession of this office; which, being regularly transmitted in this way from age to age in the Christian Church, has come down finally to our time.

The concluding paragraph of Cooper's letter repeated Sprott's tracing of the "required" unbroken chain of manual succession within the Scottish Church. He said:

The historic ground on which we claim this succession being sometimes misunderstood, I add a few words in explanation of our position. The misunderstanding, indeed, is not unnatural. Twice over an ugly-looking break occurred. At the Reformation in 1560, imposition of hands was dispensed with for a few years. 'But at the time,' says Dr. Sprott, 'the appointment of pastors consisted very much in the induction of priests, who had accepted the Reformation, to settled charges, and the laying on of hands was resumed in 1570, when the old ecclesiastics had scarcely begun to disappear.' Again, after the Revolution settlement in 1690, the Episcopalian clergy who confirmed were not always allowed to ordain. But our existing Presbyters are the successors in an unbroken line of the Presbyters who were ordained between 1610 and 1638, under what is called 'the First Episcopacy'. Their ordainers were the Scottish bishops of the Spottiswoode line, who were in full communion with the Church of England, and the validity of whose orders was recognised by Archbishop Laud himself.
This final assertion by Cooper as regards Laud's acceptance of Scottish Orders had to do with the fact that those who were consecrated bishops in 1612 were not first re-ordained. Laud would have known, however, that even the Roman Church does not ordain to the priesthood one being raised directly from deacon to bishop. Consecration to the higher power carries with it of necessity all inferior powers. The "Second Episcopacy" bishops were, where necessary, re-ordained; but this was indicative of a falling away from Catholic practice, not definitive of Scottish Orders.

The defence of the Presbyterian Order addressed to the Anglo-Catholics rested upon the essential equality of Presbyter and Bishop. The High Churchmen were agreed that "Presbyter" is the essential and fundamental Order of Ministry, and that the historic episcopate was but an administrative refinement of this Order. Cooper, in fact, used the statements of Anglican scholars (J. B. Lightfoot and John Wordsworth) to prove this contention with reference to the Early Church, and said that John Wordsworth, in particular, had stated the case for some of their Reformed positions "more fully and more conclusively" than any recent Presbyterian scholar. Inseparably connected with this understanding of the fundamental Order of "Presbyter", was the necessity of defining the requirements of a valid ordination into
that Order. They held that ordination is a solemn setting 
apart of a person to public office; that no man was to 
take the office without being lawfully called and 
ordained thereto; that ordination is a "perpetual ordinance" 
instituted by Christ for the proclamation of the Word and 
the administration of the Sacraments. 35

This position, however, led to a concern for the 
historical succession of the office. Sprott and Cooper 
both spoke of an "unbroken chain" of manual transmission 
through Presbyters. It was their contention that the 
act of ordination in the Scottish Church involves 
necessarily the traditional imposition of hands, with 
prayer and fasting, by those preaching Presbyters to whom 
it uniquely belongs. Sprott said that such "Presbyterial 
Ordination" is essential to order in the Church; it 
prevents anyone who so pleases taking the office upon 
himself. 36 He held that the power for ministry derives 
from Christ alone, but uniquely through the agency of the 
Apostolic Succession through Presbyters. 37 "We hold that 
congregational suffrage is not the spring from which the 
ministerial function flows", said Thomas Leishman. 38 Sprott 
emphasised this point: "The General Assembly in 1695 passed 
an Act, in which they unanimously declare, that they allow 
no power to the people, but only in the Pastors of the 
Church, to ordain Church Officers." 39

In 1883, in a bid to prevent a repeat of the 1882 
deliverances, an Overture from the High Church quarter was 
forwarded to the Assembly. 40 It was to the effect that
due to the frequent application of ministers of various denominations for admission into the ministry of the Church, it should be made the rule that no one should be accepted "as a lawful minister who had not been ordained by prayer, and the imposition of hands of at least three persons orderly associated for the purpose". Tulloch, leading the attack on what he saw as a new advance of superstition and clericalism, stated that it was part of the "unhappy tendency appearing in their young men; a tendency showing itself in the very forms of their dress and of their relations to their people". Milligan, not surprisingly, defended the terms of the Overture, and denied any sacerdotal intent. But Tulloch again carried the Assembly. It was the last time he did so as regarded the matter of ordination.

When the Scottish Church Society was formed in 1892, the sundry thoughts found formal expression in one of its "special objects":

The maintaining of the necessity of a valid Ordination to the Holy Ministry and the celebration of the rite of Ordination.\[^{41}\]

The position that Sprott had assumed in the Assembly of 1882 became an essential aspect of the Society's programme. Sprott stated that if any attempt was made to break the "apostolic rule" again, they would have something to say on the subject.\[^{42}\] In this statement the idea of "party"
seems implicit. As late as 1909, when the Scoto-Catholic lobby was much stronger, H. J. Wotherspoon repeated the claim that the decision of the 1882 Assembly had gone against the law of the Church; that it had represented the acceptance of an unlawful ministry.\(^{43}\)

Within the Society Wotherspoon continually spoke of "lawful ministry" in the sense of a ministry which fulfils Reformed principles and satisfies "the essential laws of the Kingdom of Grace".\(^{44}\) But the concept of the unbroken historic succession was so unremittingly impressed upon the Society, that talk of "valid Orders" and "valid ministry" pervaded its publications.

Cooper stated emphatically that the Church of Scotland, no less than the Church of England, was bound to the principle of Apostolic Succession, although it was held "in a less objectionable form"\(^{45}\) (i.e., through Presbyters). Thomas Leishman noted that even Newman had spoken of "ministerial succession" as a most reasonable doctrine,\(^{46}\) and Cooper claimed that, unlike the Anglo-Catholics, Newman had distinguished between ministerial succession and its necessary derivation through the Episcopate.\(^{47}\) Sprott stated that although the argument of "divine right" of Episcopacy broke down, it did not therefore follow that Ordination by Presbyters, or the Apostolic Succession through them, is not essential to a valid ministry.\(^{48}\) A pamphlet of the Scottish Church Society, written in defence of the Presbyterian Order, repeated that the succession of ordained ministers had continued "unbroken"
in the Scottish Church; the problem of the cessation of the laying on of hands at the Reformation being resolved through resort to Sprott's assertion of the purification of the line after 1612, and by Wotherspoon's appeal to "intention" - that removing the manual act does not alter the doctrine or the intention underlying that act.

This quest to defend and advance the status of the Scottish Order of Ministry was enhanced by the Scoto-Catholics reference to the "admission" rather than the "ordination" of elders. Elders had no role to play in the Apostolic Succession of Presbyters. Although they were members of Presbytery, that was in a strictly judicial capacity; they had no right to participate in the "laying on of hands of the Presbytery". Sprott spoke of elders as a separate Order, and allowed that as such they too should be ordained by the imposition of hands. But the High Churchmen generally accepted Cooper's assertion that Ordination was inappropriate except with reference to the two New Testament Orders - Presbyter and Deacon.

Cooper held that although elders were allowable, perhaps even useful, they were not essential to the life of the Church. While anxious to extend the awareness of the priesthood of the laity, Cooper and his disciples were unwilling to appear to side with various secessionist bodies, in minimising the clerical/lay distinction. They would not speak of "ordaining" elders, as they did of
ministers, for this was to identify the "Office" and the "Order" too closely. They held that elders derived no indelible character from their "admission to office". A Presbyter, on the other hand, was ordained to the ministry of the Holy Catholic Church, and that ordination was of an indelible character - there was no re-ordination after translation, nor even after resignation and reinstatement.

The High Churchmen were not alone in this quest to defend the validity of the Presbyterian Order. Churchmen with Broad Church sympathies, too, were anxious to defend their ministry to Anglicans. Story, in the Baird Lectures for 1897, took as his subject "The Apostolic Ministry in the Scottish Church". In defence of Reformed ordination he stated:

It is in connection with the reformed use in ordination, and the transference of the act from the bishop to the presbyter, that the charge is brought against the Church of having separated itself from the Church Catholic. We cannot admit the charge is valid. The 'laying on of the hands of the Presbytery' ... had gradually given way ... to the laying on of the hands of the president of the presbyters, as the essential element in ordination. ... The episcopate, being a mere post-apostolic development from the presbyterate, could have no exclusive claim to appropriate a right of which the presbyter etc. was the original depositary. ... The theory of episcopal apologists that ... the apostles ... 'consecrated' a few chosen men to a rank higher than the presbyters and equal to their own, 'qualifying them to ordain deacons and presbyters, and, when necessary, to impart their full commission to others', is a theory merely, without historical support.
Story said that the Scottish Church had restored the right of the laying on of hands to the Presbyters to whom it properly belonged. The fact that the Reformers had—in the First Book of Discipline—abolished the rite entirely, Story dismissed as an "abrupt departure from apostolic usage". "Knox and the other writers of that book", said Story, "were evidently under the impression that the apostles, by the imposition of hands, imparted some miraculous gift—a superstition they ought to have rid themselves of when they bad farewell to 'the works of men's invention'. . ." 55

In the Baird Lectures of 1903, Donald Macleod picked up the theme, and devoted one in the series explicitly to the subject of Apostolic Succession. The title under which the lectures were published indicates the stance he assumed: The Doctrine and Validity of the Ministry and Sacraments of the National Church of Scotland. It was a polemical work. 56 He presented the traditional Anglican view and criticisms of that view. He then devoted himself to proving that "the Church of Scotland possesses a succession through the presbyterate as truly as any Episcopal Church does through the episcopate". 57 More especially, he tried to answer the assertions made by Bishop Gore in his book "Church and Ministry" 58 respecting the invalidity of Presbyterian ordination. "It is not proved", Gore had said, - "it is not even probable—that any presbyter had in any age the power to ordain." "Beyond all question", he had asserted, "they [the Presbyterian
Reformers] 'took to themselves' these powers of ordination, and consequently had them not." "It follows, then", said Gore, "not that God's grace has not worked, and worked largely, through many an irregular ministry . . ., but that a ministry not episcopally received is invalid - that is to say, falls outside the condition of covenanted security, and cannot justify its existence in terms of the covenant."

Macleod, using the researches of Sprott and Bishop Lightfoot, argued that the ordination by Presbyters was equally valid to that by bishops in that it was essentially in virtue of their being in the Order of Presbyter that they become ordaining bishops. He also drew a distinction between the question of authority and order, and that of covenanted sacramental grace dependent on the action of the special ministry of bishop. But he was emphatic that the source of ministerial authority in Scotland, no less than in England, derived from the "true succession in the presbyterate of the Church to which we belong". He noted, however, that the "true succession" must always "have relation to the truth and word of Christ", and he contended that it was this for which the Scottish Reformers had fought.

The statements and assertions of the High Churchmen, and the attempts at redefinition of the Anglican position by their Broad Church allies, were not without effect in
the Church at large. William Mair has stated: "The Assembly received without requiring their re-ordination, ministers from the Congregational body in 1874; 1875; 1882; but none since then."\(^62\) In the Appendix to the "Digest of Church Laws", Fourth Edition (1923), is added: "It is now considered incompetent to admit without Ordination by the Church of Scotland ministers of the Congregational Church or the Baptist Church."\(^63\)

The Church of Scotland has required re-ordination of others too. At the 1908 Assembly, for example, Cooper objected to a Methodist minister being received as an Ordained Minister, and to a Reformed minister being accepted only as a Licentiate. He carried the Assembly with him. Again at the Assembly of 1911 he objected to a Methodist minister being received as an Ordained Minister, and first in Committee, and then in Assembly, pressed to have a definitive statement made on Wesleyan Orders. But the final Deliverance of the Assembly stated simply:

The "former decision" was to the effect that the 1908 ruling should again apply, and that Mr. Macdonald should be received not as an Ordained Minister, but as a Licentiate, and be [re-]ordained by the Presbytery of Edinburgh. Again in 1916 the Assembly held to this pattern, and received a Congregational Union minister, and an ordained missionary of the Congregational Church of Scotland, as
Interestingly, in that year the Assembly received a Moravian minister as an Ordained Minister. It had previously accepted those in Anglican and Roman Catholic priests' Orders as having a "valid" ordination also.

It was now clearly established that the validity of the Church of Scotland's Ministerial Succession and Order had to be protected, and this "validity" was something quite different to "lawful". Lawful meant simply that the candidate had the necessary qualifications and had received a public (congregational) call. It might also mean that the ordination had been effected with prayer and the laying on of the hands of assembled Presbyters. It had to do with the public recognition of one to an office in the Church by others in that same office, and was treated not unlike the earlier form of recognition by extending "the right hand of fellowship". These things the Wesleyan Ordination had. But it was not deemed "valid" in that its historical transmission—succession had been disrupted. As Sprott had said in Worship and Offices: "Wesleyan Methodists, . . . do intend it [Ordination], but . . , unfortunately for their intentions, only began the form of Ordination in 1836, when all the Presbyters who had taken part in originating that movement were dead, and only lay preachers were left." The purity of the historical succession of those effecting ordination was now definitive as regarded "valid ordination".
Concern in the Scottish Church for "valid ordination", as opposed to "lawful ministry", was new. Basing the claim of ministerial and - by extension - sacramental effectuality upon the historic transmission succession, represented a development on the Reformed position. Its object undoubtedly was re-union on a large scale with those Churches which valued such things. The defence of the Scottish Order was aimed at Anglo-Catholics, and was constructed in terms of the Anglican "Transmission Theory". It was based upon an unproven theory - that the Apostles manually, through the imposition of their hands, transmitted the power of their divine commission to others - in this case not bishops, but Presbyters; that this process has been repeated without interruption; that catalogues exist which attest to the continuity of the lineal descent; that the grace so received has the capacity to make supranaturally effectual (in the sense of coming from above and also through an event previous in time) that which otherwise would have no ordinary efficacy.

The Scoto-Catholics claimed that the transmission theory, as restated by them, was in essential agreement with the position of the sixteenth and seventeenth century Reformers - that these Reformers had been concerned to eliminate only the hierarchical abuse, without destroying or jeopardizing the historic continuity of the Church or the standing ministry; that even if they had not maintained inviolate the traditional form of ordination by the laying on of hands, that this was none-the-less their
intention. The High Churchmen asserted that, although there might have been a few sixteenth century irregularities, the purity of the manual succession was re-established through the English line during the First Episcopacy, and had since remained inviolate. The Scoto-Catholics appealed to the history of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to prove their position to the dubious Anglicans, and to convert their co-Presbyters who saw the whole matter as of little relevance and of doubtful importance.

The resort to history to justify their position was not an uncommon feature of High Church programmes of reform. It is of significance that the foremost exponents of reform within the Church of Scotland were historically oriented: G. W. Sprott; Thomas Leishman; James Cooper; R. H. Story. Cumming at Crown Court, London, had set this historiographical tone in his edition of "Knox's Liturgy" (1840), and it seemed to be good strategy. At home, people were ready to concede almost anything if it could be proved to accord with Knox and his fellow Scots Reformers. His name was invoked by the Scoto-Catholics to vindicate almost everything in their programme of Anglicanisation, from justifying medieval Ecclesiology (Knox was not responsible for the destruction of medieval churches in Scotland, he even tried to arrest the movement), to the introduction of a formal liturgy (Knox's Liturgy was not a "directory", but a liturgy, in that readers were not to
depart from its form and words); from priestly absolution (Knox had used a form of absolution in his Berwick liturgy), to weekly Communion (Knox was in full agreement with Calvin, and Calvin had commended the weekly administration of the Sacrament). Even in the matter of the historic transmission of the ministerial Order, and the effectuality derivable from the imposition of hands of those who were in the true Apostolic Succession, Knox was the man with whom they had to come to terms (Knox was allowed to minister by virtue of his Roman Orders; he fought for a lawful ministry; he held a doctrine of succession).

If Knox could not be shown to be in basic agreement with the plan, even by the most selective use of his words, then he had to be discredited. This tradition lives on in High Church societies: "... it was the fate of Scotland", said Foster Franklin in 1961, "to have, as the man who most deeply stamped her religious life at this formative period, one whose greatness lay in spheres theological and governmental, rather than liturgical." The same approach was used with Reformation documents; for example, Sprott's rejection of the First Book of Discipline because it not only did not require, but explicitly rejected, the laying on of hands in Ordination.

Outside of Scotland, also, more especially with the Anglo-Catholics, there was more probability of success by means of this strategy, for they were open to the historiographical argument, since their justification too had come from precisely this source. And if it could be
shown - as in the matter of the historic succession transmission, or in the use of the English Prayer Book - that the Scottish had been intermingled, and might even have derived from English Orders and usage so much the better, for the Anglo-Catholics were then bound, on their own principles, to recognise the Church of Scotland as a true national branch of the Church Catholic. Their own arguments could be used to win from them a grudging acceptance of the validity of the Scottish Church's ministry, and the effectuality of her Sacraments.

This defence of the Church of Scotland was obviously important, more especially to those Broad Churchmen like A. K. H. Boyd, Robert Story, and Donald Macleod, who were often guests in English Episcopal palaces, or those like James Cooper, who was a not infrequent visitor to his friend Charles Gore, at the College of the Resurrection, Mirfield. Their mission was to show how truly Catholic the Church of Scotland had been prior to the "baneful influence" of the seventeenth century English sectaries, and how the Catholic principles of the sixteenth and early seventeenth century Reformers and Divines were capable of revival because the essential succession was still pure.

The Scoto-Catholic position, though motivated by good intentions and noble ideals, was based upon a dogmatic rather than an historical foundation. Their history was tendentious; it was a "secondary science". By means of
a highly selective use of history, and a biased reading of the Reformation personalities, they created - what might reasonably be called - a "historiographical mythos", and within that created "mythos" they sought not only their model and guide, but also their vindication. Such an approach was in basic agreement with the Victorian love of romantic history. Whether it was true, or merely a fabrication, was not of primary interest. The capacity to stir the heart and imagination to nobler ideals was of more immediate concern. The Gothic façade of Victorian architecture, quite unrelated to utility or to the building or factory so hidden, is a good example of this genre.

Dr. D. Hay Fleming, the impeccable nineteenth century Reformation historian, saw through their statements. In a consideration of the High Churchmen's growing library of historical "research" he wrote:

It is a curious fact that the keenest innovators, who heartily despise the Reformers and sneer at their work, are so anxious to prove that they were ritualists like themselves. The object is plain. While many people oppose innovations on conscientious grounds, there are many more who only dislike them because they are new. If the latter class can be convinced that the Church of Scotland, in its best days, worshipped as the innovators wish to make us worship, then, so far as they are concerned, the battle will be won; and in the same way, even some of the conscientious objectors may be gained or at least silenced. This is the reason why the attempt is ever and anon being made to prove that Knox, Melville and Henderson used liturgies, hymns, and doxologies. Much ingenuity, special pleading, perversion of history, and bold assertion, have been expended in this unholy cause. . . . The danger is that the continuous repetition of the ritualistic creed may lead the sheep . . . to accept as true those partial statements which are coloured and twisted to suit a purpose.
It is relatively unimportant in a consideration of the Scoto-Catholic programme of "Tractarian" reform to consider whether their "historiological mythos" was built upon an accurate reading of solid and irrefutable historical "facts". Reformation evidence is patchy at best, and can often be read with a subjective bias. From the beginning, the High Church statements have been met with a barrage of counter-statements and general scepticism; sometimes from reputable scholars, often from those distressed by "innovations". But the High Churchmen have been undeterred, and their contentions, often supported more from what the documents do not say, or might not necessarily mean, have been often repeated.

What is of more importance than the relative truth of their statements, is the particular avenue of research they chose to tread. For example, in the face of the English Prayer Book and the obvious benefits it brought to the nineteenth century English Church, and the knowledge that possession of such a prayer book would encourage reunion, it was important for High Churchmen within the Scottish Church to press for the creation and acceptance of a comparable book. The desire to rationalise and justify their liturgical quest forced them to consider Knox's Book of Common Order as a possible authority for establishing a formal liturgy. Obviously the Westminster "Directory" was not suitable for their purpose - it was only a directory which could be departed from freely. It was easily dismissed as a product of English Independents.
There was historical authority for calling Knox's book a "liturgy", even though Knox and his associates had never applied the term to it. David Calderwood (1575-1650) in his "History" wrote of it as "the Liturgy or manner of ministrations of the sacraments", and Anderson of Dumbarton wrote in 1711 about "our Scotch Liturgy, commonly called Knox's or the Geneva Liturgy". But even a cursory glance through the publication makes it clear that at best it was a "discretionary liturgy": its forms were for optional use; its words always "these, or like in effect".

Knox's book, compared with earlier English publications, practically eliminated private devotion, excluded the sacrificial aspect of worship, encouraged the extem­pore prayer of ministers, and eliminated congregational responses - except in the form of sung psalms. It was violent and pragmatic in much of its language; its office for the Lord's Supper was meagre; there was little of "the Christian grace of devotion" about it. Cumming, of London, thought that "Knox's Liturgy" (as he called it for obvious reasons) was capable of use in its original form; but most, from Robert Lee to James Cooper, knew that this was impossible. Knox's Book of Common Order was the product of a reactionary age; it could not be the required model.

Perhaps it is not surprising that Story, in his "Reformed Ritual" lectures, attempted to diminish the authority of Knox's book by stating that it was not, in fact, the first Reformed service-book used in Scotland.
Edward VI's Prayer Book, said Story, was "the first liturgy in the Church of Scotland after the Reformation". He said that it had travelled north from England and had been "welcomed" by the Scottish Reformers. "The Prayer Book of Edward VI", said Story, "was the earliest adaptation of the ancient ritual to the use of the Reformed Church. And it was this book which formed the first liturgy of the Church of Scotland after the Reformation." "The interesting fact", he continued, "is that the first authorised vehicle of the Reformed worship of Scotland was the English Prayer Book, and that its use continued until it was superseded by an Act of the Church itself, in favour of ANOTHER LITURGY OF DIFFERENT PARENTAGE AND . . . OF INFERIOR QUALITY" [emphasis mine]. "We cannot but acknowledge", said Story, "that to substitute these [Knox's book and the Psalms] for the liturgy of King Edward was as bad an exchange for the devotional education of the people, as it was for the interests of ecclesiastical brotherhood and political unity, which the retention of forms of public prayer common to both nations would have powerfully reinforced." 

In view of these statements, it is not surprising that the publication Euchologion, of the Church Service Society (of which Story was a leading light), hereafter was made to conform unashamedly to Anglican mattins, in direct violation of the Reformed Order. But Edward's Prayer Book was not a Reformed liturgy in the technical
sense: it could never command authority as the Scottish Reformation model.

The Prayer Book of Edward VI, of which Story took such note, was the revised issue, published in 1552. It was dramatically different from the 1549 edition, and marked "the furthest point in the Puritan direction ever reached by the Liturgy of the Church of England".82 Percy Dearmer quoted with approval one source to the effect that "it never had the slightest claim to ecclesiastical authority, and cannot even plead acceptance by the Church [of England], for it was only in force about eight months, and never was used at all in parts of England".83 Such a book as the Second of Edward VI, though it might have given support to Story's quest for a formal liturgy in Scotland, was not about to excite the admiration of English liturgiologists.

Quite apart from this fact, and keeping in mind that this publication was the most Puritan oriented of any English liturgy, it is interesting to note Knox's reaction to the book. When it was, as Story says, "welcomed" by the Scottish Reformers, Knox was not even in the country.84 It is probably quite true that those of the Scots Reformers who were English trained and who were in English Orders (John Rough85 and James Spottiswoode,86 for example) approved of the book. But the Continentally-trained Reformers thought quite differently. It is clear from the Frankfurt troubles that Knox did not like it.87 He had not used the prescribed liturgy of the English Church
(First, of Edward VI) when he served in England: it was hardly surprising that he should choose not to use it elsewhere where it had no legal status. Peter Lorimer, in his exhaustive study of Knox's years in the English Church (i.e., 1549-53), has stated:

John Knox preached and prayed and dispensed the Sacraments during all these years, entirely according to his own views of Scriptural warrant and prescription. . . . And he used this Puritan franchise not only with the full cognizance of the King and the Privy Council, but with their cordial recognition and support.88

In 1559, Knox wrote these words to a Mrs. Locke about Edward's Prayer Book.

Our Maister calleth upon His owne, and that with vehemencie, that they depart from Babylon; yea, severelie He threateneth death and damnation to such as, either in forehead or in hand, bear the marke of the Beast. And a portion of his marke are all these dregges of Papistrie which were left in your great Booke of England, any jote whereof will I never counsell any man to use. One jote, I say, of these diabolicall inventiouns, viz., crossing in Baptisme; kneeling at the Lord's table; mummelling, or singing of the Letanie, . . . The whole order of your Booke appeareth rather to be devised for upholding of massing priests, than for any good instruction which the simple people can thereof receive.89

It was by no means favourable to Story's plan to consider that when the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI was set aside in 1562 in favour of Knox's book,90 that this had represented a radical, not conservative, reaction to the worship of the medieval church, and a revolutionary change in the mode of liturgical expression. And even Knox's book fell into disuse.
Thomas Leishman and others have tried to put the blame on the English for this happening, asserting that Knox's book was in use until replaced by the Westminster "Directory". They have also tried to maintain that the reaction against a formal liturgy followed upon Laud's attempt to obtrude a liturgy of English form in an arbitrary way. But Dr. Hay Fleming has quoted Anderson of Dumbarton (1714) to this effect: "The Scots were not restricted to Knox's liturgy, but were allowed to use their own freedom", and further, that "Knox's Liturgy was falling into desuetude ere Episcopacy was established in the time of King James VI" (i.e., 1612). Further proof is available. Archbishop Spottiswoode, writing in 1615, stated: "There is lacking in our Church a form of divine service; and while every minister is left to the framing of public prayer by himself, both the people are neglected and their prayers prove often impertinent." Hence his attempt in 1616 to have a liturgy prepared.

Knox's book had been a measure of expediency in the post-Reformation age when ministers were few. "Readers" were commissioned to "read prayers" in those places without the services of a minister. But this read service was probably intended to serve only until such time as there should be a qualified minister. The First Book of Discipline had made this assertion:

In great townes, we thinke expedient that every day there be either sermon or common prayers with some exercise of reading of Scriptures. What day the publick Sermon is, we can neither require nor greatly
approve that the common prayers be publickly used, lest that wee shal either foster the people in superstition, who come to prayers, as they come to the Masse, or else give them occasion, that they think them no prayers but which be made before and after Sermons. 95

The assertion made by the High Churchmen concerning Laud's Liturgy - that it had been rejected merely because of its unlawful introduction, and that the very morning of its ill-fated inauguration at St. Giles', the prayers had been read as usual - was also less than straightforward. Thomas McCrie "the younger" has stated that long before 1637 there was no leaning towards ministerial read prayers. He said:

In the pretended Assembly of 1616, it was ordained that a new Liturgy or book of common prayer should be formed for the use of the Church of Scotland. But this project was not carried into effect, probably from their knowledge of the aversion of the Scots to fixed forms of prayer. The people did not question the LAWFULNESS of set forms, but their NECESSITY; they had been long habituated to hear them read, THOUGH NOT BY THEIR MINISTERS [emphasis mine]; and they considered it altogether at variance with Scripture, with the practice of antiquity, and with the very nature of prayer, that the Church should be shackled and bound to an invariable formulary in this part of Divine Worship. 96

It is perhaps well to remember how necessary the readers were initially. The Reformers would not compromise on the standard they required of one who was to minister. They knew that this would mean hardship, and that many parishes would be left without a minister. But they would not accept the position of the old Church. An educated ministry was fundamental to the Reformation ideal: it could not be forfeited without leaving the Reformation Church in
peril. At the Assembly of 1560 there were only six "ministers" registered, and so late as 1596 there were still "above four hundredth paroche kirks destitute of the ministrie of the word, by and attour the kirks of Argyll and the Isles".97 As the parishes were filled with authorised ministers, the readers' book naturally fell into disuse; for even the readers had not invariably followed the book.98 Some ministers undoubtedly did use the prayers given in Knox's book, but it is unlikely that they used them fully. It is more probable that a parallel is found in Knox's "Order of Excommunication": "This order may be enlarged or contracted, as the wisdom of the discreet minister shall think expedient; for we rather show the way to the ignorant, than prescribe order to the learned, that cannot be amended."

Story in his biographical defence of Robert Lee of Greyfriars, said that he had merely "read his prayers as Knox and Henderson had done"; but David Laing, Knox's biographer, even though he overstates the case, makes it clear that Story's comparison is misapplied:

In no instance do we find Knox himself using set forms of prayer; but that this book [B.C.O.] was sanctioned, if not partly prepared by him is undeniable. The Presbyterian forms of worship were totally unlike those of the English Church by endeavouring to adhere more closely to Scripture, and to avoid anything approaching to Popish ceremonial worship. Thus there was not only this freedom of extempory prayer, . . . but there was neither kneeling during prayer, nor while receiving the Sacrament; there were no responses, or collects for particular days; the frequent repetition of the Lord's Prayer was avoided; and the Litany and the use of the Creed rejected. . . . But the use of the Book of Common
Order, so far as the liturgical part was concerned, had fallen into desuetude long before the time of the Westminster Assembly.99

As regards Sprott's words addressed to The Scotsman (1890) - "It may be safely said that the idea of a Church without a liturgy never entered Knox's mind. He had no objection to the substance of the English Liturgy, but merely to a few features of its."100 - these too must be seen as a dogmatic rather than a historical statement, for they bear little relation to the ideals or the character of the Scots Reformer. They do, however, show Sprott's preconceived and highly-motivated opinions.

It could be shown that other "historical" assertions made by the High Churchman are also open to interpretation and refutation. For example, the assertion that people in Reformation days knelt to pray, still requires to be proved; there seems to be evidence going both ways.101 So too, the claim that it was the universal practice in Scotland to stand to sing, is also unproven. The High Churchmen have insisted that the Creed should find insertion in every service, and have cited Knox's Liturgy in support; but in that book the Creed occurs within the prayer after the sermon - and that prayer is expressly said to be optional. They have contended for weekly Communion, or monthly; basing themselves on Knox's statement that the "Lord's Supper" was "commonly used once a month or so oft as the congregation shall think expedient". The First Book of Discipline, however, made this statement: "Foure times in the yeare we think sufficient to the
administration of the Lord's Table", though it was allowed that "any severall Kirk for reasonable causes . . . may minister oftener", so long as they did not coincide with the Christian Year (the "superstition of times"), or foster superstition. 102

In almost every case the High Church assertions have been tendentious; sometimes they have been simply untrue. But the basic thrust of their "research" shows clear signs of being Anglican-affected. If they had been truly trying to "restore" Reformed usage, they would surely have looked to the Reformed Churches of the Continent who had been relatively untouched by the "baneful influence" of Westminster Puritanism. But that was not their ambition. They looked rather to England and the fond Tractarian seventeenth century ideal.

The vindication of their continuity with the old church was a matter to which the High Churchmen addressed themselves repeatedly, and it was in this dogmatic quest that they placed themselves most at odds with the ideals of the Reformers. Continuity with the old church was explicitly disowned by the sixteenth century Reformers: 103 it was, to them, the synagogue of Satan. By its doctrine, ceremony, hierarchy, and moral corruption it had disfigured the true face of the Church. It was not "continuity", but "restoration" that was the operative principle of the Reformation.
If external and formal continuity was slighted, the Reformers were insistent upon the essential continuity of faith: the Word of God was the unique and absolute norm, and this continues from age to age. The true Church had continued, and was she which had most clearly heard and most diligently attended to the voice of her Lord. The visible true Church for Knox, as shown in the "Scots Confession", had nothing to do with those things the High Churchmen considered essential; it was rather discernible by certain "notes". "The notes ... we affirm are neither antiquity, title usurped, LINEAL DESCENT [emphasis mine], place appointed, nor multitude of men approving an error."104 The "notes" of the true visible Church were the lively preaching of the Word of God, right administration of the Sacraments of Christ ("which must be annexed to the word and promise of God, to seal and confirm the same in our hearts"), and ecclesiastical discipline uprightly ministered as God's Word prescribes.

Such Kirks we ... confess us to have in our cities, towns, and places reformed; for the doctrine taught in our Kirks is contained in the written Word of God ... in which we affirm that all things necessary to be believed for the salvation of mankind are sufficiently expressed.105

These notes were of the "particular Church", that is, of the local congregation, and not of the "universal Church". In so defining the Scots Reformers were holding to a fundamental feature of the Calvinist Reformation - "that the Church shows its face where Christian people gather for instruction and worship around the Word". It is in the
local gathering where Christ has promised to be present. The wider organisation is useful in the refutation of error and heresy, and in the declaration of the faith. It is also important for ensuring that "good order and policy" are observed in the Church; but the life of the true Church is Christ in the midst of the two or three gathered to be met by Him in Word and Sacrament.

That "the Church" or her ministry should assume an authority greater than that of Scripture by virtue of their divine commission, was to the Reformers, blasphemy against God and an insult to the true Church "which always hears and obeys the voice of her own Spouse and Pastor, but takes not upon her to be mistress over the same". Even the claim to be the "authorised interpreter" of Scripture was explicitly rejected: "... the interpretation [of Scripture] ... neither pertains to private nor public persons neither yet to any Kirk for any pre-eminence or prerogative, personal or local ... but pertains to the Spirit of God, by which also the Scripture was written".106 Interpretation of Scripture was to be accomplished by appeal "from a difficult passage to a plainer clearer passage in Scripture itself". Clerical authority in the sense of priestly pretention was made impossible, or at least ineffectual, in this system.

As regarded defending the position on the validity of the ministerial Order of the Church of Scotland, on the basis of their restatement of the Anglo-Catholic "Transmission Theory" of Apostolic Succession, the High Churchmen
were in a difficult position. But it had to be proved, and convincingly. As in the matter of liturgy, so in defence of their Order, appeal was made to Reformation history. It was their contention that not only was a transmission theory of Apostolic Succession through Presbyters traditionally held in the Church of Scotland, but that it had been held in an unbroken lineage of mechanical acts. It was this unbroken line of the transmission of grace through the Apostolic rite that guaranteed the validity of the Presbyterian Order. The rite of ordination belonged properly to Presbyters, and it was by virtue of their being in the Presbyter's "Order" that bishops in an episcopal system had their power to ordain. The Church of Scotland's ministerial Order was as pure as that of England; her transmission derived from the same source in 1613, and had since been maintained inviolate through a different, and better - in that it was more obviously primitive - vehicle, that is, the Presbyterate.

More recently it has been shown that the position which the High Churchmen assumed on Orders and succession is indefensible historically. It represented a radical departure from the integrity of the Reformed position; it was based upon nineteenth century Anglo-Catholic apologetics. Historically, there is no ground for saying that the sixteenth century Scottish Reformers were interested in any
succession theory of their ministerial Order, or had the "intention" of such a doctrine in their ordination service, or required proof of the laying on of hands prior to induction. In the face of the Reformers' statements on the Church, and the Ministry of Word and Sacrament, it is irrelevant to speak of an unbroken chain of manual succession, or of their holding to the rite of the laying on of hands. It is even inappropriate to speak of "clergy", or "ordination" or "induction": these words related to the Roman system which the Scottish (and some English) Reformers were at pains to repudiate. They spoke of "ministers", of "inauguration" to the ministry, of "admission" to a particular congregation. The whole point of choosing such words with thoughtful precision was to accentuate their discontinuity with the "superstitious" medieval Church, with canon law and its influence; it was part of the programme of educating their people in biblical truth.

Dr. Sprott, H. J. Wotherspoon, and others have tried to minimise the importance of The First Book of Discipline; have attempted to get around the clear meaning of its words:

Other ceremonie than the publick approbation of the people, and declaration of the chiefe minister, that the person there presented is appointed to serve the Church, wee cannot approve, for albeit the Apostles used imposition of hands, yet seeing the miracle is ceased, the using of the ceremonie we judge not necessarie.
In another place the "First Book" resumed consideration of the matter:

It is neither the clipping of their crowns, the greasing of their fingers, nor the blowing of the dumb dogges called the Bishops, neither the laying on of their hands that maketh Ministers of Christ Jesus. But the Spirit of God inwardly first moving the hearts to seeke Christs glorie, and the profite of his Kirk, and thereafter the nomination of the people, the examination of the learned and publick admission . . . makes men lawfull ministers of the Word and Sacraments.  

Few who take history seriously could now accept the Scoto-Catholic position. "The First Book of Discipline", says Professor Cameron in the preface to his edition (1972), "is one of the primary documents of the Scottish Reformation and one of the most formative writings in the history of the Protestant Church." The Book represented an authoritative expression of the Reformation Church's mind, and formed the basis of the Church's policy on constitutional and disciplinary matters; its position on "inauguration", in particular, survived into the seventeenth century.  

The statements of the "First Book" quoted above were in full accord with Calvin's position, for he had stated in the Institutes that there was no express precept for the laying on of hands. He said that although the Apostles had used this form "with those upon whom they conferred the visible graces of the Spirit (Acts 19:6)", that the Apostolic office had now ceased, and with it the power that derived from the imposition of their hands. "If this ministry", said Calvin, "which the apostles then
carried out still remained in the Church, the laying on of hands would have to be kept. But since the grace has ceased to be given, what purpose does the laying on of hands serve? . . . those miraculous powers and manifest workings, which were dispensed by the laying on of hands, have ceased. . . .”

Yet Calvin strongly commended the practice, so long as it was not turned to "superstitious abuse". He did not want it to be seen as connected with an infusion of peculiar priestly grace, part of the medieval superstition, but he thought that it could be a useful "sign", commending to the people the dignity of the ministry, and warning the ordinand that he was "no longer a law unto himself, but bound in servitude to God and the Church". Any attempt to develop Calvin's commendation of the rite into one of sacerdotal intent had already been destroyed by the words of the previous section: "this call of a minister is lawful according to the Word of God, when those who seem fit are created by consent and approval of the people". It was just such a lawful calling, without the manual acts, which he himself had.

Three elements were held to comprise the "lawful call": election, examination, and admission. The laying on of hands in the public service of admission was specifically rejected as unnecessary, and prone to excite superstitious abuse. And that superstitious abuse involved seeing the act as having the capacity to bestow the sacramental Apostolic grace, to effect a valid ordination, to infuse
an indelible character, to place in a new Order.

It was clever of Leishman to see that the High Church problem with "The First Book" was compounded by the omission of the rite of imposition in the "Form and Order of the Election of a Superintendent" (1560-61), and to attempt to eliminate the damage by stating that it had been prepared uniquely for Spottiswoode, himself already in English Orders. But his position fails. It has not been shown that Spottiswoode was in other than "Deacon's Orders", nor that the "Form and Order" was meant to apply uniquely to the case of Spottiswoode, or even to that of Superintendents, seeing as its title continues "which may serve in election of all other ministers". Of more import was that this particular document was not published until 1569, and was precluded by an Act of the Assembly in 1570 from pertaining to anything other than the election of Superintendents.

Leishman might better have considered the problems for the High Church position inherent in the Book of Common Order. In its consideration of the mode of election, inauguration, and admission of ministers, the position assumed was that of the "lawful call" which found fuller expression in The First Book of Discipline. At a congregational meeting convened by ministers and elders, a leet of two or three candidates was to be drawn up. The ministers and elders were to choose one of these, and to signify their choice to the congregation at least eight days before the election. If anything was alleged and
proved against the presentee, another was to be nominated. On the day of the election one of the ministers was to present the nominee at the morning sermon - the whole or part of which was to set out the duties of a minister. In the afternoon, the officiating minister was to call for the election and to offer extempore prayer. After the election, the officiant was again to offer extempore prayer, giving thanks to God for the new minister, and asking such things as would be necessary for him in this public office. The nominee was then to be declared appointed, and after the singing of a psalm, the congregation was to depart.122 There was no imposition of hands, no concept of being placed in an Order: the inauguration and admission had to do with the testing and trial of the necessary qualifications, the public consent, and the recognition by the larger Church.

Of importance in any consideration of the High Churchmen's statements regarding the necessity of the historic continuity of the laying on of hands, was their contention that it had been unnecessary at first in the Reformed Church because the Reformers themselves were mostly in priest's Orders. This is to overlook a plain fact. It was the general practice in Reformed Churches to demand from former priests a renunciation not only of Popery, but also of their priestly Orders.123 In particular, it would be hard to justify Knox's authority to minister on the basis of his Roman ordination to the priesthood in 1536, since he had been deposed, degraded,
and even burned in effigy by the Scottish hierarchy in 1556. He in fact went out of his way to renounce his Roman Orders; he based his authority to minister on the call to preach he had received from the Castillians in 1547, which had been recognised by the larger Church. In this he was of one accord with the Continental Reformers.

The Reformers did maintain a type of succession, but it had nothing to do with manual acts of historic lineage. As John Knox stated to the Jesuit, James Tyrie: "we are able to show the succession of our Kirk directly and lawfully to have flowed from the Apostles. And our reason is, because in our Kirks we neither admit doctrine, rite, nor ceremony, which by their writings we find not authorised." Lineal descent and mechanical continuity were explicitly rejected: the Apostolic ministry was to be carried on in a pure doctrinal succession.

The Reformers were all too well aware that the vaunted claims of Apostolic Succession in the Roman Church had not guarded her from heinous corruption. The requirements for the succession of the standing office of ministry had to be made to rest upon some far better guarantee than formal mechanical acts. As Calvin stated so clearly:

We certainly deny not that the Church of God has always existed in the world, for we hear what God promises concerning the perpetuity of the seed of Christ. In this way, too, we deny not that there has been an uninterrupted succession of the Church from the beginning of the Gospel even to our day; but we do not concede that it was so fixed to external shows—that it has always been, and will henceforth be, in
possession of the bishops. . . . If the Church resides in the successors of the Apostles, let us search for successors among those only who have faithfully handed down their [the Apostles'] doctrine to posterity. . . . Very different is our case; for we deny the title of Succession of the Apostles to those who have abandoned their [the Apostles'] faith and doctrine. . . . Would that the Succession which they falsely allege had continued until this day; with us it would have no difficulty of obtaining the reverence which it deserves. Let the Pope, I say, be the successor of Peter, provided he perform the office of an Apostle. Wherein does the successor consist, if it be not in perpetuity of doctrine? But if the doctrine of the Apostles has been corrupted, nay abolished and extinguished by those who would be regarded as their successors, who would not deride their foolish boasting? 128

It was because of their rejection of the Roman conception of ordination and manual succession that the Reformers would not speak of "valid Orders" in the medieval sense. They spoke rather of a lawful calling and a lawful ministry. They saw the right to administer the Sacraments as deriving not from any manual act of ordination, or through any unbroken succession, or from any infused "character", but from the lawful call (as defined above) 129 to the preaching ministry. Knox said that where Christ Jesus is not preached, "that there hath the Sacrament neither life nor soul; and farther, . . . none can be a lawful minister of Christ's Sacrament who first is not a minister of his blessed Word". 130 In The First Book of Discipline this position was reasserted. 131 The precise nature of the public ceremony associated with the inauguration and admission of a minister was of little consequence, so long as it represented the understanding of being set apart for public office in the Church and avoided fostering superstition.
That this Reformed position gave way to a reintroduction of the necessity of the laying on of hands as effecting ordination was owing chiefly to King James' desire to bring the Scottish Church into conformity with the English Church, and to his move to reestablish episcopacy. There is evidence that the laying on of hands was used sporadically after 1571 in Scotland, probably because of the Biblical warrant, but none that would suggest that this was either deemed required, or interpreted in a medieval sense, or that it was effected by those who had themselves received the imposition of hands of those in a valid succession.

That The Second Book of Discipline advocated the imposition of hands has often been cited as proof of its restored use at a relatively early date, but this theory has a two-fold problem for its High Church proponents. Firstly, in that the influence of this book was less than is often assumed until after 1638; and secondly, in that the imposition they proposed was to be effected by the assembly of Pastors, Doctors, AND ELDERS. One scholar has summarised the problem: "... if under the influence of this Book [The Second Book of Discipline], inauguration by the laying on of hands ever took place [to 1620] ... ministers, with doctors and elders, who had not the remotest chance of ever having received the laying on of hands, laid hands on the new minister after his election."
The rather strange case of the license from Archbishop Grindal, which seems to imply a formal English acceptance of the Scottish Order, has also been shown to have been of little consequence in that even Independents received such licenses.  

It was, in fact, more a statement about Grindal than about the Scottish Order. So too, the second Helvetic Confession (printed in Zurich, 1566), has sometimes been used in support of certain High Church assertions as regards the election and ordination of ministers - especially the date of resuming the imposition of hands. But this Confession, though reviewed by a Committee and approved of by the Assembly (except as touching "festival days"), was never even printed in Scotland, nor did any section of it appear in any Act of the Assembly. Its influence at most, was small. And unfortunately for the High Church assertions, what is meant by the laying on of hands is not necessarily what they should like to assume. Even today in the Swiss Reformed Church exception is taken to "ordination of ministers", for it is maintained that "a Reformed Church only knows an induction by the Church to a particular office, but not an ordination per se".

In 1597, in response to the King's question to "the Convention of Estaits and General Assemblie" - "Is he a lawfull Pastor, who wants impositionem manuum?" - the Synod of Fife stated that the imposition of hands was neither essential nor necessary in the admission of a pastor, but ceremonial and indifferent. Another Synod
stated that the admission of the Church serves for imposition of hands. In these statements they were at one with the Reformers. Under pressure from the King, however, that Assembly enacted that ordination to the ministry should be by the laying on of hands. Calderwood, commenting on this legislation, stated:

... this imposition of hands, whereabout all this bussinesse was made, was holdin for a ceremonie unnecesarie and indifferent in our Kirk, whill that now, laying the foundation of episcopacie, it was urged as necessar. For it being layed as a ground, that none can receive ordinatioun to the ministrie without imposition of hands, and this ceremonie was proper to bishops, it behoved to follow that none could enter in the ministrie without imposition of hands by bishops, who were to be brought in, according to the intent of the king and the commissioners ...

By the time of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, a concept of ordination and succession was within the Scottish position: the First Episcopacy had effected this subtle change. But ordination still had nothing to do with the transmission of grace or mystical power: it was merely succession of the public office itself. George Gillespie, one of the leaders of the Scottish delegation to the Assembly at Westminster, made the traditional Scottish position quite clear. He first drew a distinction between the "act" of ordination, and the "rite" of it. "The act of ordination", said Gillespie,

standeth in the mission to the deputation of a man to an ecclesiastical function, with power and authority to perform the same; and thus are pastors ordained when they are sent to a people with power to preach the word, minister the sacraments, and exercise ecclesiastical discipline among them. ... UNTO WHICH MISSION OR
ORDINATION NEITHER PRAYER NOR IMPOSITION OF HANDS, NOR ANY OTHER OF THE CHURCH'S RITES, IS ESSENTIAL AND NECESSARY [emphasis mine]. 142

Gillespie then emphasised his point by stating that the "application" of a minister to his ministerial function "may be done by word alone". 143 He made it perfectly clear that although the church had "for order and decency" used some rite in ordination, that there was no such rite to be with "opinion of necessity", as though it were of divine appointment. 144 "When our writers", said Gillespie, "prove against the Papists that order is no sacrament, this is one of their arguments, that there is no rite instituted in the New Testament to be used in the giving of orders 145

Yet Gillespie thought that the rite of ordination by the laying on of hands was to be retained. "Although I hold the imposition of hands of the Presbyters to be no sacrament", he said, "nor efficacious and operative for giving the Holy Ghost, ... [or] necessary to ordination, ... as if ordination were void and no ordination without it, ... yet I hold ... that the laying on of hands is still to be retained in ordination." 146 But this retention of the rite was to be carefully guarded; it was to be retained providing that:

(1) It be not used with the opinion of necessity; for that the church hath full liberty either to use any other decent rite, or else to use no rite at all, beside a public declaration that the person there presented is called and appointed to serve the church in the pastoral office, together with exhortation to the said person, and the commending of him to the grace
of God, the church not being tied by the word to use any rite at all in the giving of ordination. (2) That it not be used as a sacred significant ceremony to represent and signify either the delivering to the person ordained authority to preach and to minister the sacraments, or the consecration and mancipation of him to the holy ministry; or, lastly, God's bestowing of the gifts of his Spirit upon him, together with his powerful protection and gracious preservation in the performing of the works of his calling, BUT ONLY AS A MORAL SIGN, SOLEMNLY TO ASSIGN AND POINT OUT THE PERSON ORDAINED [emphasis mine].

Gillespie would not allow the rite of ordination to be used as a "sacred significant ceremony" because men were not allowed to ascribe to any rite, at their pleasure, "a holy signification of some mystery of faith or duty of piety", and also because all such rites had been "notoriously abused to superstition". He said that if the imposition of hands in ordination "be accounted and used as a sacred rite, and as having a sacred signification", that it therefore became unlawful, "by reason of the bygone and present superstitious abuse of the same in Popery".

Gillespie also made reference to the ordination of elders. He said:

... it cannot be denied but as election to the office, so ordination to the exercise thereof, is a thing common to both preaching and ruling elders. Howbeit in Scotland, imposition of hands is not used in the ordination of ruling elders, as it is in the ordination of preaching elders, yet this is not to be thought a defect in their ordination; for imposition of hands is not an act, but a sign of ordination; neither is it a necessary sign, but is left free: ... many of our learned writers ... make a distinction betwixt the essential act of ordination, and the external rite thereof, holding that ordination may be full, valid, and complete, not only without the unction used in the
Roman church, but even without the laying on of hands used in the Reformed churches. 150

For Gillespie, as for the other Scottish Divines at the Westminster Assembly, "all that belongeth to the essence or integrity of ordination" was election, with notice and consent of the whole church, public designation and "an authoritative or protestative mission, ordination, or deputation of them to their presbyteral functions", together with public exhortation to them, and prayer in the church for them. 151

Other features of Gillespie's statement on ordination should also be noted. He said that "the whole church hath the power of ordination communicated to her from Christ, to whom it wholly pertaineth", 152 but that the church "hath, by divine institution, delivered the power of ordaining ministers to the presbytery, whereof the church consisteth representative". 153 The Independents at the Assembly queried what would happen if the Presbytery did not exist, or if all presbyters suddenly died. Gillespie answered that in extraordinary cases, when ordination could not be had through the normal channel, that there "an inward call from God enlarging the heart, stirring up and assisting with the good-will and consent of a people whom God makes willing, can make a minister authorised to do ministerial acts". 154 Gillespie held that consent of the people was part of the "outward" calling of a minister, the other part being ordination or deputation. He said that election of ministers was essential, and "pertaineth to
the whole body of that church where they are to serve".  

But he would not allow all authority to reside in the people's election. "Whilst we plead for the election of the people", said Gillespie, "we add, let the clergy of the adjacent bounds, in their presbyterial assembly, try and judge who are fit for the ministry." It is not surprising that the Free Church, at the "Disruption" of 1843, found their justification in Gillespie's position, for he was emphatic:

neither the patron's presentation, nor the clergy's nomination, examination and recommendation, nor the bishop's laying on of hands and giving of institution, nor all of these put together, can make up to a man's calling to be a pastor to such or such a particular flock, without their own free election.

Gillespie said, furthermore, that:

a man hath, from his election, power to be a pastor, and ordination only applieth him to the actual exercising of his pastoral office, which ordination only ought to be given unto him only who is elected, and that because he is elected.

It is clear that ordination for the Reformers of the sixteenth century and the Divines of the seventeenth century involved the same features: the inward call, the necessary and approved qualifications, the public call and consent, and recognition by the larger Church - as large as possible. In the seventeenth century it also involved the transmission of the rights and authority of a public office in the Church from those themselves currently in that office, to another who had the consent of a particular congregation. It could also involve the
manual act of the imposition of hands of these fellow office-bearers; but that not with any sacerdotal intent - it was to accord with Calvin's understanding of it as a useful and Biblical sign to both congregation and ordinand.

In view of the Scoto-Catholic affection for the "Aberdeen Doctors", it is remarkable that they did not choose to follow Bishop Patrick Forbes' defence of Scottish Orders through a rejection of a merely mechanical succession. He said:

The succession of piety is properly to be holden succession, for who professeth the same doctrine of faith he is a partner of the same chair, but who embraceth a contrary faith, he ought to be counted an adversary, albeit even sitting in the chair, and this indeed hath the name, but the other hath the substance and truth of succession. 159

Like the Reformers of the century previous, Forbes wanted to speak of doctrinal succession as being fundamental to the Church's continuity: the essential succession was that of the faith once delivered - received and transmitted from age to age through the standing office of ministers, lawfully called. But resort to such an understanding of doctrinal succession was not easy for the Scoto-Catholics. It rested upon the static view of Christian truth as immutable "deposit", and it was precisely this "deposit", as formalised in the Creeds and embedded in the Confession, which was under concerted attack. It was, therefore, most important that the mechanical succession be restated to protect the whole
authoritative Apostolic transmission - the doctrinal no less than the ministerial.

From even such a brief review it is clear that the deliverance of the General Assembly of 1882, which brought the whole matter of valid Orders and Apostolic Succession into public prominence, was not the radical departure from the Reformed position it was made out to be. The Assembly safe-guarded that which alone had been traditionally held to be essential in Reformed ordination - the lawful calling. Principal Tulloch was right in his assertions, more especially as regarded the laying on of hands. Sprott was misguided in this as in other matters, and has misled many scholars since his time. His pronouncements on Orders and succession were influenced by dogmatic considerations; they were not only tendentious but untrue. Proving a manual succession in the Scottish Church in order to validate her "Order" was at least as difficult and as highly speculative as it was in the English Church, and of far less relevance in view of her Reformed polity. Succession through a transmission theory might establish an Order's relative "validity" in Anglo-Catholic or Roman terms, but it had little to do with the Protestant concept of lawful calling to the public office of Minister of Word and Sacrament. The quest of Sprott, Cooper, Leishman and other Scoto-Catholics to prove their ecclesiastical "pedigree" was misguided and
misapplied, and — as J. F. Ainslie has commented — it is difficult for them to maintain their contentions convincingly "to any except those who wish to believe them".160

Their quest, though misguided, was not without effect, and the dogmatic statements made by the Scoto-Catholics towards the turn of the century, continued to muster party support, and to tie the General Assembly to a High Anglican-affected statement of ministerial transmission-succession through manual acts. It represents one aspect — a most successful aspect — of the Scoto-Catholic programme of "Tractarian" reform in the Church of Scotland. Lawful Ordination by the laying on of the hands of other ministers, which had been of some tradition in Scotland, was extended backwards to consider the "validity" of the ordination of the ordinators. That the "intentio" of Reformed ordination was not the same as that of Rome or the Anglo-Catholics, that it sought to publicly recognise the mission of a lawful preacher of the Gospel of Jesus Christ rather than to make a sacrificing priest, was ignored by the Scoto-Catholics.

It was precisely this charge of a sacerdotal conception of the ministry which was seen to be at the bottom of the East Church Case. Cooper's statement to the effect that the effectuality of the Sacraments depended upon valid Orders and unbroken succession, proves that the elders' charge was well founded. But the Presbytery of Aberdeen did not act, and a position, quite opposed to the Reformed, was considered by the High
Churchmen to have been "vindicated" within the Scottish Church.

Interestingly, the only Anglicans who seemed not unwilling to accept the Scoto-Catholic statements on the Presbyterian Order were those who had themselves not fully accepted the Anglo-Catholic position. The Anglo-Catholics themselves followed Gore in rejecting the Scottish Order because it lacked to their minds the one essential requisite - the historic episcopate.

The "historiological mythos" proved to be a strong force in the Church of Scotland, and that not only in this matter of an unbroken ministerial succession by manual acts, or of devotion to the doctrine of Apostolic Succession. Other aspects of their created "mythos" have also tended to become authoritative: Edward VI's Prayer Book (1552) was the first Reformed "liturgy" in Scotland and was widely used; Knox's Book of Common Order was a "liturgy", and was in use as such until it was replaced by the Westminster "Directory"; the "Directory" was the product of English sectaries and was foisted upon an unwilling Church of Scotland; "Laud's Liturgy" was rejected only because of its unlawful manner of introduction; Knox had no objection to read prayers, to kneeling, or to the English Prayer Book ("but only a few features of it"); the Reformers' ideal was weekly Communion; the "First Episcopate" was the "Golden Age" of the Church of Scotland; the Church of Scotland today is the Celtic Church continuing.
The whole point of developing this "mythos", of citing an early seventeenth century "Golden Age", of looking back to the romantic past, was a reflection of the Victorian quest for a legitimate authority in an age of transition. It was part of the larger quest for security through a dogmatic claim to authority. It was only natural that the Scoto-Catholics should look to England for inspiration; it was natural too that they should pattern themselves on the Oxford Movement which had proved to be so effective in the fight against Liberalism and the restoration of religion.

In accepting the Tractarian model, in looking back to an episcopal Golden Age, in insisting that the laying on of hands and an Apostolic Succession were essential to ordination, in pressing for a formal "National Liturgy", the Scoto-Catholics were laying the foundations for "Catholic reunion" on a large scale, and that at the expense of the Reformed position. Once the integrity of the Reformed system as regarded the Church, the Ministry, and the Sacraments had been lost sight of, or deliberately obscured, more especially if it was surplanted by the Tractarian system, then the way was open for reunion with the Church of England and a reacceptance by the Scottish Church of the historic episcopate - the darling ambition of James Cooper and his Scoto-Catholic party.
CONCLUSION

H. J. Wotherspoon concluded his biography of James Cooper with these words:

Dr. Cooper was sometimes described as 'priestly'. That is high praise. One can hardly say more of a man's character or demeanour, than use of it that term. ... A priestly instructor of youth - that too is rather a fine conception; possibly Dr. Cooper in some measure attained to realise it. ... [Dr. Cooper] was not furtive, but extremely direct; not subtle, but blunt; not tyrannous, but lowly and in a literal way the servant of all. He was extremely courageous and was free from the fear of being in the minority. He was, I think, most at ease when in the minority, knowing then that he was probably in the right. He was nothing of a mystic and not in the least a visionary. ... He proposed nothing fantastic or remote, but the practicable, if men would do it. He agreed with the ancient writer who says, 'It is possible if God wills it' - and he saw no doubt as to Christ's will for the Church of Scotland.

... His works follow him. His influence lives in those whom he taught to see God and to serve Christ, and through them he still touches our life and will help to mould the better world and fairer Church for which he prayed.

The gentleness of the words, and the tenderness of the judgment, must themselves be reflections of and tributes to the pious quaintness of James Cooper. He was quite obviously a Christian with a profound faith, a learned and devout Churchman, and a Scot, terribly proud of his national institutions and heritage - more especially of Scotland's historic National Church. But for all that, he was no lover of Presbyterian polity, even though he himself was the most indefatigable of presbyters. Cooper's ideal was the English Church - to his mind, a Church strong
in the received Faith, proud in her history, wealthy in her noble liturgy and her fine parish and cathedral churches, respected among other churches, and highly honoured as the foremost example of an established estate of the realm. His master was Pusey; his ecclesiastical orientation, Tractarian and medievalist.

James Cooper, and the Scoto-Catholic party popularly identified with him, were instrumental in bringing certain fundamental aspects of the Tractarian programme of reform in the Church of England into the Church of Scotland. Although the English Tractarians had initially failed as a doctrinal movement, had been frustrated in their attempt to impress their set of doctrinal principles upon the popular consciousness of English religion, their evangelical concern for "vital religion", their Romantic sensitivity and evocative literary style, their re-evaluation of historical tradition, and their devotion to the two-fold assertion of Apostolic Authority (Apostolic Succession and Apostolic Tradition), were part of that second set of principles, those of "religion", which found a home - albeit grudgingly at first - in the English Church. Keble's *The Christian Year*, Newman's sermons at St. Mary's, the Ecclesiological and Ritualistic reforms, were all part of that swing of opinion against cold Reason; were part of that Romantic movement of the heart toward what is traditionally called "Catholic devotion". Obviously there were societal and economic pressures at work which encouraged this movement and others, but the
inescapable fact remains that the religious principles, ideals, and symbolic expressions of the Oxford Movement transformed the face and self-image of the Church of England, and - perhaps even more fully - that of the Episcopal Church in Scotland.

It was these "religious principles", these principles addressed primarily to the heart which had proved to be such a force toward reform in the English Church, that were accepted by Cooper and his party, and were impressed upon the Church of Scotland in ways not dissimilar to those which had been used in England. As in England, it was the piety of these Scoto-Catholics which impressed everyone with whom they came in contact. It was the holiness of their lives which captured the imagination of their students, and encouraged them to adopt the Catholic principles enunciated.

The Scoto-Catholics, for their part, made moves to widen and extend their field of influence. They assumed control of the liturgical society, and pressed for the creation of a formal liturgical compilation that would exude Catholic doctrine and the traditional expressions of Christian orthodoxy. Their liturgy they tried to instil with historical warrant; to attribute to it the capacity to guard lovingly and transmit faithfully "the faith once delivered"; to provide through it a Catholic "manual of devotion". They wrote scholarly and learned texts and tracts to foster an awareness of Catholic doctrine, and to prove how Catholic had been the principles of the
Reformation and those who had effected it in Scotland. They created societies committed to the Ecclesiological ideal, and actively pursued their plan of converting the "preaching houses" of Scotland into shrines of medieval piety and mysticism, where, "in the beauty of holiness", the Christ of awe and majesty was to be beheld from afar, on bended knee and with downcast eye. They availed themselves of every opportunity in print, in lecture, and in exhibit to disseminate their particular views, and to impress them not only on faithful Churchmen, but on artists, and architects, and builders. They created a society with the primary object of defending and advancing Catholic doctrine in the Scottish Church. Some of them adopted advanced ritualistic practices and ornaments, and fostered a "priestly" image of ministers, and the sacerdotal nature of their ordination and function. The Scoto-Catholics were not above twisting history to suit their purpose, nor beyond power politics, nor free from the narrowness and rigidity of sectarian Christianity. In their attempt to protect the "validity" of the Scottish Order of Presbyters, for example, they manifest a most un-Reformed understanding and appreciation of the essence and integrity of ministry. In their "unalterable" declaration of the "fundamental verities" in the "Articles Declaratory", they evidenced their fundamental mistrust of Christ's promised "Comforter".

James Cooper and his Scoto-Catholic party were anxious to effect "Tractarian" reform in the Church of Scotland,
and, in the years 1882 to 1918, they were not without significant progress in this enterprise.
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CHAPTER I


4. Ibid.


14. The Bill, which represented concessions to Roman Catholic members of Parliament, proposed to reduce two archbishoprics to bishoprics; to abolish (i.e., merge at the next vacancy) ten of the twenty-two bishoprics; to abolish church "cess" (rates); to cut the revenues of the two wealthiest sees; to abolish certain deans and chapters; and to allow for the conversion of certain tenant leases on church lands into permanent tenancies. Cf. Chadwick, op. cit., I, 51. Also, G. I. T. Machin, Politics
and the Churches in Great Britain: 1832-1868 (Oxford, 1977), 32f. The Opposition pointed out the various faults with the Bill, the most important to them seeming to be that it would violate the Coronation Oath. They also noted that a decrease in the number of Anglican Bishops would give undue advantage to the rival Romanists. E.g. cf. speech by Lord Carbery in the House of Lords, 18th July, 1833.

15. W. Palmer, A Narrative of Events concerned with the Publication of the Tracts for the Times, 2nd ed. (London, 1883), 45: "The Government's real object was to gratify the [Roman] priests by the abolition of the hierarchy of the Church of England as the first step in the entire destruction of the Church's status and property, and the formation of a Roman Catholic establishment; but they did not venture to avow this motive and pretended that the measure was for the purpose of reforming and strengthening the Church itself . . . the shock upon the introduction of this sacrilegious bill was electric. The bill called upon Newman and his friends to resist as one man the enactment of laws contrary to the first principles of the Church's discipline, divesting Christians of spiritual privileges not originally bestowed by the State, and which the State, therefore, could not take away."

16. The word "High" in this context emerged just prior to the revolution of 1688 and meant someone who was rigid and precise in his churchmanship, someone who was "stiff for the Church of England" against dissenters, a man of the Establishment. It was a conviction based upon doctrine and upon principles of religious authority. The actual line of thought was traced to even earlier periods; to Richard Bancroft (1544-1610) and Richard Hooker (1544-1600), for example, who took issue with Puritanism and Presbyterianism and emphasized not only traditional doctrines on the nature of the Church, the Sacraments and the liturgy, but also stressed the significance of the episcopate as a sign of Catholicity. Their position was based primarily on the late sixteenth century advances in Patristics; advances that tended to support the conservatives more and the continentally trained Protestants less. It was based also on a resurgence of Platonic philosophy that viewed the visible world as sacramental. Cf. Owen Chadwick, The Mind of the Oxford Movement (London, 1960), 14-30.


19. They, like the country generally, were certain of Parliament's right to legislate for the Church; a certainty based partly on the awareness of the Protestant character of the Nation, and partly on honour. As The Christian Observer (1832, 365) remarked: "Of one thing we are sure, that if the Established Church, or the cause of Scriptural education, or the preaching of evangelical doctrine, or any other of our most valued institutions, are not safe in the hands of the majority of respectable British householders, they can under Providence be safe nowhere."

20. The Act of 1813 (53 Geo. III, c. 127) "abolished the writ de excommunicato capiendo", and enacted another "for the imprisonment of any person contumaciously defying an order of a spiritual Court, until he should be purged of his contumacy". Laski, *op. cit.*, 34.


29. Newman's understanding of the Church as a "Substantive body or corporation" was derived from Richard Whately at Oxford in 1826. Newman, *Apologia*, 24: "What he [Whately] did for me in point of religious opinion, was, first, to teach me the existence of the Church, as a substantive body or corporation; next to fix in me those anti-Erastian views of Church polity, which were one of the most prominent features of the Tractarian movement."

31. *Tract XVIII: Thoughts on the Benefits of the System of Fasting Enjoined by our Church.*


39. The Tract was based on Newman's understanding that faith is deepened and confirmed by moral growth, and suggested that religious knowledge should be communicated in such a way that the deepest mysteries of the faith would be unveiled only when a person had morally developed to such a point where he could receive them. The one word "reserve" in the title seemed to suggest to the Evangelicals that the Movement wanted to hold back what to them was the most precious part of the Gospel Message - the Atonement.


41. The *Times*, March 6, 1841.

42. *Tract XC* represented the inauguration of the final phase which ended not with Newman's secession in 1845, but more fundamentally with the Gorham judgment of 1850. Cf. *infra*, 35f.

43. Newman gave the other two reasons as the move by the Church of England to establish a Jerusalem bishopric in common with the recently united Church of Prussia (which, in his eyes, meant allowing Protestants to place themselves under an Anglican bishop without their being required first to renounce their error; with no regard to the traditional Anglican doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation); and the return of his "Donatist ghost" (an awareness based on his study of the Arian controversy that in the end Rome would be found to be right). Newman, *Apologia*, 130f.


47. It is clearly with this revival of discipline in view that Newman followed Tract I with five letters to The Record. In these he argued that the Church should hold up before the world the rules of God's government. He stated that the Church had to maintain the discipline declared by Christ and His Apostles to be necessary for the Church's life. He held that there was no difficulty in knowing who ought to be excommunicated; it was the heretical, the immoral, the schismatical. In this way he thought a bulwark could be built against Popery, and that the increased difficulty for the episcopate would encourage the appointment of more spiritually-minded bishops. "The abandonment of State persecutions for blasphemy, etc.," said Newman, "and the disordered state of the Christian Knowledge Society, where books are taken cognisance of and condemned, render it desirable that there should be some really working court of heresy and false doctrine. . . . The chief advantage of this would be its practical curb upon the King's power; . . . the whole Church would be kept in order. Further, it would give rise to a school of theology, the science of divinity, councils, etc.; the theological law of the Church must be revived and ecclesiastical law, moreover. The effect of this upon the divinity of the clergy would be great indeed." Cf. Mozley, *op. cit.*, II, 87.


51. Ibid., 138.


53. Ibid., III, 163, 165.

54. Hansard, 3rd Series, XLVIII (June 4, 1839), 1338.


61. Ibid., I, 555.

62. Ibid., I, 558. This was, in fact, the position he had maintained in his letter to the Lord Bishop of Chichester (supra, n. 59). There he had said:

"I do not see how the Church of England can permit two contrary doctrines on Baptism to be propounded to her people without abdicating the divine authority to teach as sent from God; and a body which teaches under the authority of human interpretation descends to the level of a human society."

63. Cockshut, Anglican Attitudes, 71.

64. Quoted in ibid., 43.

65. Quoted in ibid., 44.

66. Ibid., 48f.


68. Gladstone, speaking on the Public Worship Regulation Act in July, 1874, gave an account of the situation circa 1830: "I wish every man in this House was as old as I am — for the purpose of knowing what was the condition of the Church of England forty to fifty years ago. At that time it was the scandal of Christendom. Its congregations were the most cold, dead, and irreverent; its music was offensive to anyone with a respect for the House of God, its clergy, with exceptions, somewhat numerous, chiefly, though not exclusively, belonging to what was then called the Evangelical School — its clergy with that exception were in numbers I should not like to mention worldly-minded men, not conforming by their practice to the standard of their high-office, seeking to accumulate preferments with a reckless indifference, and careless of the cure of souls of the people committed to their charge, and upon the whole declining in moral influence. This is the state of things from which we have escaped." Cf. also White, op. cit., 16f.


70. Ibid., Vol. II (Feb. 1843), 112.

71. Ibid., Vol. III (Sept. 1844), 161.
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CONCLUSION

1. Memoir, 354f. Other contemporary testimonials are not inappropriate to the basic contention of this thesis. The Times, 28th Dec. 1922: "Much in him [Dr. Cooper] was also traceable to the home and haunts of his early youth in Morayshire, and to the Catholic tradition of the Aberdonian north, to which Presbyterianism was largely exotic. In what Professor W. P. Paterson has called Scoto-Catholicism, Dr. Cooper throughout his life really represented that Northern tradition, rather than that of the Southern or Western 'High Presbyterianism', which Sprott or Leishman stood for, or the John Macleod of Govan influence or type, or that which traces to the primitive, and to 'those mad High Churchmen, the Apostles', spoken of by Law. At the same time, he was always a convinced Presbyterian in the strict sense of the term - regarding the presbyterate as the essential and fundamental order, and sufficient for validity." British Weekly, 11th Jan. 1923: "All through life Dr. Cooper stood for two great principles - the necessity of an apostolic ministry and the integrity of the Christian faith, as enshrined in Holy Scripture and the Catholic Creeds." The Church Times, 5th Jan. 1923: "... by far the greatest ecclesiastic of this generation."
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

THE CATHOLIC APOSTOLIC CHURCH: ANALOGUE OF OR SUCCESSOR TO THE OXFORD MOVEMENT?

Some years ago it was suggested that Irvingism, the more popular name for the Catholic Apostolic Church, was an "analogue" of the Oxford Movement. The position was based upon the readily observable similarities between the two developments: both originated at approximately the same time; both consisted of a complete rejection of popular Protestantism by pious and learned men of evangelical persuasion; both appealed to the ancient Fathers, Councils and Traditions of the Church; both used a determined supernaturalism to justify the establishment of an ecclesiastical authoritarianism. It was noted that there seemed to be a basic motivation common to each which transcended the limits of either; something which appeared implicit in these two movements which showed the same directional trends in two separate fields without any visible links of interaction. It was stated that Irvingism and Tractarianism evidence, in fact, a higher category of unity — the only one readily observable being that of religious authoritarianism through apostolicity. Although both traced and treated the matter differently — the Tractarians through the continuous transmission of the real and specific function and power of the New Testament Apostles through history to the present, the Irvingites through a miraculous restoration of the Office — they ended up maintaining much the same final belief; that is, the recognition of the present apostolic authority as of the esse of the Church, the certain and sure guarantee of the Church as a living organism. It was argued that whereas the Oxford Movement had a "formal" cause, that is, the Acts of Parliament from 1828 to 1833, and the Catholic
Apostolic did not, and that whereas both progressed in the same direction, there was evidence of a higher "efficient" cause - the "spiritual and religious response of contemporary Englishmen to their life problems". Hence the application of the word "analogue".

It is time that this thesis was challenged. In the light of more recent research, especially as relates to the life and character of John Bate Cardale, the "analogue" thesis is now untenable. The Irvingite movement was not an "analogue" of the Oxford Movement, but was, in fact, a successor to it, and that because the primary influence on the Catholic Apostolic Church as it developed was not Edward Irving, as commonly assumed, but Cardale, "the Pillar of the Apostles", and it was through him that the Anglican and Tractarian influence was mediated to the Catholic Apostolic Church.

It is quite true, and well to bear in mind, that the Catholic Apostolic Church developed out of the London congregation that crystallised around the famous Scottish preacher, Edward Irving. Even though later spokesmen of this communion found it expedient to minimise their attachment and debt to Irving's theological position, and to repudiate in exaggerated terms the name "Irvingism" by which they were commonly known, yet research has shown that the most distinctive tenets of the Catholic Apostolic Church can be found - in embryo form, at least - in Irving's writings and printed sermons.

It was in 1822, after having assisted Thomas Chalmers at St. John's, Glasgow, for three years that Irving was called as a Church of Scotland minister to the Caledonian Chapel in London. There, because of a certain craze in high society, he became extremely popular, and soon a new church had to be built for him in Regent Square. In Scotland he had been intimate with the then emerging Thomas Carlyle; now in London he met Samuel Taylor Coleridge. A fast friendship began, and a particular chiliastic strain of German mysticism began to pervade Irving's thinking.
In 1826, Irving became acquainted with a mystical and apocalyptical work, *The Coming of the Messiah in Glory and Majesty*, by the Spanish Jesuit, Lacunza. The translation of this work Irving accomplished with the help of Henry Drummond, M.P., a wealthy banker, and it was published in 1827. This interaction led Drummond to invite Irving to conferences at his home in Albury, conferences where interested persons could come together to study and discuss all the prophecies of the "second Coming". The impetus for this had come some years earlier when evangelicals began to see in the revolutionary troubles, that had embroiled France from 1789 to 1815, a sign of portent. The spread of cholera to England from the Continent in 1831 had encouraged this particular interpretation, and had reinforced the idea that the "Day of Judgment" was at hand.

Irving was simultaneously in trouble with Calvinistic churchmen on the point of his Christology, and he was forced to consider this matter more fully. But the Albury conferences had convinced him that the point of vantage for a comprehensive view of the whole purpose of God for the world was the "Second Coming", and he began to preach this often neglected doctrine with great urgency.

It was well known in Scottish clerical circles that Irving was sympathetic to the views expressed by the young minister of Row, John McLeod Campbell (1800-1872), on the nature of Christ's humanity. The closeness was further evidenced by Irving's publication of a book on the doctrine of Christ's human nature in 1830, the year McLeod Campbell was libelled in the Church of Scotland Courts. McLeod Campbell was deposed by the General Assembly of 1831, or rather, as his close friend and champion in the ecclesiastical Courts, Robert Story, said: "[He was] . . . not only deposed by the General Assembly, but deposed in such circumstances of indelicacy and precipitation as to be without precedence in the annals of the Church." He had been found guilty of "erroneous teaching" on the nature of assurance of faith, and on the universality of the Atonement
and pardon. He had considered the doctrine of the Atonement in terms of the "Fatherliness of God", seeing in this fatherliness the origin and meaning of Christ's person and unique work, and in the Christ, the truth of all brotherhood. To those in the Church who had inherited from previous generations that the doctrine of the Atonement had reference only to a certain elect, this "universalism" was indeed heresy.

Irving's book on the human nature of Christ set him open to libel also, but it was his acceptance of certain pentecostal outbursts during his congregation's worship-service, that first brought trouble. The "bedlam and chaos", that now distinguished his Regent Square Church, was protested alike by Thomas Carlyle and The Times, and also by his Deacons and Session. It was Robert Story at Rosneath who, in 1830, had quite innocently brought to Irving's attention a Scottish girl, Mary Campbell, who could "speak in tongues". A miraculous cure was also attributed to her, and Irving hailed this as a sign. On his return to London he encouraged prayer-meetings with pentecostal intent, and on 16 October, 1831 the manifestation of "tongues" was allowed to disrupt public worship in the Regent Square Church. It was this innovation that caused the Presbytery of London to act formally against him. After a protracted trial, the Presbytery deposed Irving from the charge, and locked him out of his London Church. With some 800 faithful, Irving removed to rented premises, and carried on his ministry. Irving was subsequently libelled in the Presbytery of Annan, and deposed from the ministry of the Church of Scotland (March 13, 1833).

Irving was deposed for his heterodoxy; for teaching that Christ had a sinful nature attached to his person. His true unorthodoxy, however, was only that he had returned to the older orthodoxy of the Fathers and the early Councils of the Church, only that he had taught -
what he himself described as - "orthodox and catholic doctrine". His position was aimed at rescuing long forgotten aspects of the real human nature of Christ, as opposed to that which saw Him as primarily divine.

Irving in his teaching showed a deliberate approximation to traditional Catholic doctrine. He said that he had been saved

from the infidelity of evangelicalism, which denies any gift of God either in the work of Christ, or in the sacraments, or anywhere, until we experience it to be within ourselves; making God a mere promiser, until we become receivers; making his bounty and beneficence nought but words, till we make it reality by accepting thereof; in one word, making religion only subjective in the believer; a religion of moods, and not of purposes and facts; having its reality in the creature, its proposal of reality only in God. The true doctrine of the Sacraments will always strike this infidelity upon the head. It revolutionized my mind.

The "true doctrine of the Sacraments" which Irving taught would not have been unwelcomed by the Tractarians in its basic interpretation. As a firm believer in "making Christians by Sacraments", Irving expressed himself clearly on the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, for example, and to a lesser extent on that of the Eucharist, which was, to him, the central aspect of the life and worship of the Church. His ideas on Baptism seem to have derived largely from Hooker, and also the High Church doctrines embedded in the Scots Confession, from which he often quoted with approval the sentence: "We utterly condemn the vanity of those who affirm sacraments to be nothing but naked and bare signs." He himself spoke of Baptism in terms unusual for contemporary Presbyterians:

For as when we are born of our natural parents the seeds of a corrupt nature are thereby conveyed to us, so, when we are baptized into Christ, the seeds of a spiritual nature are thereby conveyed to us: otherwise it were vain to hope that there could be any fruit of holiness yielded to our husbandry of prayer, faith, and instruction. Baptism declaring the child's natural
deadness and inherent corruptness, placeth a bar
against all dealing with the child; for who laboureth
upon the dead? This bar it must remove, otherwise it
were the inlet to no good hopes or painful labours of
faith and love. If it declareth spiritual death, it
must also declare spiritual life, or be utterly ruinous
to all purposes and endeavours after holiness. . . .
No man may take upon him to separate the effectual
working of the Holy Spirit from baptism, without making
void all the ordinances of the visible Church; which
become idle ceremonies, or worse, save for the faith
that the Holy Spirit may be and is in them of a truth,
to all to whom the Father granted the faith of His
presence in them.13

The reason for his adopting such a "High" view is clear:
only in the Catholic Faith was there hope for the situ­
tion then current, a situation that he had not failed to
notice was denying the power of God and destroying the
Church's sacramental extensions.

Irving observed that the Church herself was in a most
fearful condition, and needed revival. He said, for
example:

The Church is in the condition of a man faint and sick
and apparently dead, who puts forth neither manly voice
nor vigorous action, and is even incapable of thought
and almost beyond feeling, but let that man revive
again (and we know the Church never dies), and he will
both hear and see and feel and act the man. So if the
Church revives, she must act as the Church; which is not
in the way of holiness merely, but in the way of power,
for the manifestation of the completeness of Christ's
work, and the first fruits of the same work in glory.14

This power for action, Irving believed, derived from the
various gifts that had been given to the Church - prophecy,
healing, working of miracles, and speaking with "tongues"
- and Irving recognised in the restoration of these gifts
in his congregation a new outpouring of the Spirit; he saw
in them the sign and promise of Christ's imminent return.

These doctrinal and theological observations were
Irving's legacy to the Catholic Apostolic Church, as were
certain of his practical considerations. He was unfavourably
disposed, for example, toward the contemporary situation, toward secular education, toward Dissent, toward Liberalism, toward democracy, and the Catholic Apostolic Church showed similar biases.

Although Irving's formative influence on the Catholic Apostolic Church was significant and must be recognised, it is important to note that of the five most distinctive features of developed Irvingism - the strong millenarian, or chiliastic aspect (a not uncommon feature of sectarian Protestantism), the pentecostal manifestation of the "gifts of the Spirit", the absolutist hierarchy, the "Apostolic rite of sealing", and the highly advanced ritualistic and architectural expression - Irving himself, was an intense, but very minor exponent of millenarianism, was an hesitant - almost reluctant - convert to new-Pentecostalism, was but an humble tool of the despotic hierarchy he had helped to introduce, had no understanding of any new "Apostolic rites", and was totally ignorant of all advanced ceremonial or ecclesiology, or of any form different from that of a simple Scots Presbyterian expression of worship.

When Irving died in 1834 the whole nature of the developing sect was fluid. Irving had pointed his followers in the Catholic direction, but had left no practical expression of it. The movement was so immature that it could have been advanced or reversed with relative ease; it all depended upon Irving's successor. Irving himself had an almost mystical insight into this fact, for he saw his own role rather as "... a sort of pioneer and forerunner of the Elias-dispensation which is to introduce the kingdom, than a herald of the kingdom". The successor, the true herald, was John Bate Cardale, and it is his person that must be studied to appreciate Irvingism's debt to Tractarianism.
A year before Irving's death, at the time of his being deposed from the ministry of the Church of Scotland, authority in the sect was transferred to Cardale, one of those who had been spiritually and publicly "recognised" as a latter-day "Apostle". Since Irving himself had never received any supernatural gifts, he was bound, on his own principles, to submit to the authority of those who had. An interesting feature to note is that when Cardale inhibited Irving from celebrating the Sacrament of Baptism after his deposition from the ministry of the Scottish Church, he was indicating that Irving was not only no longer a minister of the Catholic Church, but was not even of the status of "deacon", for even deacons are canonically allowed to Baptise. Irving had to limit himself to "preaching" until such time as he was re-ordained, which eventually he was by Cardale himself.

It was Cardale who, as its chief liturgical scholar, and as "the Pillar of the Apostles", was the real "founder" of the Catholic Apostolic Church as it developed. Henry Drummond, the financial backer of the new Church and also an "Apostle", was important too, but to a much lesser extent. This was clearly evidenced in Cardale's "apostolic" responsibility for England, styled the chief tribe of Judah, whereas Drummond had oversight of Scotland and Switzerland, styled the tribe of Benjamin (the strange combination suggested, apparently, by their mountainous terrain, and their exemplification of "dignified patriotism, though in small nations inhabiting poor countries"). These two men, Cardale and Drummond, like most of those who had been attracted to Irving's Chapel, formerly were Anglicans, and this fact is at least a partial explanation for the Irvingite change of ecclesiastical orientation.

The precise nature of the evolution from a Church of Scotland Chapel through the miraculous restoration of the "apostolate", to near total conformity with a supposed primitive model, governed by a "College of Apostles" and boasting a four-fold order of ministry (prophets,
evangelists, pastors, and teachers), is not here introduced. 18 Of importance is that this development showed signs of being a participant in that larger quest for the definition of authority, the claim for an authoritative and relevant tradition, and the almost fanatical desire for integral unity, which characterised the Tractarian movement as well. Indeed, it is an acknowledgment of precisely this fact which is the foundation of the thesis of "analogue" here being considered: this quest for authority was the response to that "efficient" cause common to both movements.

As proof of the existence of this "efficient" cause, The Great Testimony, one of the main works associated with Irvingism was cited, and certainly it echoes the alarm felt over contemporary life problems. The Great Testimony was delivered in person by the "Apostles" of the Irvingite Church, along with The Shorter Testimony, to the chief civil and religious authorities of Europe, and one can only guess at what must have been the nature of their reception. The overwhelming impression left by The Great Testimony is that of regarding the contemporary situation as the decisive epoch; dating Revelation's calculation of the "end-time" from the French Revolution; basing all on the imminence of Christ's return. It stated, for example:

None can doubt the fearful dangers which surround you on every side, . . . whether we look to the removing of all ancient landmarks, the breaking up of all ordinances of life, the decay of reverence in all for those set over them . . . ; or whether we regard the contempt for the priestly office, and the denial of the holiest truths of God as irrational; or lastly, that open and abashed avowal by the infidel and revolutionist to complete the work which the revolution of last century left unfinished, by the disorganization of all ancient principles, moral, religious, or political . . .; and to establish a new era of atheistic anarchy, under the name of liberalism . . . 19

Here we have all the features which any reader of the Tracts for the Times could identify as a contemporary
address to the same situation. Here Liberalism and Dissent, in all their decadent self-assertiveness, were identified; here was a statement that Protestant civilization was threatening to collapse into moral, religious, and social anarchy. Here was an address from the same conservative quarter. And is not that the precise point? Is it not more probable that Oxford had already identified not only the "formal" cause, but also the "efficient" cause? And was it not this "efficient" cause which they were in fact trying to correct through their campaign to reassert Orthodox and Catholic doctrine, as contained in the "Tracts"? They did complain about the "formal" cause, also, but in that their programme was based upon the inevitability of disestablishment and the removal of that "formal" cause, they must be seen as primarily concerned with the rampant Liberalism against which Protestantism had proved ineffective; they were determined to retrieve the solid ground of Catholicity.

Was not The Great Testimony but a development of the Oxford "Tracts"? Though the first testimony was prepared at Christmas, 1835, The Great Testimony was not completed until 1837. The Oxford Movement was then strong and young and sure; the creative vitality generated in its "Tracts" must have been irresistible to sympathetic minds - especially in London. It was producing materials that touched upon the very fundamentals of the Church, the Ministry, the Sacraments; work was going ahead on the Library of the Fathers. Irving had spoken the "High" doctrine of the Scots Confession, but had left no practical expression of it. The "Apostles", even before Irving's death in 1834, had been, more or less, groping toward a dimly conceived Catholicism with only random hints and Old Testament types. Why was it only in 1835 that "prophecy" told that their doctrines should be formalised in terms of their Catholic claims under the Senior "Apostle"? Why should a sect, with all the makings of ultra-Protestantism, develop into a pseudo-Catholicism? Does it not suggest that Irvingism
was not an "analogue" of Oxford at all? that it was rather the impact of the Oxford Movement that was determinative of its definition of Catholicity and its formal expression. What else can account adequately for its adopting so many of the distinctive features of Western and Anglo-Catholicism?

A recent study has shown that the traditional notes of Catholicity (Authority, Tradition, and Comprehensiveness) were clearly manifest in the person and work of John Bate Cardale, and were reflected from him directly into the life and worship of the Catholic Apostolic Church; and not merely an inchoate Catholicism, but a mature Catholicism, with a sub-couscious Anglican bias. In Readings Upon the Liturgy, for example, Cardale gave this definition of Catholicity.

We believe the Church to be Catholic. First. Because, whosoever is a child of God and a member of Christ, and one in whom is the Life of Christ, wherever he may be, the Church owns and embraces with maternal love. The Church is Catholic for it comprehends all baptized men, and all congregations or particular churches into which they are gathered or collected. Second. It is Catholic, because it is God's gift to all His creatures, never to be recalled. There is but one Church, and the mission given to that Church extends to the whole world. . . . And as the mission of the Church is unto all, so it contains every remedy for every possible evil, and every blessing which can be enjoyed. It is Catholic because it is One; and being One, it embraces all. It gathers into itself all the elect of God; it contains and interprets all truth; it is the very temple wherein the Holy Ghost dwells; the fulness of God; and it imparts from that fulness to all creatures.

It is of interest to note that the problem of a comprehensive Catholic Authority was not resolved by such a definition, and on the matter of the credal problem between East and West, for example, Cardale (not unlike Pusey) was forced to think in terms of a once-upon-a-time Catholic Church that used to be authoritative, but no longer existed. He said that ". . . until a competent authority shall pronounce thereon, it seems unreasonable that either should
be imposed". Although he did not choose to define this "competent authority", he certainly inferred in this comment that it was not to be found in the restored "College of Apostles", of which he was "the Pillar".

During the years when the Church of England was experiencing her crisis of authority, the Catholic Apostolic Church was faced with a not dissimilar question: "Where does practical authority reside?" Was it in the charismatic element, that had confirmed the "Apostles'" vocation - the "Prophets", or was it in the institutional element - the "Apostles" themselves? In 1840 the "Apostles" decided that theirs was the final authority, but not without a split in their number. They decided the matter by a consideration of their vocation; that since there was no doubt that they had derived their authority from God, without the intervention of men, that they alone were called to be the final court on matters of doctrine and discipline. Unlike the Church of England which had no such structure in which to decide the matter, and no acknowledged claimants to personal divine vocation with prophetic confirmation of the same; the Catholic Apostolic Church, once the question was raised, was able to answer it, authoritatively and finally. Since it now had a central absolute authoritative structure, focused in the person of Cardale, pre-eminently (who became almost a papal figure), it is little wonder that the movement should hereafter be able to move faster than Oxford or Cambridge toward a practical expression of the Catholic ideal they advanced, and, in fact, to antedate them in most ritual and ceremonial developments.

The Liturgy of the Catholic Apostolic Church is perhaps its most important legacy to the Church universal in that it has directly influenced the compilations - among others - of the Church of Scotland, the American German Reformed Church (through Philip Schaff and John W. Nevin), and the French Reformed Church (through Eugène Bersier). The whole framework of this Liturgy
was the work of Cardale, and was the expression of his theological position. His Anglican background was clearly the major influence in the basic shape into which it evolved, and the fact that of the eleven active Apostles at the time, all but two were former Anglicans, ensured its acceptance without any problem of Presbyterian prejudice. His chief non-Anglican sources would appear to have been various seventeenth-century Roman Catholic publications. The Liturgy itself sought to combine the basic elements of Catholicity: Authority, as seen in the hierarchical mode of its celebration; Tradition, in the use of ancient models; and Comprehensiveness, in the diverse sources of its parts, in its concern for a complete life-cycle of services, and in its appeal — even in its original material — to Christians of differing traditions.

Cardale's intention was to produce a unique liturgy, worthy of the high Catholic claims of his Church; but, as his biographer has said, "[in . . . choosing to give it a Western shape, his unconscious mind could not help but be influenced by the model he knew best, the Book of Common Prayer]." Although Cardale thought the Prayer Book Liturgy of 1662 was defective, he gave his full approval to its ancestor, the Eucharist of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI, which he spoke of as a "holy and catholic service", free from corruptions and full of worthy features. Certainly his rite of 1843 showed a decisive departure from a Presbyterian shape in favour of a Catholic one, with Anglicanism providing not only the basic shape of the Liturgy, but also virtually all the Collects, Epistles and Gospels, the Prayer of Humble Access, the Prayer of Thanksgiving, the Benediction, and even the placement of the Te Deum. The adjustments and enrichments were provided by Cardale's own liturgical studies, in which, most probably, Cardale must have made a detailed study of the publications of the Cambridge Camden Society, and also the illustrated books of
A. W. Pugin. The rewording of much of the familiar material derived from the *Book of Common Prayer* was not necessarily with the view to correction or improvement, but, with his training as a lawyer in mind, his biographer has suggested: "The slight modification of wording in virtually all the material drawn from the *Book of Common Prayer*, in the Eucharist as well as in other services, can best be accounted for as a means of avoiding the infringement of copyright."  

As well as the Liturgy, Cardale collaborated on the preparation of some services for the daily services, said on weekdays at six, nine, three, and five o'clock, and on Sundays at ten and two o'clock. These again show that components were freely drawn from the comparable Anglican services - the general confession and part of the general absolution, for example - but again the language was altered. Cardale said of the services:

The work of Christ in His own person, presenting His own atoning sacrifice and blood, and as our High Priest, the one and only Mediator, offering intercession, is commemorated and represented, yea, is on earth fulfilled, in the Office of the holy Eucharist, But in the Office for Morning and Evening Prayer, it is not only this work of Christ in His own person which is represented and fulfilled; but, in the first place, the work of the Holy Ghost proceeding from Christ, and acting through the principal members of His body, the ordinances of the Church: and then ... the Lord, as Head of the Body, is seen in the Angel, as head of the particular body, fulfilling that ministry of intercession which belongs exclusively to His office as High Priest.

This particular understanding conformed to His understanding of the general principles found in Old Testament types and prophecy, where the daily burnt offering was integral to confession and absolution, and where supplication, intercession and thanksgiving were identified with the burning of incense on the golden altar, and Aaron's entry into the tabernacle to trim and light
the lamps. These acts, coupled with the required reading from Holy Scripture and the psalm sung in praise of God, were elements of the acceptable morning and evening service for the Jews, and the Catholic Apostolic Church moved towards their approximation as that required in the new dispensation no less than the old.

Linked with this movement towards a Catholic liturgy on Anglican lines was one to devise its symbolic expression, and here too Anglicanism - and in particular, Tractarianism - provided the definitive example. Toward the end of 1845 and until early in 1850, signs of depression and discouragement pervaded the Catholic Apostolic Church. This was partially because of declining numbers, and partially because of the increased strife over some ritualistic advances. None of the "Apostles", nor any of the "angels" (Ministers), had risen to the social prominence or public eloquence of Irving, none had the learning or the command of controversiality of Newman or Pusey. The Catholic Apostolic Church had not grown to the extent anticipated; its foreign outreach had proved to be a great disappointment. With the righteous anger that had been generated over Tract XC, and with the secession of Newman; with the ritual troubles beginning in the Establishment, and with the anti-papal sentiment building to its 1850 explosion, the advancement of a Catholic tenor in the Irvingite sect was not about to meet with much popularity or success. Nor did it help the cause when, in 1847, Drummond withdrew from active service in the Church, and was returned as a member, to the House of Commons.

The ritual troubles surrounded a few of the "angels" who had extended various forms and rituals, without awaiting Apostolic sanction, and, in 1846, when the matter was formally decided, the Apostles had adopted such an intermediate course as to leave many, on both sides of the question, dissatisfied. It is of significance that the
Irvingites, no less than the Church of England, knew ritual controversies. The ritual development in both Communions was far from being generally popular, and - in the Catholic Apostolic Church, more especially - it was not likely to reverse the trend of declining numbers. The assumption of an almost despotic power by the Apostles, and chiefly by Cardale in his direct control of London after 1846, allowed - in fact, almost required - the introduction of the new Liturgy and vestments.

The new Liturgy and the vestments introduced in 1842, were inspired by the "Apostles" continental exposure, and included, for all altar-centred services, the alb, stole, and chasuble, and copes for the presiding "angel". In 1846, a surplice with a rochette and mozette were added for preaching. By 1845 "holy oil" was in use for the anointing of the sick and those being ordained, and the traditional seasons of the Christian Year were being observed. In 1847 "sealing", a form of Apostolic rite of confirmation into the elect 144,000 of the "Revelation", was introduced (although two of the Apostles refused to participate in such "sealing"). In 1850 the reserved Sacrament was commended, and this not only with a view to its consumption, but also in Cardale's words:

... of proposition before the Lord: by this was expressed the spiritual truth, symbolized by the table of shew-bread, or bread of proposition, under the Law. It was directed, that at morning and evening services, immediately before the supplications, the Angel should go up to the altar, and taking the holy vessels containing the Bread and Wine out of the tabernacle, should spread them reverently before the Lord; not proposing them to the people as an object of adoration, but as an expression in symbol, afterwards to be declared in word, that our whole trust is in the all-sufficient sacrifice of Jesus, and that it is in His name we offer up our prayers, and for His sake only expect an answer. By the reservation of these symbols upon the altar, the people are continually assured of the Presence of the Lord, which alone gives sanctity, and designates the house where they assemble as His; while the daily
Reserved Sacrament required that every Irvingite Church possess a thurible for burning the accompanying incense, and also at least two lamps and a tabernacle in which the Sacrament was to be housed.

The waning enthusiasm required an exaggerated statement of faith, and in 1850 the Catholic Apostolic Church announced plans for the building of a great new centre of worship in London - the Gordon Square Church. It is not surprising that the Anglican Ecclesiologists were worried when they heard that Raphael Brandon had been commissioned to design a church of cathedral size and "of some architectural pretension", in Gordon Square; it was to be bigger and more ornate than any new Anglican Church, and built on their own principles. Brandon had captivated the professional world in 1847 with his published work *An Analysis of Gothic Architecture*, fully illustrated in minute detail even to the treatment of wood-work and metal-work. One nineteenth century chronicler of the Gothic Revival has said that it was these "early and untiring researches . . . which enabled him at a later period to raise one of the grandest and most effective modern churches which have marked the Revival - the 'Apostolic' Church in Gordon Square London".

The opening of the new building at Christmas, 1853, was extensively reported by the newspapers, who described the splendour of the Early English, or First Pointed, style of Gothic building, but who were left puzzled by the exotic ritualism. *The Ecclesiologist* devoted a five page article to the subject in their April, 1854, issue. After a detailed account of the "paraphernalia of worship" contained in "this complex edifice", which obviously left the Ecclesiologists confused (and maybe not just a little envious), *The Ecclesiologist* summarised it as a "novel
"delusion", adding: "If we permit ourselves to be led away by the outward splendour and skin-deep conformities of the subtle antagonist, we shall become accomplices in all the mischief which it plans against the genuine Catholic Apostolic Church."

The nave of the lofty cruciform church was filled with open seats and contained the pulpit. The choir rose in three levels: the lowest contained the various "lecterns" for said services; the middle contained the elders' stalls and a seat for the "angel", reminiscent in style to a bishop's cathedra; and on the uppermost level was placed the altar, standing on a footpace and made of alabaster, richly carved, gilded, and coloured. Fixed atop the altar was a large brass tabernacle; but no other furnishings were placed on the altar except a richly bound Gospel-book. Two brass oil lamps stood either side of the altar (candles were not permitted), and the consecrated oil for them was stored, along with the reserved Sacrament, in the Tabernacle. Six stalls were placed on either side of the sanctuary for use by the "Apostles" when present. A faldstool, from which the "angel" offered the intercessions, and the standing incense burner which accompanied it, were situated in the midst of the sanctuary. An eastern chapel was located behind the altar, but it had no direct access from the main church. It was intended only for solemn assemblies of the "Apostles", and also for the Eucharist celebration before the monthly meeting of the seven London churches. The entrance to the Church from Gordon Square was through cloisters, about which were housed in apartments the clergy and deacons of the Church.

It has been pointed out that it is doubtful if even this "cathedral" of Irvingism ever mustered the required total of officials - one "angel", six elders, six prophets, six evangelists, six pastors, and seven deacons - not to mention the acolytes, sub-deacons, deaconesses, lay assistants and choristers [39] - all of whom wore cassocks
differentiated by colour. The Eucharistic vestments, in
despite of this use of colour, were always white (except
on Good Friday and days of humiliation, when black or
violet were ordered).

Holy water was only introduced in 1868, and it was
concerning this that Cardale said: "... any increase in
outward forms is a serious call upon us for growth in
spiritual life and earnestness of devotion. Vain it is to
add to outward observances, unless faith and godliness,
reverence and piety and devotedness are proportionally
brought into exercise." By this time the churches were
more richly furnished, the ritual and ceremonial more
ornate, the rubrics more intricate, than anyone - maybe
Irving especially - would have dreamed possible or
desirable thirty-five years previous.

Much of the symbolism of the ceremonial was revealed
in Drummond's Principles of Ecclesiastical Buildings and
Ornaments, which was published in 1851. The illustrations
were mostly adapted or copied from Pugin's works, and the
descriptions reflected Drummond's and Cardale's under­
standing of the purity of early worship being aimed at,
free alike from all later accretions and perversions. As
Cardale in the Liturgy had deliberately adopted the
Anglican rather than the Roman rite, because of his dis­
like of Romanism and its attendant corruptions, so Drummond
in this book stated: "True taste is the expression of true
feeling, and where there is no principle at the bottom,
there is no feeling to express. Hence the 'histrionic
mummeries' and mockeries of Popish rites, almost as much
destructive of Christian worship as the baldness of the
conventicle." With the symbolism of the Catholic Apostolic Church
so far advanced, it is perhaps not surprising that many
early Ritualists, persecuted in the Church of England,
changed allegiance. In fact, the alarm felt within the
Tractarian element of the Church of England over
defections, or clergy with shared loyalties, was clearly
evidenced by the section entitled "Irvingism" in The Old Church Porch periodical of 1862. The section was written by Pusey himself, and evidenced not only his great learning and zeal for the Church of England as THE Catholic Church in England, but also his inability to understand any non-Anglican body. But in addressing the new threat of Irvingism, Pusey was probably right if he thought it had the capacity to seriously jeopardise the Oxford Movement; and that because the Irvingites evidenced their complete captivation by that very strand of Anglicanism which Pusey represented - "Apostolicity", to the extinction of practically all remaining traces of its earlier Presbyterianism. Whereas Irving remained throughout a loyal son of the Church of Scotland, his successors had no such loyalty, and quickly approximated to Oxford's interpretation of Catholic ideals. But the early interpretation was defective; it led to bad history, poor theology, and introverted values.

The "Apostles" in their taking to themselves absolute ecclesiastical authority had necessarily silenced the voice of prophecy. The death of one of the "Apostles" in 1855, initiated the inevitable and final decline; for without the "prophets" there could be no new "Apostles". One by one the "Apostles" died, and were not replaced, until in 1901, with the death of the last, the end of the "Restored Apostolate" came. That higher category of apostolical authority which the Irvingites had shared with the Tractarians was left a dead letter; the Catholicity Irving had alluded to and the Apostolicity Cardale had actualised were left frustrated and paralysed. As Newman had at one point placed complete confidence in the Anglican bishops, and had been broken by their declaring against him, so the Irvingites had placed complete confidence in the "Apostles", and were left similarly destitute. Later Tractarians, who had already learned to distrust all human agencies in their quest for Catholicity, could not but have been confirmed in that position by this
further experience. Pusey indeed looked to Apostolic Authority, but that not in individual bishops, but by Canon and Council. Newman had argued as a Roman Catholic that this Anglican position was untenable, for it rested on the Apostles and ancient consent, to the exclusion of Catholicity and universal consent; that its appeal to antiquity was simply the pedant's surly enjoyment of his right to private judgment. 44

Seen in terms of the Irvingite conception of authority, the Tractarian position proved strong and durable because it was variegated. The position of Tract I, which limited authority to apostolic descent and the bishops, proved to be bad strategy, and had to be softened by the addition of a more comprehensive Catholicism. Later Tractarian authority was to be found at once in Apostolic Succession and the bishops; in Apostolicity acknowledged in Council and Antiquity; in the coetus fidelium with formal organisation, unity of jurisdiction, continuity of existence, and national character; in the power it exhibited to foster the life of holiness. This was the Tractarian attempt at clothing Carlyle's saying, "true guidance in return for loving obedience, did he but know it, is man's prime need".

The Irvingites, too, had tried to accept Carlyle's insight, but in that they had committed themselves absolutely to one finite aspect of "apostolicity", they had left no logical ground for reinterpretation. Within Irvingism there was no possibility of apostolic "succession" in any sense. The worthy Liturgy, with its lofty Catholic ideal, remains the sole intelligible legacy of that misguided allegiance to the higher category which they had shared with the Oxford Movement - religious authoritarianism through Apostolicity. Interestingly, in the Catholic Apostolic Church the ability to define authority had not guaranteed continuity.

The thesis that Irvingism was an "analogue" of the Oxford Movement breaks down. It was based upon an awareness of a higher "efficient" cause which was common to
both movements, and an assertion that there were no visible links of interaction. It treated the Oxford Movement as deriving primarily from certain "formal" causes. There is no reason to believe that the beginnings of the Oxford Movement were so narrowly delimited; it seems clear that the Oxford Movement had been well aware of the "efficient" cause no less than the "formal" cause, and had, in fact, prepared its programme of Catholic reform to deal with precisely this aspect by instilling the Church with divine authority and all rights which flow from that authority. The bishop was the locus of authority not because of the State's recognition, but because of his succession to the divine Apostolic Commission. The development of features not dissimilar to these in the Catholic Apostolic Church had little to do with Edward Irving. It was through the person of John Bate Cardale that the traditional aspects of Catholicity found practical expression in the Irvingite sect, and these were Tractarian affected in both definition and application. Because of this, it might reasonably be held that Irvingism was in fact a successor to the Oxford Movement.
NOTES

1. P. Butler, "Irvingism as an Analogue of the Oxford Movement", in Church History, Vol. 6 (June 1937), 101-112.


5. DNB (London, 1892), XXIX, 53.


8. For John McLeod Campbell's teaching, cf. his classic work, published some thirty-five years after the deposition, The Nature of the Atonement and its Relation to Remission of Sins and Eternal Life (Cambridge, 1856).

9. Cf. Whitley, op. cit., 30. The charge that was brought against him was "... that he had allowed public services to be interrupted by persons not members or licentiates of the Church of Scotland".

10. DNB, op. cit., 55.


16. Ibid., 58.

17. Quoted in Miller, op. cit., I, 180.

18. For accounts refer to works cited supra, n. 3.


20. Lancaster, op. cit.
24. Ibid., 90.
25. Ibid., 64.
26. Ibid., 178. Cardale's chief sources were probably Jacques Gou's Euchologion (publ. 1647), Merati's eighteenth century edition of Thesaurus sacramorum rituum by Bartolommeo Gavanti (publ. 1736-38), Cardinal Bona's Rerum Liturgicarum libri duo (publ. 1671), and Edmond Martene's four volume work Die Antiquis Ecclesiæ Vitibus editio secundus (publ. 1735-38).
27. Ibid., 188.
28. Ibid.
29. Ibid., 189.
30. Ibid., 190.
32. Ibid.; also, Lancaster, op. cit., 196.
33. Cardale, Readings, I, 385f.
34. Miller, op. cit., I, 252.
35. Chronicle, 39, quoted, ibid., 257f.
36. Quoted in Miller, op. cit., I, 269.
42. Cf. Shaw, op. cit., 40, n. 9. The leading subject of the periodical was "The Church's Broken Unity", and although Irvingism was introduced, Presbyterianism had led the way for its consideration. Cf. Miller, op. cit., I, 273.
43. Ibid., 241.
CHILDREN'S CHRISTMAS SERVICE IN AN ESTABLISHED CHURCH.

The following rather long account which appeared in the Aberdeen Daily Free Press of the 26th ult., is so unusually interesting that we are sure its length will be excused by our readers. We doubt if so effective a children's service was held in any of our own churches on Christmas Day—

From correspondence which has recently appeared in our columns readers will doubtless be aware that some changes have recently taken place in connection with the conduct of matters in the Established East Church, Aberdeen. A visit to the church will enable anyone to verify the statement that a small chapel has been fitted up in Collinson's aisle, and furnished with a very neat and artistic manner. It is divided from the open portion of the aisle by a screen which extends from each wall, dividing a large space in the centre. Within this screen a number of beautifully finished wooden seats or benches, furnished with nicely fitted kneeling cushions, have been placed; and probably some thirty or forty persons could sit or kneel—if that is the approved posture—at a time. In front of these seats there is an elevated dais, covered with crimson cloth, to which one ascends by a step. On this dais—taking that to be the proper term—it is placed a large table draped in crimson cloth, like the covering of the dais. The "table," at its west end, is placed a brass reading stand, well polished, and of very attractive design. It carried no book or missal yesterday. Below the east and west ends of the "table" are two kneeling stools very nicely padded. A little way off from the "table" on the east side and to the front of the dais is a little lectern, or perhaps pulpit, very prettily carved, and bearing on each side a candle, both of which appear to have been lighted and in recent use. The candles may have been lit to enable the open Bible which the lectern carries to be read, though it is not easy to see any need for this, the window immediately behind being a very large Gothic one, while the chapel, it is understood, is used during the day only.

On Saturday afternoon a special service—which has been in rehearsal for some time—took place in the East Church. The children connected with the congregation, as well as with other congregations, have been in training for some time, and there could be little doubt as to the skill and care which have been bestowed upon them. They were supplied with a text book in a little work, which is titled "Christmas OFFER for Children," and which seems to have been prepared by some one specially for the occasion. They also had the assistance of an augmented choir, and had it not been for some objections that were urged in certain quarters as to the propriety of introducing brass bands into an Established Presbyterian place of worship, they would have been aided by the brass band of the Boys' and Girls' Hospital. The want of the band, however, in no way detracted from the freshness and novelty of the service. The children occupied the area of the church, and the gallery was very well filled by interested spectators. Rev. J. Cooper, pastor of the congregation, having ascended the pulpit, the service began in this wise, "all standing":

Minister. The Lord be with you, children. And with thy Spirit.

Following came the hymn, "While humble Shepherds," at the close of which came the following:

M. O come let us worship and bow down; and kneel before the Lord our Maker.
M. Let us pray.

"Then all together," said one prayer, the minister following with a second, after which the whole of those present recited the Lord's prayer—the "Amen" of the prayers being admirably intoned. This is what followed:

M. O Lord, show thy mercy upon us:
C. And grant us Thy salvation.
M. Bless, O Lord, Thy Holy Catholic Church;
C. Which is from one end of the earth to the other.
M. O Lord, save the Queen.
C. And mercifully hear us when we call upon Thee.
M. Endue Thy ministers with righteousness.
C. And make Thy people joyful.
M. O Lord, save Thy children.
C. And bless Thine inheritance.
M. Give peace in our time, O Lord.
C. Because there is none other that fighteth for us, but only Thou, O God.
M. O God, make clean our hearts within us.
C. And take not Thy Holy Spirit from us.

Succeeding this came a prayer from the minister, then a sentence addressed by the minister to the children, and a reply from them, and after that the beautiful hymn "Hark! the herald angels sing." At the close of the hymn came the following:

M. Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son;
C. And shall call His name Emmanuel.
M. Unto us a Child is born;
C. Unto us a Son is given;
M. And the government shall be upon His shoulder;
C. And His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor,
M. The mighty God.
C. The everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.

M. O Immanuel, our King and Lawgiver, the Desire of all Nations, and their Saviour.
C. Come, and save us, O Lord our God.
M. Glory be to the Father, and to the Son: and to the Holy Ghost; as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be: world without end. Amen.
C. Lift up your hearts.
M. We lift them up unto the Lord.
C. Let us give thanks unto our Lord God.
M. It is meet and right so to do.

The minister then gave thanks, another hymn was sung, and the Magnificat, according to the Church of England service, was rendered by the minister and children very pleasingly and perfectly. The "first lesson" and the "second lesson" were read by the minister, a hymn, of which the following is the first verse, coming between:

The first Nowell the Angel did say,
Was to certain poor shepherds in fields as they lay; in fields where they lay keeping their sheep,
On a cold winter's night that was so deep.

Nowell, Nowell, Nowell, Nowell,
Born is the King of Israel.

The Apostles' Creed was next recited "all standing," another hymn was sung, and then Mr Cooper preached a short and appropriate sermon on the subject of Christmas Day. The sermon having been finished, another novelty was introduced in the collection of the "offering" by a number of young laids, who went from seat to seat carrying small bags in red and black cloth for the reception of the contributions of the audience. When the money had been collected this followed:

Let us pray.
M. Lord, have mercy upon us.
C. Christ, have mercy upon us.
M. Lord, have mercy upon us.

[Then came a very beautiful Litany, which we hold over till next week, as it is too good to be abbreviated, and we have no room to give it now in full.]

After an appropriate prayer, the last hymn was sung, and the Benediction was pronounced "all kneeling." Mr Cooper throughout the service at various passages intoned in a highly artistic way, all the "Amen" as already stated, were intoned sweetly, and the final "Amen" was executed in a very striking fashion. The collection was in aid of the Jewish Children's Mission. The reason for this fund being selected was, as mentioned by Mr Cooper, that Christ was Himself the child of Jewish parents. (Surely the plural here is a slip of the reporter's. — Ed. J. G.)
The following is the Litany, used at the Children's Christmas Service in Aberdeen, which we described last week:—

I. O Holy Jesus, One with the Father and the Holy Ghost,
Ch. Have mercy upon us.
II. O Holy Jesus, our elder Brother,
Ch. Have mercy upon us.
III. O Holy Jesus, Giver of Life, yet fed from Thy mother's breast,
Ch. Have mercy upon us.
IV. O Holy Jesus, Lord of heaven and earth, yet lying in a manger,
Ch. Have mercy upon us.
V. O Holy Jesus, clothed with glory, yet wrapped in swaddling clothes,
Ch. Have mercy upon us.
VI. O Holy Jesus, King of kings, and Lord of lords, yet housed in a stable,
Ch. Have mercy upon us.
VII. O Holy Jesus, Strong in Thy Weakness,
Ch. Have mercy upon us.
VIII. O Holy Jesus, Author of the blessings of heaven,
Ch. Have mercy upon us.
IX. O Holy Jesus, Healer of the sufferings of earth,
Ch. Have mercy upon us.
X. From all chain of sin,
Ch. Good Lord, deliver us.
XI. From the snares of the devil,
Ch. Good Lord, deliver us.
XII. From pride, lying, and disobedience,
Ch. Good Lord, deliver us.
XIII. From obstinacy, perverseness, and hardness of heart,
Ch. Good Lord, deliver us.
XIV. By the holy Incarnation,
Ch. Save us, O Christ.
XV. By Thy lowly Birth,
Ch. Save us, O Christ.
XVI. By the Offerings of the Wise Men,
Ch. Save us, O Christ.
XVII. By Thy Presentation in the Temple,
Ch. Save us, O Christ.
XVIII. By Thy Flight into Egypt,
Ch. Save us, O Christ.
XIX. By Thine Obedience to Thy Mother,
Ch. Save us, O Christ.
The Fourth Meeting was held on 21st April.

Before proceeding to the business of the evening, the Society went to the East Church of S. Nicholas to see a new Frontal and Super-frontal for the Holy Table, which have been presented by the ladies of the Congregation. The President, who exhibited the hangings, mentioned that the work had been executed from Mr. Kelly's designs, by two ladies, Miss Meston,—who did much the greater part, and Mrs. Milligan. The Frontal consists of white silk brocade traversed by a bold cross of rich red velvet bordered with gold. In the four panels thus formed are conventional roses, crowns, and foliage; at the two sides are gold silk orphreys bearing respectively the Rose and the Lily (Song of Solomon ii, 1) ; while at the four corners the emblems of the Four Evangelists appear on a gold ground. The Super-frontal, also of white brocade, has the words "Holy, Holy, Holy," with angel-heads between, set on wavy lines of gold, which suggest the aerial firmament in which the angels move. The gift as a whole is both costly and beautiful, and design and execution alike evoked the warm admiration of the Society. It was generally felt that a distinct advance had been made.
**SCOTTISH ECCLESIOLOGICAL SOCIETY.**

**Office**

**FOR THE ANNUAL MEETING.**

*All kneeling, let the Reader begin:—*

In the Name of the Father, and of the Holy Ghost

Then all together shall say the Lord's Prayer: Amen.

O God, make haste to help us

Then, all standing up, the Reader shall say:

V.—As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.

Praise be to Thee, O Lord, King of Eternal Glory


Thou shalt arise, and mercifully
Thou to Mount Zion shalt extend;
Her time for favour which was set,
Behold, is now come to an end.

Thy saints take pleasure in her stones,
Her very dust to them is dear.
All heathen lands, and kingly thrones
On earth Thy glorious name shall fear.

God in His glory shall appear,
When Zion He builds and repairs.
He shall regard and lead His ear,
Unto the needy's humble prayers:

Thy afflicted's prayer He will not scorn,
All times this shall be on record:
And generations yet unborn
Shall praise and magnify the Lord. Amen.

Then let the Reader say the Antiphon:

**Lord, I have loved the habitation of Thy House.**

Psalm lxxxiv. Quam Dilleta!

Then let the Reader say the Antiphon:

**Lord, I have loved the habitation of Thy House.**

Psalm lxxxiv. Quam Dilleta!

**Then let the Reader say the Antiphon:**

**Lord, I have loved the habitation of Thy House.**

Psalm lxxxiv. Quam Dilleta!

**Then let the Reader say the Antiphon:**

**Lord, I have loved the habitation of Thy House.**

Psalm lxxxiv. Quam Dilleta!

**Then let the Reader say the Antiphon:**

**Lord, I have loved the habitation of Thy House.**

Psalm lxxxiv. Quam Dilleta!
Thanks be to God.

Behold, I will lay thy stones with fair colours:

And lay the foundations with sapphires.

And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord.

And great shall be the peace of thy children.

And they shall build the old wastes.

They shall raise up the former desolations.

Turn us again, O Lord God of hosts.

Shew the light of Thy countenance, and we shall be whole.

[ADDRESS]

Let us pray.

LORD, have mercy upon us.

CHRIST, have mercy upon us.

LORD, have mercy upon us.

Collect for the Day.

Collect for the Society.

Almighty and Everlasting God, who of old didst fill with Thy Spirit in wisdom and understanding the builders of Thy tabernacle, Vouchsafe, we beseech Thee, Thy grace and blessing to Thy servants: enlighten, purify, direct, and sanctify them; and prosper all endeavours to do greater honour to Thy holy house, and to render the offering of our prayers and praises more worthy of Thy Divine Majesty. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the Holy Ghost, ever one God, world without end.

Amen.

Prevent us, O God, in all our doings with Thy most gracious favour, and further us with Thy continual help; that in all our works, begun, continued, and ended in Thee, we may glorify Thy holy Name, and finally by Thy mercy obtain everlasting life; through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Amen.

V. — The Lord be with you.
R. — And with thy spirit.
V. — Let us bless the Lord.
R. — Thanks be to God.
THE OFFICE OF THE HOLY COMMUNION.
SECOND SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Introit, Ps. 25.

v. Remember, O Lord, Thy tender mercies and Thy loving-kindnesses, for they have been ever of old.

r. Let not our enemies triumph over us; deliver us, O God of Israel, out of all our troubles.

v. Unto Thee, O Lord, do I lift up my soul.

r. O my God, I trust in Thee; let me not be ashamed.

v. Remember, O Lord, etc.

r. Let not our enemies, etc.

v. Glory be, etc.

r. As it was, etc.

v. Remember, O Lord, etc.

r. Let not our enemies, etc.

The General Confession.

(to be said by all)

Lord, have mercy upon us.

Christ, have mercy upon us.

Lord, have mercy upon us.

Almighty God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Maker of all things, Judge of all men: We acknowledge and bow down our manifold sins and wickedness, Which we from time to time most grievously have committed, By thought, word, and deed, Against Thy Divine Majesty, Provoking most justly Thy wrath and indignation against us. We do earnestly repent, And are heartily sorry for these our misdoings; The remembrance of them is grievous unto us; The burden of them is intolerable. Have mercy upon us. Have mercy upon us, most merciful Father; For Thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ's sake, Forgive us all that is past; And grant that we may ever hereafter serve and please Thee in newness of life, To the honour and glory of Thy Name, Through Jesus Christ our Lord. AMEN.

The Absolution.
The Collect.
The Epistle, 1 Thess. iv. 1-7.

The Creed.
I believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, And of all things visible and invisible . . .

The Offertory.

Hymn 317. Ps. 119, 41.

v. I will delight myself in Thy commandments, which I have loved.

r. My hands also will I lift up unto Thy commandments, which I have loved.

The Offertory Prayer.

v. The Lord be with you,

r. And with thy spirit.

v. Lift up your hearts.

r. We lift them up unto the Lord.

v. Let us give thanks unto our Lord God.

r. It is meet and right so to do.

It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty that we should at all times and in all places give thanks unto Thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God, through Christ our Lord, by Whom Angels praise Thy Majesty, Dominions adore Thee, Powers tremble before Thee, the Heavens and the Heavenly Hosts and the Blessed Seraphim join with one glad voice in extolling Thee. Together with whom we pray Thee suffer our voices to have entrance, humbly confessing Thee, and saying:

Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts; Heaven and earth are full of Thy glory; Osanna in the highest. Blessed is He that cometh in the Name of the Lord: Glory be to Thee, O Lord, in the highest. AMEN.

The Canon.

O Lamb of God, That taketh away the sins of the world,
Have mercy upon us.

O Lamb of God, That taketh away the sins of the world,
Have mercy upon us.

O Lamb of God, That taketh away the sins of the world,
Grant us Thy peace.

The Communion Hymn.
Ps. 5.

v. Give ear to my words, O Lord, consider my meditation.

r. Hearken unto the voice of my cry, my God, and my King, for unto Thee will I pray.

The Post-Communion Collect.
The Blessing.
THE OFFICE OF THE HOLY COMMUNION FOR THE DEDICATION FESTIVAL OF THE CHURCH OF S. MARGARET.

Dedicated on S. Margaret's Day, November 16, A.D. 1895.

THE INTROIT.

v. O Lord God of Hosts, how dreadful is this place.

n. This is the House of God, and this is the gate of heaven.

v. The Lord is King, and hath put on glorious apparel:

n. The Lord hath put on His apparel, and girded Himself with strength.

v. O Lord God of Hosts, how dreadful is this place.

n. This is the House of God, and this is the gate of heaven.

v. Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost.

n. As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.

v. O Lord God of Hosts, how dreadful is this place.

n. This is the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven.

THE GENERAL CONFESSION.

(To be said by all.)

Lord, have mercy upon us.

Christ, have mercy upon us.

Lord, have mercy upon us.

Almighty God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Maker of all things, Judge of all men: We acknowledge and bewail our manifold

sins and wickedness, Which we from time to time most grievously have committed, by thought, word, and deed, Against Thy Divine Majesty, Provoking most justly Thy wrath and indignation against us. We do earnestly repent, And are heartily sorry for these our misdoings; The remembrance of them is grievous unto us: The burden of them is intolerable. Have mercy upon us, Have mercy upon us, most merciful Father; For Thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ's sake, Forgive us all that is past; And grant that we may ever hereafter Serve and please Thee in newness of life, To the honour and glory of Thy Name, Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE ABSOLUTION.

(To be said by the Minister.)

The Almighty and Merciful Lord grant you pardon and forgiveness of all your sins, space for true repentance, amendment of life, and the grace and consolation of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

GLORIA IN EXCELSIS.

Glory be to God on high, and in earth peace, good will to men.

We praise Thee, we bless Thee, we worship Thee, we glorify Thee.

We give thanks to Thee, for Thy great glory, O Lord God, Heavenly King, God the Father, Almighty, mighty, O Lord the only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ; O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father, most High God, which hast taken away the sins of the world by Thy cross, O Lord what shall we say among Thy saints? Thou, who hast taken away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us. Thou, who hast taken away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us.

Thou only, art holy, Thou only, art Lord, Thou only, art Christ, with the Holy Ghost are most high in the glory of God the Father. Amen.

THE COLLECT.

O God, who restorast year by year the day of the dedication of this
Thy holy temple, and always permittest us to present ourselves in safety at the holy mysteries: hear the prayers of Thy people, and grant that whoever entereth into this temple to ask any blessing of Thee, may joyfully obtain all his petitions. Through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Almighty and everlasting God, Who hast given unto us, Thy servants, grace to be conformed to the image of Thy Son Jesus Christ, may shew forth our renewed brightness in our land.

Who livest and reignest, one God, world without end.

O God, who by the labours of Thy blessed servant, Margaret, Queen of Scots, didst cause the light of Thy Church to shine with a renewed brightness in our land; grant, we beseech Thee, that we, having her good works in perpetual remembrance, may shew forth our thankfulness to Thee for the same, by following the holy example which she hath left us; Through Jesus Christ our Lord, to Whom, with Thee, O Father, and Thee, O ever-blessed Spirit one God, be all honour and glory, world without end. Amen.

THE CREED.

I believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible:

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, Begotten of His Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God, Begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father; By Whom all things were made: Who for our sakes, and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate of the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man, and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate. He suffered and was buried, and the third day He rose again according to the Scriptures, And ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father. And He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead: Whose kingdom shall have no end.

And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life, Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, Who spake by the Prophets. And I believe one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins, and I look for the resurrection of the dead, And the life of the world to come. Amen.

THE OFFERTORY HYMN.

1 Jerusalem, my happy home!
   Name ever dear to me!
   When shall my labours have an end,
   In joy, and peace, and thee?

2 When shall these eyes thy heaven-built walls
   And pearly gates behold;
   Thy bulwarks with salvation strong,
   And cirruses of shining gold.
3 There happier bowers than Eden's bloom,
Nor sin nor sorrow know;
Blest seats! through rude and stormy scenes
I onward press to you.

4 Why should I shrink from pain and woe,
Or feel at death dismay?
I've Canaan's goodly land in view
And realms of endless day.

5 Apostles, martyrs, prophets, there
Around my Saviour stand;
And soon my friends in Christ below
Will join the glorious band.

6 Jerusalem, my happy home!
My soul still pants for thee:
Then shall my labours have an end,
When I thy joys shall see. Amen.

The Offertory.

v. O Lord God, as for me, in the willingness of my heart have I offered all these things.

n. And now have I seen with joy Thy people which are here to offer willingly unto Thee.

v. O Lord God of Israel, keep this willingness forever in the heart of Thy people.

n. And build up within them the living temple of the Lord.

The Offertory Prayers.

Grant, we beseech Thee, O Lord, our petition that, whatsoever we be who are met within the walls of this church, whereof we celebrate the Dedication Anniversary, we may please Thee with full and perfect devotion both of body and soul; that while we pay those our present vows, we may, with Thy help, be counted worthy to attain unto the everlasting reward. Through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Sanctify, we beseech Thee, O Lord God, Holy Trinity, by the invocation of Thy Holy Name, the offering of this oblation; and through it perfect us to be an eternal offering wholly consecrated unto Thee; Through Jesus Christ our Lord.

We offer Thee, O Lord, our gifts and prayers; let them come up before Thee with the prayers of all Saints; and of Thy mercy minister to our salvation; Through Jesus Christ our Lord; to Whom, with Thee, O Father, and Thee, O ever-blessed Spirit, one God, be all honour and glory, world without end. Amen.

The Thanksgiving.

v. The Lord be with you.

n. And with thy spirit.

v. Lift up your hearts.

n. We lift them up unto the Lord.

v. Let us give thanks unto our Lord God.

n. It ismeet and right so to do.

It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty that we should at all times and in all places give thanks unto Thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God, through Christ our Lord. For whose sake we supplicate and entreat Thee that this altar, which we have prepared for holy uses, Thou wouldest continually bless and sanctify; and make Thee that didst in Thy wondrous condescension accept the oblation of the high priest Melchizedek so Thou wouldest always accept the gifts laid upon this altar, that by the help of the blessed Trinity and the ministration of Thy good angels, Thy people who assemble in the holy habitation of this church, being preserved by the heavenly consecration of these gifts, may obtain also the eternal salvation of their souls. And therefore with Angels and Archangels, with thrones and dominions, and with all the host of heaven we sing the hymn of Thy glory, evermore saying:—

Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Hosts:
Heaven and earth are full of Thy glory: O—sauna—in the highest.
Blessed is He that cometh in the Name of the Lord:
Glory be to Thee, O Lord, in the highest—A. — — — men.

The Canon.

Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church.

Almighty and ever-living God, who by Thy holy Apostles hast taught us to make prayers and supplications and to give thanks for all men; We humbly beseech Thee most mercifully to receive those our prayers, which we offer unto Thy Divine Majesty, beseeching Thee to inspire continually the Catholic Church with the spirit of,
truth, unity, and concord; and grant that all they that do confess Thy holy Name, may agree in the truth of Thy holy Word, and live in unity and godly love. Specially we beseech Thee to save and defend Thy servant Victoria our Queen, that under her we may be godly and quietly governed. And grant unto her whole council, and to all that are put in authority under her, that they may truly and indifferently minister justice, to the punishment of wickedness and vice, and to the maintenance of Thy true religion and virtue. Give grace to all Thy ministering servants that they may both by their life and doctrine show forth Thy true and lively word, and rightly and duly administer Thy Holy Sacraments: and to all Thy people give Thy heavenly grace, that with meek heart and due reverence they may hear and receive Thy holy word, truly serving Thee in holiness and righteousness all the days of their life: And we most humbly beseech Thee of Thy goodness, O Lord, to comfort and succour all them, who in this transitory life are in trouble, sorrow, need, sickness, or any other adversity. And especially we commend unto Thy merciful goodness this congregation which is here assembled in Thy Name, to celebrate the Commemoration of the Death of Thy Son: and here we do give Thee most high praise and hearty thanks, for the wonderful grace and virtue, declared in all Thy saints, from the beginning of the world: and chiefly in the most glorious Virgin Mary, mother of Thy Son, Jesus Christ our Lord and God, and in the holy Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, and Martyrs, whose examples, O Lord, and steadfastness in Thy faith, and keeping Thy holy commandments, grant us to follow. We command unto Thy mercy, O Lord, all other Thy servants, who are departed hence from us with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the shop of peace: Grant unto them, we beseech Thee, Thy mercy and everlasting peace, and that, at the day of the general resurrection, we and all they which be of the mystical body of Thy Son may altogether be set on his right hand, and hear that his most joyful voice: Come unto me, O ye that be blessed of my Father, and possess the kingdom, which is prepared for you from the beginning of the world; Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake, our only Mediator and Advocate.

The Conssecration.

O God, Heavenly Father, who of Thy tender mercy didst give Thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption, who made there, by His one oblation once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, and did institute, and in His holy gospel command us to celebrate, a perpetual memory of that His precious death, until His coming again: Hear us, O Merciful Father, we beseech Thee; and with Thy Holy Spirit and word, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ. Who in the same night that He was betrayed took bread, and when He had blessed and given thanks, He brake it, and gave it to His disciples, saying: Take, eat, This is My Body which is given for you, do this in remembrance of Me.

Likewise after supper He took the cup, and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them saying: drink ye all of this; for this is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many, for remission of sins: do this as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of Me.

The Oration.

Wherefore, O Lord and Heavenly Father, according to the Institution of Thy dearly beloved Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, we Thy humble servants do celebrate, and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make, having in remembrance His blessed Passion, mighty Resurrection, and glorious Ascension, rendoring unto Thee most hearty thanks, for the innumerable benefices procured unto us by the same; entirely desiring Thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching Thee to grant, that by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His Blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His Passion. And we humbly entreat Thee, Almighty God, command these things to be carried by the hand of Thy holy angel, to Thy altar on high, before the sight of Thy Divine Majesty, that as many of us as shall by partaking at this altar receive the most sacred Body and Blood of Thy Son, may be fulfilled with all grace and heavenly benediction. And here we offer and present unto Thee, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee; humbly beseeching Thee, that Thou wouldest graciously look upon us; not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Christ, our Lord, by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto Thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. Amen.

As our Saviour Christ hath commanded, and taught us, we are bold to say:—"Our Father, which art in heaven, Hallowed be Thy name.
The Communion Hymn.

v. My house shall be called the house of prayer, saith the Lord: and in it he that seeketh receiveth. Amen.

r. And he that seeketh findeth. And to him that knocketh it shall be opened.

The Post-Communion Collects.

O God, Who hast deigned to call Thy Church Thy Spouse, that she who had obtained grace through her steadfast faith should also gain honour in name; grant that all this people, who serve Thy name, may be found worthy to have a share in that title. Through Jesus Christ our Lord.

May the receiving of this Sacrament, O Lord, our God, and the confession of the Everlasting Trinity, and of the undivided unity of the same, be profitable to us for the salvation of body and soul: through Jesus Christ, our Lord.

Grant, we beseech Thee, O Lord, that through the partaking of this Sacrament, Thy faithful people may ever rejoice in the fellowship of all Saints, and be aided by their unceasing prayers: through Jesus Christ, our Lord; to whom, with Thee O Father, and Thee, O ever blessed Spirit, one God, be all honour and glory, world without end. Amen.

Let the obedient performance of our bounden duty be pleasing unto Thee, O Holy Trinity, and grant that this Memorial which we, unworthy as we are, have offered in the sight of Thy Majesty, may be acceptable unto Thee; and may, through Thy mercy, obtain Thy favour for ourselves, and all those in whose behalf we have offered it; Who livest and reignest God, world without end. Amen.

The Peace and Blessing.

The Peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God, and of His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord. And the Blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be amongst you, and remain with you alway. Amen.
APPENDIX G

James Cooper's handwritten comments (pencil) on the Assembly's proceedings in the Barnhill Case. As found in Cooper's copy of Church of Scotland Assembly Papers, 1902, First Issue, reverse of p. 151, lodged in St. Andrews University Library. (Church of Scotland Pamphlets, BV4241.S7). Inscription reads: "This volume was given by Mrs. Cooper to the Rev. Dr. John Wilson Baird, Old Aberdeen, September, 1946.")

Transcription:

Recall the deliverance speech - but should have come after a libel that had been proved.
   condemns practices which he will not particularise
   general usage
to be condemned not by law, but by common sense,
   and I claim for myself and for every other minister of the Church of Scotland, to be judged by the law of the Church of Scotland

Would he say it of S. Giles'?

architectural progress
tawdry and meretricious are the last words that could be used of S. Margaret's.

Doctrine . . . 144 . . Make the service popular: Mr. Adamson thought only of God's glory.

[see over...]
Office

for the

ANNUAL VISIT TO GLASGOW CATHEDRAL.

All standing, let the Minister say:
Our help is in the Name of the LORD:
Response—Who made heaven and earth.
V.—O LORD, open Thou our lips:
R.—And our mouth shall shew forth Thy praise.
V.—O LORD, make speed to save us.
R.—O LORD, make haste to help us.
V.—Glory be to the FATHER, and to the SON, and to the HOLY GHOST:
R.—As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. AMEN.
V.—Praise be to Thee, O LORD.
R.—King of eternal Glory. Alleluia.
Then shall be sung:

Psalm xix. (verses 1-4, 7, 6);
The heavens God's glory do declare,
The skies His hands works preach;
Day utters speech to day,
And night to night doth knowledge teach.
There is no speech nor tongue to which
Their voice doth not extend;
Their line is gone through all the earth,
Their words to the end of the world.
God's law is perfect, and converts
The soul in sin that lies;
God's testimony is most sure,
And makes the simple wise,
Then shall the Minister say this Antiphon:
The saints shall go from strength unto strength.
Then shall be sung, or said alternately, the following Psalm:

Psalm lxxxix.

How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord of hosts! My soul longeth, yea, even fainteth for the courts of the Lord; my heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God.

Yea, the sparrow hath found an house, and the swallow a nest for herself, where she may lay her young, even thine altars, O Lord of hosts, my King, and my God.

Blessed art thou that dwellest in the house of the Lord; in whose heart are the ways of the Lord.

Who passeth through the valley of Baca maketh it a well; in the rain also filleth the pools.

They go from strength to strength; every one of them in ZIon speakesteth with me, saith the Lord.

O Lord God of hosts, hear my prayer: give ear, O God, to the voice of Jacob.

Behold, O Lord, our shield; and look upon the face of thine anointed.

For a day in thy courts is better than a thousand; yea, I had rather be a door-keeper in the house of my God, than to dwell in the tents of wickedness.

For the Lord God is a sun and shield; the Lord will give grace and glory; he will not withhold any good thing that is in his hand.

O Lord of hosts, blessed art thou that dost keep the testimonies of Jacob.

Glory be, etc.

Then shall all together repeat the Antiphon:
The saints shall go from strength to strength; the God of Gods shall be seen in Zion. Alleluia!

V.—In the ways of the Lord, how great is the glory of the Lord!
E.—The way of the just is made plain and the path of the saints hath been prepared. Alleluia!
By the sending of the Holy Ghost, the Comforter.
O Lord, deliver us.
Holy Father, we sinners do beseech Thee to hear us.
Holy Father, we sinners do beseech Thee to hear us.
That Thou wouldest grant us peace and concord,
We beseech Thee to hear us.
That Thou wouldest grant us perseverance in every good work,
We beseech Thee to hear us.
That Thou wouldest grant us true repentance,
We beseech Thee to hear us.
That Thou wouldest grant us that peace which the world cannot give,
We beseech Thee to hear us.
That Thou wouldest grant us zeal in Thy holy service,
We beseech Thee to hear us.
That Thou wouldest grant us all Christian people peace and unity,
We beseech Thee to hear us.
That thou wouldest deign to preserve and increase the Catholic Church,
We beseech Thee to hear us.
That Thou wouldest keep and guard the whole clergy and people of this realm,
We beseech Thee to hear us.
That Thou wouldest guide and defend Edward our King, and all his hosts,
We beseech Thee to hear us.
That Thou wouldest grant him victory and long life,
We beseech Thee to hear us.
That Thou wouldest keep all the congregations of Thy people in the true Faith and godliness,
We beseech Thee to hear us.
That Thou wouldest bless this City and give Thine angels charge over it,
We beseech Thee to hear us.
That Thou wouldest dwell in this Cathedral, builded for Thine honour,
We beseech Thee to hear us.
That Thou wouldest prosper our University as a School of Religion and Learning,
We beseech Thee to hear us.
That Thou wouldest recompense everlastingly good things to all our benefactors,
We beseech Thee to hear us.
That Thou wouldest pity us;
Son of God, we beseech Thee to hear us.
That Thou wouldest have mercy upon us;
Son of God, we beseech Thee to hear us.

That Thou wouldest grant our prayer;
Son of God, we beseech Thee to hear us.
O Lamb of God: Which taketh away the sins of the world,
Hast mercy upon us.
O Lamb of God: Which taketh away the sins of the world,
Grant us Thy peace.
Christ conquereth; Christ reigneth; Christ ruleth.
Christ conquereth; Christ reigneth; Christ ruleth.
O Christ, hear us.
O Christ, hear us.
Lord, have mercy upon us.
Christ, have mercy upon us.
Christ, have mercy upon us.
Lord, have mercy upon us.
Lord, have mercy upon us.
O Christ, grant us Thy grace.
O Christ, grant us Thy grace.
O Christ, fill us with joy and peace.
O Christ, fill us with joy and peace.
O Christ, grant us life and salvation.
O Christ, grant us life and salvation.

Our Father, Which art in Heaven, Hallowed be Thy Name;
Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven;
Give us this day our daily bread; And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us; And lead us not into temptation; But deliver us from evil; For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

[Almighty God, the Giver of life, we render thanks unto Thee for the wondrous grace shewn forth in Thine accepted servants, the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors, Virgins, and all the Saints who now rest with Thee in Paradise. We pray Thee to grant us pardon and forgiveness of all our sins, the increase of Thy heavenly grace, and Thine effectual help against all the snares of our enemies, visible and invisible, inasmuch as our hearts also are given up wholly to Thy service; that when this mortal life is ended we see the face and glory of Thy saints in the Kingdom of God, and rejoice with them in our most glorious Lord, Jesus Christ, to Whom be honour, and power, and dominion with the Father and the Holy Ghost throughout all ages. Amen.]

[Here may follow a Short Lesson of Holy Scripture; with the Response—
Thanks be to God.]
Then shall be said the Prayers following:

The Collect of the Day.
A Prayer for the City of Glasgow.

V.—Except the Lord keep the city: 
R.—The watchman waketh but in vain.

Let Thy blessing, O Lord, rest upon this city of our habitation, that it may ever flourish through the preaching of Thy holy Word; mercifully banish from it all strife and evil; and grant that we and all who dwell in it may walk in truth, abound in the love of Thy holy Name, in brotherly kindness one toward another, and in charity to all men; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

A Prayer for the University of Glasgow.

V.—Jesus saith, I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life: 
R.—No man cometh unto the Father but by Me. 
Vouchsafe, we beseech Thee, O Lord Jesus Christ, to prosper with Thy blessing the work of our University, and grant unto all who rule, or teach, or learn therein, that they may know Thee to be the Way, the Truth, and the Life; that, setting Thy holy will ever before them, they may do that which is well-pleasing in Thy sight; and holding forth the Word of truth, may shine as lights in the world, to the glory of God the Father; to Whom with Thee and the Holy Ghost, One God, be glory for ever and ever. Amen.

A Commemoration of the Fathers of the Faith in Scotland.

(S. Ninian, our first Apostle, who consecrated a cemetery where the Cathedral of Glasgow stands; S. Kentigern, who built his church on this spot, made it the centre of his mission to the Britons of Strathclyde, and here reposed in the holy; and S. Columba, who according to tradition came hither to visit S. Kentigern, and held spiritual intercourse with him.)

V.—Though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers: 
R.—For in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the Gospel. 
Keep, we beseech Thee, O Lord, with Thy perpetual mercy, Thy faithful people; and grant that as by the preaching of Thy blessed servants, Ninian, Columba, and Kentigern, Thou didst deliver our forefathers from the darkness of error, so by the help of Thy grace we may be enabled to walk in the light of Thy truth; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

A Commemoration of the Builders of Glasgow Cathedral.

V.—The liberal man devisest liberal things: 
R.—And by liberal things shall he stand.

O Lord our God, how just and right it is, that we should recall to memory the venerable men who, in the times before us, led by great devotion, in honour of Thy holy Name, built and adorned with many beneficences and good works this our spiritual mother, the High Church of Glasgow, whose names, we trust, are in the book of life, and their merits in the heavens, and their souls co-equal with the saints! Grant, O Lord, that thy name may ever flourish through the preaching of Thy blessed Ghost, one to the glory of God, be glory for ever and ever. Amen.

Then shall be sung the Hymn:

Thou art the Way; by Thee alone 
From sin and death we flee, 
And he who would the Father know 
Must know Him, Lord, by Thee.

Thou art the Truth; Thy word alone 
Sound wisdom can impart; 
Thou only canst inform the mind 
And purify the heart.

Thou art the Life; the rending tomb 
Proclaims Thy conquering arm; 
And those who put their trust in Thee 
Nor death nor hell can harm.

Thou art the Way, the Truth, the Life; 
Grant us that Way to know, 
That Truth to keep, that Life to win, 

Or else this:

Blessed City, heavenly Salem, 
Vision dear of peace and love, 
Which of living stones art builded 
In the height of heaven above, 
And with Angel hosts encircled, 
Like a bride dost earthward move.

From celestial realms descending, 
Bridal glory round thee shed, 
Meet for Him whose love expresseth thee 
To thy Lord thou shalt be led; 
All thy streets and all thy buildings 
Of pure gold are fashioned.

Bright thy gates of pearl are shining, 
They are open evermore;
A Historical Lecture on Glasgow Cathedral

WILL BE DELIVERED BY

MR. P. MACGREGOR CHALMERS, ARCHITECT,

and the Class will be conducted over the Building.

CHRONOLOGY.

A.D. 397. S. Martin of Tours dies; S. Nianu founds Candida Casa.
A.D. 397. S. Columba dies.
609 or 614 (13th Jan.) S. Kentigern (S. Mungo) dies at Glasgow.
1116. David I. (S. David) restores the Bishopric of Glasgow. John, the first Bishop of the restored line.
1125. The first Cathedral dedicated.
1147-1164. Episcopate of Bishop Herbert, who constituted the Cathedral Chapter.
1175-1199. Bishop Joceline, who restored the Lower Church, rebuilt the Choir, and began the Nave. Part of his work remains in the descent to the Lower Church.
1233-1258. Bishop William of Ballingdon, who built the existing Lower Church and the Choir. In his time the Use of Sarum was introduced.
1272-1316. Bishop Robert Wishart, who was at work on the West Front and the Nave. In his time Edward I. prayed at the shrine of S. Mungo. Wishart was a supporter of Wallace and Bruce; and Bruce's coronation robes are said to have been prepared in the old Sacristy.
1404-1425. Bishop Lauder, who built the Central Tower and began the Chapter House.
1456-1466. Bishop Cameron, who completed the Chapter House and was at work on the present Sacristy. Adviser of King James I.
1448-1454. Bishop Turnbull, founder of the University of Glasgow, who completed the Sacristy.
1484-1506. Bishop Robert Redadder, who became first Archbishop of Glasgow, began the great South Transept, and built its Crypt. In his time King James IV. acted as a server at the High Altar.
1524-1537. Archbishop Gavin Dunbar, first President of the Court of Session.
1531-1566. Archbishop James Beaton. At the Reformation (1560) he fled to France, where he died, 1563.
1574. Andrew Melville, Principal of the University.
1577. Nova Erasmo of the University by King James VI.
1610. General Assembly at Glasgow restores Episcopacy in the Church.
1622. John Cameron, Principal.
1638. General Assembly at Glasgow—Alexander Henderson, Moderator, abolishes Episcopacy.
1660. Zachary Boyd, in the Lower Church, preaches before Oliver Cromwell, and rebukes him.
1660. The Restoration. Cargill from the Cathedral pulpit denounces Charles II.
1661. Robert Baillie, Principal.
1671. Archbishop Leighton. Gilbert Burnet one of his "preachers."
1688. The Revolution.
1707. Union of the Parliaments.
1716. The Clock Tower taken down.
1838. Dr. John Robertson, Minister. Restoration of the Cathedral.
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Cedar Bank
Broughty Ferry.
27th Apr. 1911.

Gentlemen,

I now send you the three articles promised on loan for the Exhibition — a silver rose, a jasper flint, a book with an illuminated cover for an inventory. The names of the artists, who are all Scots, may be mentioned here: that of the flint maker.

I hope that the exhibitions are still in time, will be glad for receipt.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

J. A. (T. N.) Adamson
My dear Dr. Cooper, I am
considerably ailed as to what

to send this box contain

1 China Vase val. £5
1 Purslane Tail
1 Book for inventors

I am not very well, being still
in bed, so I have no cell on
you, hope it is not too late.
Can we allow to one work
this after May 7. Hope your
getting on well. It must be
very interesting. Remain regards
from us both.

Yours'

J.N. A.

Will you see that my name
is right. T.N. Adam son (not
Patterson) please let any
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(1) Advice should be sought as soon as a Memorial is proposed, and before the question of the form it should take is decided.

(2) The Committee urge the importance, as a general rule, of concentrating upon a single Memorial in each Church or Churchyard, and the avoidance of a number of small Memorials. The best and most permanent Memorial is that which best harmonises with the building or surroundings where it is placed. This is not meant, however, to exclude separate Memorials erected as parts of a common scheme—for example, the building, restoring, or furnishing of a Church or Churchyard.

(3) The erection of a general Memorial should be postponed until the end of the War, though it may be of importance to decide beforehand what form it should take.

(4) In deciding as to the form of Memorial, the character of the Church in or near which the Memorial is to be placed ought to be taken into consideration. In cases where the present building is not worthy, the Committee deprecate the introduction of costly structural Memorials, and suggest in such cases that the Memorial should take the form of a simple and modest tablet, or a small ornament on the Church wall.

(5) The following might be mentioned as suitable forms of Memorial: Pulpit and Canopy, Communion Table, Silver Communion Vessels, Alms' Dishes, Font with Cover, Prayer Books, Lectern, Bibles, Organ, Bells, Memorial Tablets, Churchyard Crosses, Memorial Funds for Church Work, Missions, or Charities.

(6) The choice of material for a Memorial should be determined with a view to durability and suitability to the Church or its surroundings. Marble, Stone, Cast Bronze, and for inside work Oak answer in general these requirements, but the Committee point out that Lacquer Brass and Copper are liable to quick decay, and soon become unsightly. Pure Tin, however, is not subject to this objection, and is a material capable of fine treatment.

(7) A stained-glass window is a most beautiful form of Memorial; but those who decide for this must remember (a) that really beautiful stained glass is expensive (costing from £5 to £7 per square foot), (b) that such good work takes a long time to execute, and (c) that the subjects treated should be devotional, and not selected without consideration of those treated in other windows in the same Church.

(8) Quality, simplicity, and permanence should be the guiding principles in carrying out the work. Special attention should be given to lettering, alike for legibility and beauty.
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