

LECTURE V.

ENDOWMENT.

OF the two requisites absolutely indispensable to thorough and effective endowed territorial work, I have already, in the previous lecture, discussed the necessity of rearranging the whole country into parishes of manageable extent and population, and the likeliest means by which this can be accomplished in present circumstances. I have now to consider what is equally essential—viz., the provision for each parish of such an endowment or stipend for the minister as shall make him so far independent of those to whom he preaches, and render his services available for the benefit of such of his parishioners as are either too poor or indisposed to pay for Gospel ordinances. In order to the complete exposition of this subject, it may be well to consider, in the first place, the method originally adopted for the sustentation of the

Christian ministry, the sources from which at different periods the funds devoted to their support have been derived, and the nature and amount of the revenues which are now either in law or equity applicable to that purpose in this country.

There seems little room for doubt that, in apostolic and primitive times, those who preached the Gospel either lived upon their own resources, or were maintained by the benefactions of those who sent them into particular fields of labour, or by the free-will offerings of those who were benefited by their ministrations. An idea has been founded on the narrative in the fourth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, that the community of goods there referred to was of such a nature that it laid upon all believers a peremptory obligation to dispossess themselves of all their property, and to put it into a common fund, from which those that preached and those that were preached to should alike draw their means of subsistence. This idea seems on the face of it quite extravagant, and is indeed refuted by the scope of the narrative itself. The specific mention of a single instance, that of Barnabas, who, "having land, sold it, and brought the money and laid it at the apostles' feet;" and a clear conception of what really constituted the sin of Ananias, who

is expressly acknowledged by Peter to have had perfect power, even after selling his property, to retain the price thereof as his own,—are sufficient to show that all the narrative is intended to set forth is the extraordinary spirit of love, liberality, and self-denial which animated the first followers of Christ—which made every man look not on his own things only, but on the things of others also, and seek not his own, but every man another's wealth. At all events, it is quite manifest that such community of goods as some have imagined, if it ever existed at all, existed only very partially, and for a very limited time. From the same book of Acts, and from the First Epistle to the Corinthians, we learn that once a-week a collection was regularly taken up in all congregations for Church purposes and the necessities of the saints, to which every believer was expected and exhorted to contribute "according to his ability" and "as God had prospered him." This indicates a state of matters in which the right of private property was fully conserved, and in which only free donations were enjoined. As the Church was extended and consolidated, these donations would of course come to be both claimed and managed more systematically. More particularly after the establishment of the

Church under Constantine, when gifts and bequests of land as well as of money could be lawfully held and received by the Church, and when, in point of fact, donations in both forms were immensely increased, the proceeds of the funded and heritable property destined to the support of the ministry were regularly distributed by the deacons, acting under the bishops of the several dioceses. Complaints as to the mode in which this was done arose early, and were of frequent occurrence. The fund was held in common for behoof of the poor as well as of the clergy, and the claims of these two parties often clashed. To prevent disputes, and secure an equitable allocation of the total income of the Church, it was decreed by the Pope in the fifth century, that at the sight of the bishops this should be distributed proportionally among the bishops themselves, the inferior clergy, the persons responsible for maintaining the fabrics of the churches and relative expenses, and the poor. The discretion allowed to the bishops in determining the proportion in which these four parts should be allocated, resulted, as might have been expected, in the abuse of many of the bishops appropriating by far the largest share to themselves; and this gave rise to such complaints on the part of the inferior

clergy, that at length there ensued a regular agitation for a larger and more adequate provision for their support. This led to the assertion and recognition of a right to tithes, which, though not expressly ordained, or more than in its general principle sanctioned in the New Testament, was part and parcel of the Jewish dispensation, and moreover is acknowledged to be valid by our own instinctive sense of duty. From the earliest times we have traces of tithes. Some of the ablest writers on the subject, such as Spelman, Selden, Kennicott, and Collyer, assign their origin to the remotest antiquity. The last-mentioned author argues to this effect: "From pagan writers we learn (he says) that several nations, very far distant from each other, in different parts of the world, and, as it seems, without the least acquaintance or commerce one with another, observed this custom. Now, since this proportion of one in ten is certainly indifferent in itself, any more than one in seven or eight, it is reasonable to believe that this custom of paying tithe, like that of sacrificing, had some divine direction for it; and that it was derived from Adam to Noah, and from him to his posterity, till at length, at the dispersion of Babel, it spread over all the world."*

* D. Collyer, *Sacred Interpreter*, i. 162.

To Melchisedek, the priest of the most high God, Abraham, the father of the faithful, gave tithes of all the goods of Sodom and Gomorrah, which he had rescued out of the hands of the kings, who had carried them off as spoil. Jacob at Bethel solemnly vowed that he would give of all his possessions a tenth unto God. And the argument used by Archbishop Magee, in his great work on the Atonement, in favour of the divine origin of sacrifices, has been feasibly employed to establish the divine origin of tithes. Speaking of sacrifices, the Archbishop says : "That the institution was of divine ordinance may, in the first instance, be reasonably inferred from the strong and sensible attestation of the divine acceptance in the case of Abel, again in that of Noah, afterwards in that of Abraham, and also by the systematic establishment of them by the same divine authority in the dispensation of Moses." Applied to tithes, this argument retains all its force. That Abraham's offering of a tenth was accepted by God, we know from his being blessed by Melchisedek. That Jacob's vow of a tenth was accepted, we conclude from his subsequent prosperous career. In the Mosaic law the appointment of a tenth is equally divine with that of sacrifice. Therefore the Archbishop's argument,

if it hold good for sacrifice, holds equally good for tithes, and proves them to have been from the beginning imposed as a positive obligation upon man.

But whatever opinion may be entertained as to the origin of tithes, there can be no doubt that under the law given by Moses the express enactment of Jehovah made them obligatory upon all Jews. In the first place, a tithe was levied upon all property for the maintenance of the ministers of religion, the priests and the Levites. "All the tithe of the land, whether of the seed of the land or of the fruit of the tree, is the Lord's; it is holy unto the Lord."* "Behold, I have given the children of Levi all the tenth in Israel for an inheritance, for their service, which they serve, even the service of the tabernacle of the congregation."† In the second place, another tithe was exacted for the maintenance of the various feasts and sacrifices. "Thou shalt truly tithe all the increase of thy seed that the field bringeth forth year by year. And thou shalt eat before the Lord thy God, in the place which He shall choose to place His name there, the tithe of thy corn, of thy vine, and of thine oil, and the firstlings of thy herds and of thy flocks; that thou mayest learn to fear the Lord thy

* Levit. xxvii. 30.

† Num. xviii. 27.

God always."* Over and above these two tenths it is not quite clear whether yet another was not claimed for behoof of the poor ; but, at all events, when we take the multitude of customary vows and of free-will offerings into account, it seems certain, that instead of a tenth, somewhere about a fourth, if not even a third of their annual income, was contributed by the Jews for religious and charitable purposes. At the same time, it is to be borne in mind, that where tithes were not paid voluntarily, there were no legal means for enforcing payment. Fairbairn and Horne agree in this opinion, that the rendering of what was due was simply a matter of religious obligation, and left to the consciences of the people themselves, without subjecting them to civil or ecclesiastical penalties. Indeed, the remonstrances of the prophets in regard to the non-payment of tithes seem to place this beyond a doubt, because their touching and persuasive appeals would have been altogether out of place in view of regular legal machinery for obtaining payment.

At all events, the payment of tithes for the maintenance of the ministers of religion was matter of moral obligation, and binding on the consciences of the faithful under the former dispensation ; and this

* Deut. xiv. 22, 23. .

fact led the Christian Church, when the difficulty already referred to arose, of providing stipends for the inferior clergy out of funds, the lion's share of which had been appropriated by its episcopal custodiers to their own use and aggrandisement, to insist that the obligation resting on the Jews to support religion by a tenth, or other fixed proportion of their incomes, was equally binding upon all Christians. This doctrine had been maintained by St Augustine as early as the fourth century. "Let Christians retain for themselves," he says, "what is sufficient, or even more than sufficient. But let us give some part. What part? A tithe. The Scribes and Pharisees paid tithes, for whom Christ had not yet shed His blood."* Indeed, from what Justin Martyr† says, it seems highly probable that when the obligation to pay tithes, first-fruits and oblations, was annulled by the destruction of the Temple, the early converts continued to dedicate these to God's service. Councils of the Church in the sixth century, while admitting it to be matter of free-will, pressed the payment of tithes upon all in the strongest language, and even on the pain of excommunication; and towards the end of the eighth century the right to levy tithes of all for religious

* Augustini Opera, v. 654.

† Apolog., i. § 67.

uses was conclusively established by imperial decree.

At what date this right was fully acknowledged and generally exercised in Scotland cannot be distinctly ascertained ; but in this country, as elsewhere, so soon as the right came into force, the patrimony of the Church consisted of two distinct parts. In the first place, there was the property, of very considerable amount, bequeathed or gifted by individuals from time to time, which was termed the *temporality* of benefices. In the second place, there was the tithe of all lands, which was called the *spirituality* of benefices. These two parts stand on a somewhat different footing, and may be regarded as held by different tenures ; but to the one as well as to the other, the Church has undoubtedly the strongest claim.

It is, I believe, a mistake to suppose that the system of tithes was established at once, or that it came immediately, on its first authorisation, into general and complete operation in any part of Christendom. Least of all was this likely to occur in Scotland. There the decree of the great Emperor and the bull of the Pope were probably less influential than anywhere else. At the same time, the practice of the Church Catholic, and the custom of other

Christian communities, in this as in other respects, would insensibly affect the Scottish Church ; and more particularly when, as in this case, a new and effective mode was adopted for meeting a difficulty felt not in one country only, but in all countries without exception. The support of the ministry, when left exclusively to free-will offerings, would press heavily on the few favoured with large and liberal hearts. The covetous and penurious, however wealthy, would bear an insignificant share of the burden. Donations and bequests, again, when left, as they generally were left, to be dispensed according to the arbitrary dictation of bishops and heads of religious houses, were very apt to be in great measure intercepted and swallowed up at headquarters. The rural districts, which lay remote from cities, cathedrals, and monasteries, were as a rule quite neglected. Therefore, those really anxious to promote the spiritual welfare of all the people would readily acquiesce in the adoption of a system calculated to promote this object ; and so, in connection with the payment of tithes, the practice which had early prevailed of endowing central or cathedral churches in cities, and afterwards of bestowing large gifts upon monasteries, was followed gradually and piecemeal—first in one place, and then in others—by

nobles and other proprietors, who built churches, and, with the consent of their ecclesiastical superiors, devoted the tithes of their land to secure the ministrations of religion for the special behoof of their tenants and retainers. In this way, rather than by royal edict, or statute of Parliament, did by far the largest proportion of what is called the spirituality as well as of the temporality of the benefices, become the property of the Church of Scotland ; and so both may be regarded as having been held by a title equally good and valid, and that in equity as well as in law.

Thus previously to the Reformation at least one half of the property of Scotland had become ecclesiastical in its character ; and, as such, was held on as good and valid a title as any Glasgow merchant could give with a chapel which his zeal and generosity might lead him to build at his own expense, for the use of any Dissenting congregation to which he belongs. It was properly the gift not of the nation, which in its corporate capacity did not interfere with the common usage or the canon law that regulated its destination. It was in general the free gift of the lord of the manor, who, with the consent, or only after the formal resignation of the bishop, in whom the

canon law vested it, bestowed it in erecting and endowing parochial churches for their own benefit, and that of their family and tenantry for all time coming. It was thus, to all intents and purposes, of the nature of a private endowment, and held by the Church as firmly as any property can be held.

And thus the secularisation of the larger portion of these funds at the period of the Reformation was in more respects than one an act of unwarrantable spoliation. The people and nation constituting the Reformed Church had as good a claim to have these funds applied to their only proper and legitimate purpose of promoting their spiritual edification, as the people and nation composing the unreformed Church. The lay lords of the soil had no right to gratify their greed by appropriating them to their own use. Their direct ancestors, in many instances, might originally have had the right to withhold them from, or to give them to, certain churches and parishes; but when they had, by solemn dedication at the altar, given these tithes and endowments, and bound their estates for their regular payment, their heirs and successors had no right or title to take them away, any more than the donor of a Dissenting chapel, who had executed a deed of conveyance in favour

of the trustees of a particular congregation, would have right to demand it back from them, and to transfer it to some other use. The confiscation of such endowments, therefore, is not, as some people seem to imagine, a mere alienation of property from the Church, regarded as a public institution or corporation. It does not merely deprive ministers of their livings. It robs the poor of the people of the benefits conferred upon them by ancient benefactors. A Dissenter may, if he sees fit, or thinks it right, refuse to avail himself of the privileges thus provided for him. That is his own individual concern, to be settled in the court of his own conscience. It is, however, nothing but downright intolerance and oppression on his part if he insists that others thankfully enjoying these privileges should be deprived of them, because of his personal dislike and non-participation of them. This, as some one has well observed, is the very same, as if any one who objected to the system of medical and surgical hospitals, should insist on pulling them down, and alienating or appropriating their revenues, because, for himself and his dependants, he made no use of them, but preferred home treatment and private advice, albeit at his own sole cost.

Before the Reformation, tithes were claimed as by divine right the property of the Church in Scotland; and the same claim was advanced on the same high grounds by the Protestant ministers, when they threw off the yoke of Popery. At first their claim was evaded by the Estates of the realm, rather than explicitly denied to be valid. In point of fact its validity was virtually acknowledged by the Act of Parliament 1567, c. 10, which provided that the thirds of all benefices should be paid to the ministers of the Gospel; "*ay, and quhill the kirk come to the full possession of their proper patri- monie, quhillk is the teindis.*" This makes it perfectly plain that the provision then made for the Reformed ministers was considered as a mere temporary expedient, the intention of the Legislature obviously being that the surplus of the tithes, which was then appropriated for the use of the sovereign, should revert to the Church, so soon as affairs, as between Church and State, were more consolidated. The Act 1572, c. 52, confirming a former grant of all benefices not exceeding 300 merks of yearly rent to qualified ministers, is in no way inconsistent with this idea. But in the mean time the tithes were alienated by a gradual process of absorption in other quarters. The king,

with lavish hand, bestowed on his favourite nobles and courtiers the large possessions of the regular clergy, including the lands and tithes belonging to them. These had, in many instances, been erected into temporal lordships, and hence the new proprietors to whom the king had granted them were called by the well-known, but not always clearly understood, name of Lords of Erection, or Titulars.

This, however, behoves to be carefully borne in mind by all who would comprehend the law of Teinds as it now exists, that, even in regard to these royal grants of tithes, the persons receiving them were uniformly burdened with the support of the clergy in their several parishes, and that the clergy never abandoned their claim to the whole tithes, which the Legislature had acknowledged to be the proper patrimony of the Church. Indeed this claim was so uniformly and unequivocally maintained, that no layman, favoured with a grant of tithes, could ever for a moment flatter himself that he was held to be released from a perpetual obligation to supply out of them an adequate maintenance for the ministers of religion.

It is, however, equally plain that this obligation, which could not be denied or ignored, was most in-

adequately fulfilled by the Lords of Erection, and, moreover, its legal form was so loose as scarcely admitted stringent enforcement on such as were anxious to evade it. To meet the urgent necessities of the clergy, arising out of this dishonourable withholding of their rights, expedients of a temporary character were resorted to, and more particularly Parliamentary Commissions were appointed in 1617, 1621, and other years. The evils which prevailed were not, however, thereby remedied; and at length Charles I., seeing the confusion into which things had fallen, the destitute condition to which many of the Reformed clergy were reduced, and the possibility that by-and-by no decent maintenance would be left to any of them, adopted a more comprehensive plan for meeting the difficulties and overcoming the abuses that existed.

In the first place he issued a general revocation of all the profuse and improvident grants of teinds which had been made by his predecessors, and then he promoted special processes of reduction as well as actions of submission and surrender in each case, in order the more effectually to set these grants aside for ever. The direct drift of these actions was to invest the whole of the

teinds in the State ; but the King, with an amount of wisdom and statesmanship which did not always guide his policy, so shaped the summonses and carried out the decrees of reduction, that he not only secured for himself and the State a large increase of revenue, but, furthermore, he managed on the one hand to provide sufficiently for the clergy, and on the other to relieve the gentry and landholders of the country from the grievous oppression to which they had been subjected by the Lords of Erection, or Titulars, who having acquired right to the ecclesiastical benefices, and persisting in stinting the clergy of their dues, tyrannically harassed those who occupied the land under them by the numberless vexations incidental to the rigid and relentless levying of the teind.

These various processes of reduction and of submission and surrender which, in 1629, were followed by King Charles's important decreets arbitral, and in 1633 by the appointment of yet another Parliamentary Commission to carry them into full effect, issued in placing teinds in Scotland on that footing which they now occupy. The superiorities of Church lands were resumed by the Crown, and it was ordained that the sum of 1000 merks Scots should be paid by the King to the Lords of Erec-

tion, in full satisfaction for each chalder of victual feu-duty, and for each 100 merks Scots of money feu-duty. With these exceptions the temporality of benefices remained with the Lords of Election, and the Titulars who had obtained grants of the tithes formerly belonging to religious houses were to receive nine years' purchase of the free valued teind. This was enough, alike for the titular to receive, and for the heritor to pay; because in no case could a title be given to the teind irrespective of, and apart from, the burden of all future augmentations.

The great change, however, effected as to teinds at this period, was the provision according to which they were all to be valued and sold to such heritors as chose to purchase them, at the rate of a fifth-part of the rent, which was then very low and which was taken at their own return. By this arrangement the heritors obtained an enormous advantage. The harassing process of a levy in kind, with all its wastefulness and many annoyances, was discontinued. The teinds were fixed permanently at a very low rate—for the most part not a sixth, and in many instances not a tenth, of what the actual teind would be if valued now. Moreover, the conversion into money prior to sale of the rents

deliverable in grain, and the provision that in calculating the price of teinds the ministers' stipends should be deducted, conferred on the heritors an additional benefit of the most important kind. Teind thus commuted is a charge upon land of comparatively small amount. It is a charge anterior to any rights now appertaining to present proprietors. It stands by itself fixed and preferential as much as any feu-duty payable to a superior. As often as property has changed hands it has been uniformly estimated and allowed for. All existing titles to land have been acquired exclusive and under deduction of it. It is not, therefore, as some imagine and argue, in any way or on any ground, of the nature of a tax laid upon property and levied from landowners, nor is its levying by its proper owners and beneficiaries in any respect burdensome or oppressive to the community. The feuar might with much greater reason complain of the feu-duty reserved to the superior in the original titles to his feu as an unfair tax upon his property, than the heritor of the commuted teind payable by him. In neither case is the payment a tax, or a burden in the proper sense of the term. They are both in reality a reserved property in the shape of a fixed annual rent-charge.

The only difference between them is—and it is a difference all in favour of teinds—that while feu-duties are payable without yielding any continuous return to those that pay them from generation to generation, the payment of teinds towards the stipends of ministers secures from age to age the services of those who minister in sacred things, to the unspeakable benefit of those residing on the properties from which the teinds are drawn. The value of these services to the community is more than the value of all the teinds; and all who regard their country's welfare, or care for the interests of the poor of the people, will be slow to divert them from their present purpose.

Their alienation from that purpose would be not merely a gross and unwarrantable misappropriation—it would be a social offence of the rankest kind, and a political blunder of the most fatal character. The present beneficiaries of these teinds hold them by a moral and legal title infinitely stronger than any which secures the heritors of Scotland in possession of their estates. No money passing from hand to hand in the country is so fruitful in good results to the whole population. The poor especially are vitally interested in the present application of teinds. Any change in that

respect would be a direct robbery of them, and by their further impoverishment could only issue in relieving the wealthier classes from some burden now justly resting on them, and so in swelling the accumulations of those already sufficiently enriched and aggrandised.

Believing that these and other considerations will prevail with the better sense of the country in retaining the teinds as now commuted and legally applied for maintaining endowed territorial work, it may be interesting to see exactly what this source of revenue amounts to, and to discuss the methods according to which it may be administered with most advantage to the whole community.

Full particulars in regard to the amount, value, and present application of the teinds may be obtained, by any who are specially interested in the subject, from the various Reports of the Commissioners of Religious Instruction, Scotland (1837), which must be read as modified by the more recent information contained in the Return to an Address of the House of Lords, dated 28th June 1870, moved for by the Earl of Minto, and ordered to be printed, 5th May 1871. It would be beside my present purpose to enter here into all the minute details of the vast subject as it is presented in these

Reports. It is sufficient to say that the teinds at present allocated as ministers' stipends amount in all to upwards of £230,000 per annum; and that the surplus of unexhausted teinds not so allocated, but liable, so far as it goes, to be modified in augmentation of the stipends in a considerable number of the parishes of Scotland, amounts to about £140,000 per annum. These two sums, amounting together to £370,000, may be viewed as representing a capital sum of £9,250,000. The sum of £230,000 already modified as stipend, is paid, in different proportions, to the ministers of 872 parishes, and yields an average of £264 to each. At the same average, the unappropriated surplus of £140,000 would supply stipends at the same rate to other 530 ministers—or, at the rate at which fixed provision has been made for the maintenance of ordinances in the recently endowed parishes, to about 1000 additional ministers. To this surplus the heritors have personally no legal title. Their intromissions with it hitherto have been to them a source of considerable profit. They have not, therefore, any equitable or moral, any more than a legal, claim to its reversion. It is simply a prior preferential charge on landed property, devoted by the strictest forms of law, and to a fractional extent only of the original right, to the

great object of promoting the religious interests of the people, by means of endowed territorial work on the part of the Church of Scotland.

To this amount of £9,250,000 available as teinds falls to be added the capital of the sums which furnish stipends to the ministers of the remaining 52 original parishes, and of the 39 parliamentary chapels erected into parishes *quoad sacra*. These sums taken together may be estimated at £620,000, and increase the total capital to £9,870,000. The portion held by recent parliamentary title may not perhaps be regarded as so permanent and secure as the remainder; but as that is purposely underestimated, the total need not be affected by this consideration.

Moreover, the private liberality of those adhering to or interested in the Church of Scotland has, within the last quarter of a century, consecrated not less than £777,000 to the endowment of 211 new parishes. A certain portion of this large sum, as originally subscribed, has been spent on process and other relative expenses; but taking into account the provision since made in many of the new parishes for permanently supplementing the stipends of the ministers, as well as the sums expended on manses, the fixed income of these incumbencies may be held

to reach an average of from £140 to £150, which represents very nearly the before-mentioned capital. From returns obtained a few years ago from all the new parishes then endowed, it appeared that the stipends paid to their ministers from permanent investments and from the proceeds of pew-rents and church-door collections averaged on the whole £248. It is pretty certain that since these statistics came to hand this average has increased rather than diminished; and therefore, reckoning, as in the circumstances we may fairly do, that the income derived from pew-rents and collections in the new churches is in a certain sense as constant and reliable as that yielded by heritable investments, it follows that the capital sum available for promoting endowed territorial work in Scotland approaches twelve millions.

Furthermore, to this sum there falls to be added the more than princely donation of Mr James Baird of Auchmedden, the founder of these Lectures, who in the terms of his trust-deed "feeling deeply impressed with the extent to which spiritual destitution prevails in Scotland, and being satisfied that this proceeds in a great measure from the want of properly organised and endowed territorial work," did in 1873 vest in trustees the munificent sum of

£500,000, declaring and directing "that the said funds shall be expended for the support of objects and purposes in connection with the Established Church of Scotland," and, "among other objects, for the promotion of endowed territorial work in the Church."

The annals of the Church, whether in ancient or modern times, record no such splendid gift as this from any private individual. It stands unparalleled on the roll of Christian beneficence; and, by the conditions according to which it has been sagaciously determined that its benefits are to be dispensed, it promises to exert the most salutary influence in promoting the cause of church extension, in those districts where unhappily spiritual destitution most prevails. Already, indeed, it has stimulated this work in a very marked way, and it seems certain to do so with increasing force. The fund will remain a most durable monument to the Christian patriotism and enlightened liberality of its donor; and it forms a testimony of the most substantial and striking nature to his clear perception and wise appreciation of the value and importance of endowed territorial work.

In estimating the resources thus available for the support of endowed territorial work in Scotland, I

have not taken into account the value of churches, manses, and glebes. Having regard to these also, there need not be the slightest hesitation in affirming that funds, whose only proper object is the promotion of such work, exist to such an amount that if duly used and judiciously distributed, they would be amply sufficient to secure the services of a staff of pastors adequate to overtake the whole Protestant population of Scotland. To secure such services is their grand end and only righteous destination. To promote their application in the most effective way to this purpose ought to be the desire, the aim, and the effort of every Christian patriot in the land. In our present complicated circumstances, and with our numerous vexing divisions, the attainment of this end may involve the necessity of large concessions in many quarters, and even in some of considerable sacrifices ; but the object is one of such paramount importance that, in order to gain it, nothing short of the sacrifice of principle ought to be grudged or accounted hard.

In utilising these resources for the maintenance of endowed territorial work, to an extent sufficient for the spiritual requirements of the whole country, I should most certainly reckon on their being largely supplemented by the voluntary liberality

of the Christian people associated in the several congregations. It is found, as a rule, that those professing extremest Voluntaryism, and therefore ever belching forth the loudest opposition to the principle of endowments, do not object to manses or to vested or mortified additions to their salaries being provided in their own individual cases. In point of fact, in all the Dissenting Churches which have existed for any considerable length of time, or which possess any principle of coherence, such accessions to the incomes of ministers fall in from time to time. By-and-by they become common. They form, in not a few cases, the chief protection against complete disintegration, as the circumstances of the locality benefited by them are changed by the waning popularity and efficiency of an aged minister—the decrease of the population from which his congregation is collected—or the turn of the tide in favour of the parish church when it is filled by a younger or more active pastor. In this way these windfalls, which in reality are nothing but endowments on a small scale, have been found very useful to Dissenting Churches; and therefore it is not at all wonderful that even the bitterest opponents of the principle of endowments do not object to such pleasant accrescences on the prin-

principle of Voluntaryism, the superior merits of which they were wont so stoutly and vauntingly to proclaim. On the other hand, I am not aware of anything in the principle of endowment that is hostile to the practice of liberality, or that should lead its advocates to dispense with free-will offerings from time to time, in supplement of its more stable supplies. It was from voluntary liberality that most of the endowments belonging to the different Churches of Christendom were originally derived. In these latter days of democratic ascendancy, it is not at all likely that they will, to any great extent, be augmented from any other source. It is therefore not at all inconsistent, nor yet unreasonable, on the part of those who support the endowment principle, that, when they require endowments supplemented, they should look to the same quarter from which, in the first instance, the permanently invested capital they principally rely on was received. Moreover, as matter of multiplied experience drawn from the cases of the new parishes erected under 7 and 8 Vict. c. 44, it has been found that the principle of moderate endowments secured under that statute, combined with free scope for eliciting, by earnest and devoted work, the free-will offerings of the people, constitutes, alike

for the minister on the one hand and for the congregation on the other, by far the most satisfactory footing on which their mutual interests and relations can be placed. It secures for the minister the absolutely indispensable condition of official independence, and prevents congregational caprice, tyranny, and dictation. It supplies, at the same time, a powerful stimulus to ministerial faithfulness and activity, while it opens up an ample field for congregational generosity. In cases that could be named by the hundred, it has operated to the production of the best results; and it has raised some of the new congregations to the very top of the tree, alike in regard to the income provided for the minister, the work done by the congregation, and the amount contributed both to local and general schemes of missionary enterprise and benevolence.

In view of all this, I do not see that, practically, there should be any great difficulty, apart from temper, prejudice, and dislike, in the way of the union of the great mass of Scottish Presbyterians on the ground of endowed territorial work. I am not aware of any who would resolutely decline the acceptance of the proceeds of any bequest or voluntary gift securing a permanent addition to their

salaries. In six of the south-western counties the Ferguson bequest has been the means of keeping in existence not a few voluntary congregations that, previous to its welcome benefactions, seemed ready to die. There does not appear to be any good reason why those who gladly benefit by such bequests, and thrive upon their fruits, might not, without offence to their conscience or injury to their position, participate in the fruits of older endowments. These endowments, as already indicated, are sufficient, if properly applied, to form, at least, the nucleus of an ample provision for religious ordinances all over Scotland. They are absolutely essential in order to secure thorough and effective territorial work, especially in the poorer and more necessitous districts of the country; and therefore, surely in such circumstances it would be the height of folly, as well as the grossest injustice, to alienate them from their proper purpose and appropriate them to any other object, however laudable and important in itself. Such misappropriation would only issue, as already shown, in enriching the wealthier, at the cost, and to the irreparable detriment, of the poorer classes; and it would deprive the Christian community of one of its chief means of maintaining complete national organisation, as

well as lessen its power to fulfil the duty primarily incumbent upon it—viz., to seek the reclamation of the lapsed at home, and the Christianisation of all heathen nations.

For these two all-important purposes the principle of endowment cannot be dispensed with. In either field it is essential to the success of a non-established quite as much as of an established Church. In the one case, the source of endowment may be more private and precarious—in the other, it may be more public and permanent. But in both, endowment is indispensable; and being so, there surely cannot be any room for calling in question the fact, that the decided advantage belongs to that Church whose endowments are derived from such a quarter, and so guaranteed, as to be least liable to flux or withdrawal.

The eminent success of the Free Church of Scotland, not only in the home, but also in the foreign field of evangelistic activity, is frequently quoted as an unanswerable argument in favour of Voluntaryism as against endowment; and on certain platforms it has become customary, for those decrying union with the State, to invite the members of the National Church, to surrender the privileges therein enjoyed, and to imitate the exodus by which their former

brethren went forth to enjoy exemption from the burdens connected with permanent endowments. Now, far be it from me, and from every one who has true Scottish blood in his veins, to say one word in disparagement of the sacrifices, exertions, and successes of the Free Church, or to seek to detract from the praise justly due to the skill and statesmanship with which the great founders and leaders of that influential denomination have shaped its policy and guided its career. But their great success is undoubtedly due in no small degree to the institution by Dr Chalmers of what is called the Sustentation Fund, which, though dependent for its supplies on free contributions from year to year, is in its principle and effects diametrically opposed to Voluntaryism, and does, so far as is possible in the circumstances, embody and carry out the principle of endowment. It is not so secure as absolute endowment, and therefore the latter is not to be lightly, or except for very much stronger reasons than have yet been advanced, abandoned for it; but the income it provides for Free Church ministers is not dependent merely on the voluntary donations of those that wait upon their ministry. It is drawn in large measure from a source which is really fixed and permanent in its character, and which, though less

secure and exempt from the possibility of variable-ness than that provided by the piety of remote ancestors and invested in substantial property, is yet sufficiently settled and sure to fulfil many of the purposes of endowment. It affects at least the constitution of the relation between pastor and people, so far as to mitigate in a very considerable degree the evil inherent in mere Voluntaryism, by which the minister is made the minion and the slave of those whom he is bound as the ambassador of Christ to "exhort and rebuke with all authority."

This mitigation, to whatever it amounts, is, so far as it goes, an immense gain. The evil it abates is most pernicious in its results. As a system, the evil tends to produce mere vapouring orators and popular demagogues and tinkling cymbals, rather than judicious expositors or valiant defenders of the truth and faithful pastors. It renders the exercise of sound and wholesome ecclesiastical discipline next to impossible, and it fills the advertising columns of Saturday newspapers with announcements of sermons and orations couched in clap-trap phraseology, the puffery of which is simply disgusting to serious minds, and cannot but be fearfully deteriorating to the spiritual quality of any man, forced to seek by such unworthy expedients to fill his

chapel and increase the coppers cast into his treasury.

That this is more frequently the result of Voluntarism than some may suspect; that

“The pulpit’s laws the pulpit’s patrons give,
And those who live to preach, must preach to live,”

is clear from the testimony borne by John Angell James, himself one of the most illustrious of Dissenting ministers. He says: “In many of our churches the pastor is placed far below his level; he may flatter like a sycophant, beg like a servant, or woo like a lover; he is not permitted to enjoin like a ruler. His opinion is received with no deference; his person is treated with no respect; and, in presence of some of his lay tyrants, he is only permitted to peep and mutter in the dust.”

No doubt it will be pleaded by Voluntaries that such cases form mere exceptions to the general rule, and that it is just as easy for a truly godly minister of Jesus Christ to rise by the strength of divine grace above the temptation to sycophantishness naturally inherent in a position of dependence, as above the temptation to indolence equally naturally inherent in a position of independence. It cannot be denied that under the endowed system there have been found from time to time not a few

pastors who have fed themselves and not their flocks ; who have “ eaten the fat, and clothed them with the wool, and killed them that were fed, but yet have not fed the flock.” “ The diseased have they not strengthened, neither have they healed that which was sick, neither have they bound up that which was broken, neither have they brought again that which was driven away, neither have they sought that which was lost ; but with force and cruelty have they ruled them.” * Such a pastor has been well described by the poet Cowper as—

“ Rare at home, and never at his books,
Or with his pen, save when he scrawls a card ;
Constant at routs, familiar with a round
Of ladyships, a stranger to the poor ;
Ambitious of preferment for its gold,
And well prepared, by ignorance and sloth,
By infidelity and love of world,
To make God’s work a sinecure.”

It may be gladly acknowledged, also, that in the ranks of Voluntary ministers, especially in remote country districts, where a certain territory of a large parish has naturally mapped itself out as the definite sphere of their labours, there have been pastors of rare watchfulness and superior skill, who have risen far above the temptations incident to their situation as to temporal matters, and in spiri-

* Ezekiel, xxxiv. 4.

tual things have been splendid examples of disciplinary authority and episcopal faithfulness. But, willingly making these concessions, it must notwithstanding be maintained explicitly in the face of all gainsayers that, taking an endowed and a Voluntary minister of equal conscientiousness and spirituality, it is much more easy for the former than for the latter to assume towards the members of his flock that position of calm and fearless independence which will enable him to speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, however distasteful it may be to some, and to administer discipline and rebuke impartially, however offensive it may prove to many.

There is no doubt that, in the great majority of instances, Voluntaryism leaves its ministers to struggle with pecuniary embarrassments, if not with actual poverty, more particularly when bodily vigour fails them, and with the advance of old age and increasing infirmities they become less equal to "*fill*" the pews of their chapels, and sustain the popularity that pays. The testimony of Mr Angell James is again most strong upon this point. He says that under the Voluntary system, "uneasiness has often arisen between a minister and people by the unwillingness of the latter to

raise the necessary support for their pastor. They have seen him struggling with the cares of an increasing family, and marked the cloud of gloom as it thickened and settled upon his brow; they knew his wants; and yet, though able to double his salary and dissipate every anxious thought, they have refused to advance his stipend, and have robbed him of his comfort, either to gratify their avarice or indulge their sensuality. He remonstrates, they are offended: love departs, esteem is diminished, confidence is destroyed; while ill-will, strife, and alienation grow apace." Again, of another case, given as a specimen of many, he says: "Loving their ministers dearly with their lips, but hating him cordially with their pockets, they treat him like wild beasts, which are kept humble by being kept poor. They pray for a blessing upon his basket and his store, while they take care that his basket shall be empty, and his store nothingness itself." It need not be denied that this is not the universal state of affairs in Voluntary Churches, and that all Dissenting ministers are not left by their congregations to starve in penury. But generally where a contrary state of things obtains, its existence may be traced much more to a feeling of rivalry with the neigh-

bouring endowed church, or to the commercial system of selling the Gospel to the rich, than to the inherent tendencies of Voluntaryism. Dissenting ministers will never know how much of their income is due to this feeling of jealous emulation till they succeed, if they ever do succeed, in secularising all religious endowments; nor will the odiousness of Gospel shopkeeping appear in all its blackness till a perfect contrast to it is presented at the period, if it ever come, when the Church of the country shall be so unified and so endowed, that from all its pulpits the precious word of the living God shall be preached pure and uncorrupted, without money and without price, to all.

The advantages secured by endowments rightly administered and improved are numerous and manifold. Perhaps the chief benefit is that it combines territorial privilege with territorial responsibility. It plants a church and provides a minister and kirk-session for the stated and permanent dispensation of religious ordinances in a certain district. All the inhabitants of that district, down even to the very poorest, are thereby at once invested with a right to the services of that minister, who in his turn can labour among

them from morning to night, and from one year's end to another, without the possibility of any of them seriously entertaining the suspicion that he is actuated by any but the most disinterested and benevolent motives, or that he has any less unselfish object than to promote their highest spiritual and eternal welfare. This is no inconsiderable advantage. The suspicion of proselytism for pecuniary ends is fatal to the success of any minister or missionary. The idea that his aim in inviting them to church is merely to fill his pews and increase his pew-rents, if it ever enter the minds of those he visits, will prejudice the effect of any message which he may combine with this invitation, urging them to repent and believe the Gospel. The endowed minister is the only one perfectly free to visit his parish from house to house without the shadow of a fear, that such an idea respecting him will ever mar the force of his endeavours to raise or reclaim his parishioners to a life of faith and godliness. Endowment sets him free from the irksome task of begging at least for himself. It makes him the pastor of the whole parish, and thereby places him in such a position, that if he only serve the cure with due consideration for the interests of the parishioners, his hold on their confidence and

affections is most powerful, and his influence over them for good immense. It constitutes him the captain of a Christian host, composed of the members of his congregation; and makes it his grand business to lead them, so that their efforts, their example, their love may be brought to bear as regenerating forces on those that are careless and godless in their midst. It makes his church the centre of spiritual life to the parish, and the sign to each and all of the parishioners, that the nation of which they form a part values religion as the way to life, and the grand means of national safety and advancement. It sets apart a man of God, here and there all over the land, whose advice and services are at the command of all, and who, mixing in a spirit of kindly sympathy with all classes of the people, on all occasions alike of joy and sorrow, when hearts are most open to receive right impressions, sows then the good seed of the Kingdom, which by God's grace grows up in innumerable instances to life and glory everlasting.

Then, again, endowments are the grand means of securing for a Church a learned ministry. Few will venture to deny this proposition irrespective of particular examples in proof of it. Learning is the fruit not of labour only, but of long leisure spent in

study, such as a well-assured competence can alone enable a man to enjoy. It is this that has made the voluminous literature of the sister Church of England such a valuable heritage to the whole land. Voluntaries as well as Churchmen in all parts of the empire and all the world over, have all profited by it. The names of the authors who adorn her annals are too numerous to be recited here. They are household words on the lips of all who know anything of sacred scholarship. Their works are mines in which all must dig who would learn all the treasures of Christianity. They have shed a halo of glory on our language. They have raised to a pitch of high renown the name and the fame of our common country. The Church of Scotland has not excelled to such an extent in this field, although she also has names of which, as conspicuous in the walks of literature, we may all be justly proud. Nor amid the dearth of high-class works and of distinguished scholarship, which may be deplored as prevailing now, or at any particular period of her past history, should it ever be forgotten that, in her constitution as originally shaped by the genius and statesmanship of John Knox, provision was made for a learned as well as a laborious ministry. The large inheritance of which the Reformed Church

was the rightful heir, was designed by him, and had it been appropriated as he desired would have been amply sufficient to secure opportunity and leisure for scholars to devote their talents to highest authorship, as well as fields for pastors to cultivate by painstaking territorial work. That it was not applied as he intended is our loss to-day, as it has been the loss of our fathers all along. The lack of high learning, which has been accompanied by zealous discharge of pastoral duty, and which on this account has not been productive of such harm as otherwise it might have been, has perhaps tended to foster the idea which prevails in some quarters, that as a Church we can prosper permanently without learning. No idea was ever more unwarranted, or calculated to produce more irreparable mischief. Those that found on the case of the Apostles as illiterate fishermen and plead the success of the Church in their days, forget not only that they had the guidance and support of immediate inspiration, but forget that the spread of the Gospel in their days was due most of all to the labours of one who, "though rude in speech, yet not in knowledge," was beyond them all, and beyond most men of that or any other age, distinguished by high literary culture, and accomplished in all the learning and

law and philosophy alike of Jew and Greek. Those who found on more modern instances, and point with triumphant emphasis to the effects produced in times of general excitement and awakening to the simple harangues of uneducated evangelists, forget that while there is room in the Church for the labours of those furnished with every variety of gift—while God often ordains strength out of the mouth of babes and sucklings, and chooseth “the foolish things of the world to confound the wise,” still there is a place also for those most highly gifted with wisdom and knowledge and sacred lore; and the history of the Church all throughout shows that but for the muniments of solid learning by which she has ever been protected as well as adorned, the doctrines drawn into greatest prominence and developed into unnatural proportions in periods of excitement would often, by their one-sided use and application, have become sources of error and delusion. Moreover, in these days of modern enterprise, and busy thought, and daring speculation, when science is in all directions making such strides—when questions of such profound interest as well as difficulty are pressing themselves, as they never did before, on men’s attention—and when, because of their non-

solution, thousands of the noblest natures and intellects are unwillingly ranging themselves outside the pale of Christianity,—it will not do for the Church to rest satisfied with mere practical territorial work and pastoral supervision, however all-important and indispensable these may be; but while she exerts her best energies to extend her parochial organisation, and to work it so that the Gospel in its simple purity shall be carried to every heart and home, she must also man the towers of Zion with men whose learning, quickened by a lofty piety, shall be able to grapple with all the perplexing problems of the day, and conquer the domains of science and philosophy, so that they also in time to come may “speak of the glory of Christ’s kingdom and talk of His power, to make known to the sons of men His mighty acts and the glorious majesty of His kingdom.” In order to this, the principle of endowment is essential and must be maintained; and therefore it is that we must not only keep all our present endowments and turn them to the best possible account in the prosecution of territorial work, but from the wisely guided liberality of the present generation we must seek further endowments, and dedicate

them to the cause of high sacred learning, for the benefit of the generations to come.

The low utilitarianism that seeks to strike at the very root of the principle of endowment by scoffing at "the dogmatic caretaking of pious ancestors," and by asking contemptuously, "What has posterity done for us, that we should be asked to do so much for posterity?"—is alike suicidal and absurd. Had nothing been done for us by the pious provision of our ancestors, we should have been in a pretty plight indeed. Were their magnificent bequests now alienated from their original object, the wide world would be all the poorer for such unhallowed misappropriation. Should we do nothing for those coming after us, we should be thereby injuring and impoverishing ourselves, and the world would soon settle down into the ignorance and corruption of the dark ages.* For what so elevating as the thoughts that carry us forward into the future! What so purifying and ennobling as purposes and acts that unselfishly seek the spiritual profit of those yet unborn! Whatever carries us out of the present and delivers us from its narrowing influences, exalts us in the scale of moral being; and

* Appendix M.

it is only as one age makes provision for another, and transmits its treasures to future times, that the world makes real progress, and from high to higher rises towards its proper destiny.

But of late it has grown into a habit with many to put down all abstract arguments in favour of the principle of Endowment, and to deny the pertinence and force of any instances and proofs of the failure of Voluntaryism in this country, by pointing triumphantly to America and asserting its marvellous success there. In that country, it is alleged by such men, Voluntaryism has free scope and fair-play. It is not cramped in its development nor hindered in its action by the deadening presence and proud prestige of a large subsidised Establishment. Religious toleration is thoroughly understood, practised, and enforced. The civil power has no authority and no desire to encroach on the sacred domain of conscience. Every man sits under his own vine and fig-tree, none daring to make him afraid. The proportion of churches to the population, the status, income, and ability of ministers, and the life, energy, and liberality of the Christian people, are all such as are not approached, far less paralleled, by the state of matters which in these respects obtains in any

country overshadowed by the incubus of an endowed and Established Church.

Such are the statements confidently put forth not only by avowed and partial advocates of Voluntaryism, but in books written by authors who profess themselves exempt from all ecclesiastical bias. But the worth of these and of similar statements on this subject has been fortunately tested and exposed by a writer pre-eminently fitted for the task, who adduces facts that speak for themselves, in proof of the utter unreliableness of all these statements, and of the hollow and misleading character of the seeming successes of Voluntaryism in America. Dr Magee, formerly Rector of Enniskillen, now Bishop of Peterborough, in his trenchant treatise on the Voluntary system, proves with reference to the current fables of its success in the great Western world, that out of a total of 42,359 churches, there were no fewer than 12,829 without any settled pastoral ministry,—that out of a population of twenty-seven millions, more than a third were not even under the influence of pure Christianity, and much less than a sixth were members of any pure Christian Church,—that upwards of five millions either make no profession of any religion whatever, or are open

and avowed infidels—that over and above these, another million connected with Mormonism, Spiritualism, or other such monstrous abortions, cannot be regarded as Christians at all—that not less than one hundred different denominations, some of them calling themselves by the most ridiculous names, and glorying in the most absurd peculiarities of faith and practice, are enumerated in the American Census—that the occupants of the pews exert the most degrading and pernicious influence on the occupants of the pulpits, who dare not, as they value their salaries or the place they fill, denounce national sins, and who, as the result of this subserviency, were the great abettors and upholders of slavery so long as it subsisted in the South—that with churches crowded in the cities, hundreds of thousands are living on the territory without Sabbath or sanctuary influences, without a pastor, and without any one to care for their souls—and that in America, as elsewhere, Voluntaryism tends to promote congregationalism and commercialism, instead of a system of faithful and devoted pastoral superintendence in connection with the ministry of the Gospel.

With these facts established—and in the work referred to they are established beyond the possi-

bility of doubt or question—what becomes of the vaunted triumphs and complete success of Voluntaryism in America? The testimony of the Rev. John Stannage of Welland, Canada West, is a direct answer to this question, not only as concerns the Dominion, of which he more particularly speaks, but as concerns the States also. “The Voluntary system is a dreadful failure. For my part, I cannot possibly conceive how it can be defended. In large towns and cities, where wealth and influence are closely combined, a good deal is done; but so much remains undone, both in towns and in the rural parts, that party spirit alone, or the most culpable ignorance of facts, can be the cause that the system still finds advocates. Why is it that every clergyman of the Church, nay, every other sort of minister in these provinces, has three or four or five congregations at great distances from each other under his sole charge? Why is it that I have myself, at this moment, four townships under my charge, and work enough to employ *four* or *five* clergymen constantly? Why is it that there are fifty townships at this moment in the diocese of Huron, as lately declared by the bishop, without one single clergyman, and not even a travelling missionary? Why is it that thousands of large settlements in all North America

are left destitute of the means of grace, and the people becoming so accustomed to do without public worship, that I am told everywhere by such persons that they must confess both themselves and their neighbours have almost forgotten the first principles of religion, and they are now more heathens than Christians? Surely it need not be said that the want of clergy, of churches, and of schools, caused by the want of pecuniary means, or by the total inefficiency of the Voluntary system, is the sole reason for all this deplorable state of things. Since the 'Clergy Reserves' were taken from us, we have not been able to fill up the vacancies which have occurred; but—would you believe it?—the richly endowed Roman Church has increased its number of clergy in Upper Canada alone, during that time, above 100.* These are facts well established and published, though I have not the documents at hand. English travellers passing through the chief towns or cities in the United States and in Canada may carry a different impression to England; but what have they seen? They should visit our poorer population, our backwood settlements, and our fishing shores. I must pass by the other still greater evil of the Voluntary system; I mean the evil

* Appendix N.

effect which must be the natural consequence of the want of independence in the clergy themselves upon the doctrines of the Gospel. The multitude of sectarian creeds produces a very general indifference to all religion."

Voluntaryism, therefore, it is very evident, does not change its hue on the other side of the Atlantic. It is fruitful of the same evils there as here. With all the free scope and fair-play it enjoys under the starred and striped Republican banner, it leaves tens and hundreds of thousands uncared for. With a Beecher there, as with a Spurgeon here, planted in a large and populous city, enshrined in a temple where fashion helps to swell the votaries, and sensationalism or genius impregnates the winged words spoken from the pulpit with power to awe, entrance, or excite, Voluntaryism will win for itself such victories as impress the vulgar or unthinking with the idea that it is the system best fitted to succeed. But the scenes described by reliable eyewitnesses, as marking the season of seat-letting in Brooklyn, are not calculated to impart a very favourable idea of the system by which such success is attained there; nor does the *olla podrida* of opinions, which recent revelations prove to be held by the multifarious masses attending that chapel, afford evidence of

any great or worthy results flowing from its external success.

Every view of the subject, therefore,—the superior excellence of the system of endowment abstractly considered—the failure of Voluntaryism alike at home and abroad to effect any real good beyond the circle of its own adherents, save when it decks itself in borrowed plumes and works out the very principle against which it protests—and especially the tendency of Voluntaryism to take its inspiration and to draw its strength from a spirit of rivalry and opposition to an old endowed Church,—all should lead us to maintain and add to our endowments in spite of all the sweet and honeyed words of seeming friends, and all the efforts of avowed opponents, that would now induce or force us to give them up. “Are the thousands,” asked Dr Chalmers, in his last appeal to the Free Church—“are the thousands and tens of thousands whom Voluntaryism, with all its efforts, and, we may well add, with all its high-sounding pretensions, has failed to overtake—are they to be sacrificed to an impotent and most in-operative theory,—a theory tried in all its forms and most palpably found wanting?”*

Let every true Scotchman who glories in the

* Appendix O.

name and genius of Chalmers, and who values and loves the principles inherited from the great Reformers Knox and Melville, answer this question by resolving, in dependence on the blessing of God, to maintain these principles unimpaired, and to carry them out into practical and complete operation, till, with a sufficient number of parishes of suitable size and population, manned by moderately endowed ministers, earnest at once and independent, learned and laborious, Scotland in all her borders shall enjoy fully the benefit of endowed territorial work.