

## VII

### THE CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH

By the influence of his startling preaching, Edward Irving had everything to do with the actual origin of the *Catholic and Apostolic Church*. But he had little or nothing to do with the formulation of its creed, constitution, practice, or polity.

I say this in order to point out how foolish and unhistorical it is to dub this honourable Church by the slang name of 'Irvingism,' as so many writers still do even in reputable Dictionaries. It may seem reasonable enough to some people to call Christian Science 'Eddyism,' or the Millennial Dawn 'Russellism.' There is apparent reason in this: for after all, one cannot think of Christian Science apart from Mrs. Eddy, or Seventh Day Adventism apart from Mrs. White, or the Millennial Dawn apart from Pastor Russell. On the other hand, except for the initial 'push,' Edward Irving had little or nothing to do with the creed, the organization or the constitution of the Catholic and Apostolic Church. It is true that he cut the rough stone out of the quarry, but the shaping, chiselling, and polishing were done entirely by other hands.

Moreover, the members of this communion claim that both in origin and development, their Church had nothing to do with any one special man. Indeed they go further and assert that they are not a *church* at all in the usual sense of that term—i.e. a church separate from the general Catholic Church, of which they claim

to be only a part or an aspect. They took historic shape and formed an organization, not to separate themselves from the Church on any difference of creed, principle, or custom, but merely to call the attention of all churches alike to the need of witnessing to the imminent Coming of Jesus. Once that witnessing had been fulfilled and the churches awakened and stirred, they were willing to dissolve themselves. Since this ideal or hope was not fulfilled, they still exist in a diminished fashion, seeking no converts, issuing no propaganda, and sponsoring no evangelism. Unfortunately they have discovered that it is easier to form an organization than dissolve it, or to make a schism than heal it.

In point of history, then, Irving had no determining part in the formation or design of their Church. Indeed, I question if he had a mind creative or constructive enough for this task. At best he was a prophet, a visionary, a voice—and 'a voice' cannot build, though it may stir others to build. As we shall see, he was in no sense either a constructive thinker or an ecclesiastic.

## I

None the less, to understand the Catholic and Apostolic Church, we must begin with this remarkable man. It was his personal influence, especially his predictive preaching, that first moved the men of his generation. What a romantic and tragic life he had, one of amazing success and equally amazing failure!

He was born at Annan in Dumfriesshire in 1792 of parents of good local influence and standing, his mother coming from the 'bonnet lairds' of the district.

He was baptized in the local Church of Scotland, which in that special area was much influenced by the traditions of the Covenanters, many of whom used to pray passionately for the Coming of Christ in power to free them from the persecution of their political oppressors. (Incidentally this may explain much in Irving's later career.) He received a good education in the Academy of the town, where he gained prizes fairly easily in his classes. He went afterwards to Edinburgh University and graduated M.A. in 1809, just in his eighteenth year. Here also he earned some distinction. Years later, Thomas Carlyle said, 'The first time I saw Irving was six-and-twenty years ago in his native town of Annan. He was fresh from Edinburgh, with college prizes, high character, and promise.'

After taking his degree, Irving began his classes in the Divinity School of the university to study for the ministry of the Church of Scotland. In order to help himself through his studies—as many Scots students then had to do—he became master of a new 'mathematical school' opened at Haddington. He stayed here for two years while studying for the ministry. It was during this time that he gave private lessons to a young girl, afterwards so famous, Jane Baillie Welsh, who later became the wife of Thomas Carlyle. (May I add here in parenthesis that there was a strong affection between Jane Welsh and Irving, and even a possibility of marriage, had circumstances permitted. It was Irving who later introduced Thomas Carlyle to Jane Welsh. Long afterwards, when poor Irving became notorious for his mysterious 'voices and tongues,' the wise and able Jane Carlyle remarked, 'If I had married Irving, the tongues would never

have been heard.' Perhaps her own wise tongue would never have given them a chance !)

After Haddington, Irving went to open a new school at Kirkcaldy. There, having now qualified as a divinity student, he was licensed to preach by the local Presbytery. But oddly enough, considering his later fame and power, wherever he preached in his own land, he made no appeal at all to the Scots people. One old elder, a typical sermon-taster, said 'He had ower muckle grandeur,'—perhaps a more acute criticism than the critic thought !

While he was in Kirkcaldy, Thomas Carlyle came to open another school in the same town ; and Irving, who was two or three years his senior, became his fast friend and gave him every help with books and study—so much so that Carlyle later recorded in his fine tribute, 'But for Irving, I had never known what the communion of man with man means. His was the freest, brotherliest, bravest human soul mine ever came in contact with : I call him on the whole the best man I have ever, after trial enough, found in this world, or now hope to find.'<sup>1</sup>

Irving resigned from his school in 1818, and went to Edinburgh for further study. He still tried and hoped, all in vain, to receive a call to some Scottish church. Then one of the odd things that marked his life happened. He had been licensed to preach in 1815, and for four long years, nobody would have him. But in August 1819, while he was giving a chance 'supply' in a pulpit during a minister's holiday, the famous Dr. Thomas Chalmers happened to be one of the worshippers. Chalmers immediately got into touch with the young man, and said in effect, 'Come to

<sup>1</sup> Carlyle's *Miscellanies*, vol. ii, 'Death of Edward Irving'

Glasgow and be my assistant.' And so, at St. John's, Glasgow, there were for two years in the same pulpit the two most famous preachers of Britain in that generation.

But Edward Irving, besides being only an 'assistant,' always felt swamped beside the massive Chalmers. Hazlitt in his essay on Irving in *The Spirit of the Age* gives an interesting contrast between these two great preachers, though it is only fair to remember that Hazlitt despised Irving. 'The small frontispiece prefixed to the *Orations* does not serve to convey an adequate idea of the magnitude of the man, nor of the ease and freedom of his motions in the pulpit. How different is Dr. Chalmers! He is like a 'monkey-preacher' to the other. He cannot boast of personal appearance to set him off. But then he is like the very genius or demon of theological controversy personified. He has neither airs nor graces at command; he thinks nothing of himself; he has nothing theatrical about him (which cannot he said of his successor or rival); but you see a man in mortal throes and agony with doubts and difficulties, seizing stubborn knotty points with his teeth, tearing them with his hands, and straining his eye-balls till they almost start out of their sockets, in pursuit of a train of visionary reasoning, like a Highland Seer with his second sight.' Then he adds, 'If Mr. Irving is an example of what can be done by the help of external advantages, Dr. Chalmers is a proof of what can be done without them. The one is most indebted to his body, the other to his mind. If Mr. Irving inclines one to suspect fashionable and popular religion of a little anthropomorphism, Dr. Chalmers effectually redeems it from that scandal.'

Thus when Irving received an invitation, he agreed to leave Glasgow and go to a little down-at-heels

Scots Kirk in London, Caledonian Church in Hatton Garden. His Presbytery at Annan then ordained him in his thirtieth year. It is odd to think that the man who was to move London like a hurricane and found a church, could not receive a call to serve in his own land, or even be ordained till his thirtieth year—and he was ordained only when leaving it !

## 2

He went to London in 1822. He leapt into fame in a few weeks. He attracted so many people from all denominations that his little church almost burst its walls with the packed crowds. All the social and literary celebrities of the day, including people like Coleridge the poet, Canning the Prime Minister, and the Carlyles, came to hear him. In a public debate in the House of Commons Canning referred to him as one of the 'great orators' among men. His oratory was indeed amazing, and his voice was fine and resonant. He had a noble presence, commanding stature, and handsome features. But, in spite of Hazlitt's sneer, it was not his presence but his *power* that moved London. He was soon forced to leave the little church in Hatton Garden, and build a large church, still known as Regent Square Presbyterian Church, in 1827. *The Dictionary of National Biography* says that 'the crowds came and they stayed'; and it adds, 'He spoke with a strange note of authority; others might reason and expostulate, he dictated.' By this time—perhaps no great loss—the society people who had flocked to the church for a new kind of thrill had left him, chiefly because of his pre-occupation in Second Advent teaching and his singularities of

doctrine. But the common people were still there in great numbers.

Then, unfortunately for himself, he began to publish, and with this, disaster drew near. For some time he had interested himself deeply in prophecy, especially in dubious debates about the time of the Second Coming of Jesus, which he himself believed to be immediate. In 1823 he had published a book of his discourses called *For the Oracles of God*; and this was followed in 1826 by a translation of a book by a Spanish Jesuit, called *The Coming of the Messiah in Majesty and Glory*, for which he wrote a remarkable preface. In 1828 he published his *Homilies on the Sacraments*. All this led him into an exposition of his beliefs and doctrines; and it was from these published addresses, which could be examined word by word by Church Courts, that his great disaster came.

It is easy to understand how he became absorbed in prophecy. All Europe was then in a ferment after the Napoleonic Wars, and to this had been added widespread industrial troubles and agitations at home. People began to speak, as they are so apt to do in days of change and crisis, about the end of things, the break-up of society, and the coming Judgment. As we can understand, a subject like this lent itself readily to Irving's literary, picturesque, and oratorical treatment. But worse! Although he was poorly equipped as a precise thinker and constructive theologian, he began to deal with theological issues, both in his sermons and books, especially with the problems of the Incarnation and Nature of Jesus. Few of us to-day would consider Irving unorthodox or heretical in his estimate of our Lord's nature and mission—any more than we should consider his friend and fellow-church-

man, McLeod Campbell of Row, unorthodox. But Irving's language, which always savoured more of popular oratory than balanced statement, was certainly unfortunate and alarming to the orthodox people of that day. Actually, he was only concerned to show one thing—how deeply and really Jesus entered into our nature, what Irving slackly called *our sinful nature*. But his words, more picturesque than precise, led people to believe—wrongly, I am sure—that he attached a 'sinful nature' to Jesus. In any case, for this, and also for the excesses and consequences of his alarming teaching about the Second Coming of Jesus, he was tried before the Presbytery of London in 1830; and having been convicted of heresy, he was ejected from his new church in Regent Square in 1832.

The London Presbytery could not depose him from the ministry, as Irving claimed 'exemption from their jurisdiction,' since he had been ordained by a Presbytery in Scotland. But none the less he had to go out from the church building of Regent Square. The big part of his congregation moved out with him and formed a new unattached congregation in Newman Street. From this migration began the new movement called afterwards 'The Catholic and Apostolic Church.' Actually it was not till 1835, a year after Irving's death, that the Catholic and Apostolic Church took definite shape—which shows how little Irving had to do with its organization, creed, or constitution.

Unfortunately it was his own Kirk Session in Regent Square that first began proceedings against him. When he was ejected, most of the solid Scots people remained in the church; and it was with a mixed gathering of people from every quarter and every communion that he went out and began the church in Newman Street.

But so far, he was still by law a *minister of the Church of Scotland* and could still take his place among his people and act as an ordained minister. Then the worst blow fell. The Presbytery of Annan that had ordained him summoned him to appear before them for heresy and disorder. He came north in poor health and pleaded his own cause with astonishing power and eloquence. But in spite of this the Presbytery unanimously deposed him from the ministry of the Kirk of Scotland in 1833. On this hangs a sorry tale which in the end shows the astonishing humility of this remarkable man.

Here is what happened. He had become overwhelmingly impressed with the immediate coming of Jesus, though, unlike most people of that sort, he never indulged in inventing dates and times and seasons. All he believed was that the Advent was soon, if not immediate. That being so, Christ's Church should be ready to receive its Lord. Hence, the Church should get back at once to the conditions of the Apostolic days.

It is worth noting here how constantly all these systems which centre round the Second Coming demand that the Church should get back to 'the conditions of the Apostolic days.' Why should the developing Church, amid modern economic and spiritual problems, seek to revive the conditions of a past century? There was nothing sacrosanct or peculiarly divine in the methods or conditions of the Apostles' day. In the name of the Holy Spirit, who has promised to lead us into all new truth, why should we make a fetish of the first century? By the leading of the Holy Spirit the first century devised methods which suited the first century. By the leading of the same Holy Spirit, the

twentieth century will be enabled to devise ways and means which can alone suit the conditions of the twentieth century. If we disbelieve this, we disbelieve the leading of God.

Believing, however, that we must return to early methods, Irving argued that there should be apostles, prophets, people speaking with tongues, evangelists, and pastors. Under his influence, the ecstatic conditions of the first century began to happen in London and other places. People professed to speak with tongues, breaking out in the services and taking command of the meeting. At first, this only happened at private gatherings, but in 1831 the public services at Regent Square began to be interrupted by an outburst of unintelligible discourse from a female worshipper, and these interruptions soon became usual. Irving humbly hailed all this as the crown of his ministry. 'I did rejoice with great joy that the bridal jewels of the Church had been found again.' The point to observe is—that he gave this 'prophetic utterance' the *highest authority* in the Church.

Well, what was the result? When Irving was finally deposed as a minister of the Church of Scotland, these prophets said in effect: 'You are no longer an ordained minister; you must be ordained again by us.' And humbly—I do not know many acts just so humble as this—this great man who had begun everything for these people was *re-ordained by those whom he himself had aroused and made*. Thus, the Catholic and Apostolic Church, which historically owed its origin to Edward Irving, made him one of its less important members. I quote from *The Dictionary of National Biography*, 'An inspired voice from a prophet said that having lost his orders in the Scots Church, he must

## THE CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH

not administer the sacraments till he had received fresh ones.' And the great soul of Irving said 'Yes.' Humbly and reverently he allowed himself to be re-ordained.

When at last the prophetic voice of one of these so-called 'inspired people' announced that he could be re-instated, Irving was allowed to resume office, by the ordination of the new Apostles. Shortly afterwards, another mysterious prophetic voice, supposed to be given in vision, sent him away from London on a mission to Scotland. As humbly as ever, this man who had called the new church into being set off on his journey to the North in mid-winter, though already seriously ill with threatened consumption. He reached Glasgow, and died there, broken in health and in heart, on 7th December 1834, aged only forty-two. He was buried in the crypt of the ancient Cathedral of St. Mungo; and they put a picture of *John the Baptist* over his last resting-place. Some one had a real flash of genius there, for like John the Baptist, Irving was only a 'voice crying in the wilderness.' Only a voice! But what a good and gracious voice!

So died Edward Irving, one of the few Scotsmen to found an alien church. And even then, he did not found it! For as soon as he admitted the supreme rights of the new apostles and prophets, whom he had called into being, *they led, and he humbly followed.* Perhaps his noblest moment was in his apparent defeat. The man who moved London was humble enough to tie other men's shoe-strings.

Let Thomas Carlyle write his epitaph. 'The man was appointed a Christian priest; and he strove with the whole force that was in him to be it. He clave to his Belief, as to his soul's soul; followed it whithersoever, through earth or air, it might lead him; toiling

as never man toiled to spread it, to gain the world's ear for it—in vain. The misguided noble-minded had now nothing left to do but die. He died the death of the true and the brave. His last words, they say, were “In life and in death I am the Lord's”—Amen, Amen.’<sup>1</sup>

## 3

The Church, of which he was the historic occasion rather than the founder, is called the *Catholic and Apostolic Church*, because it claims to revive the conditions of the Christian community of the early Church in the days of the Apostles. Believing strongly that Christ was coming immediately, Irving also believed, under the excitement of this idea, that the exceptional and striking gifts of the Spirit which were manifested in the early Church, ought to belong to us equally with the Apostles. We had lost these powers, spiritual healing, and speaking with tongues, because of the unbelieving faithlessness of modern Christians. If only we believed as fully and urgently as the Apostles, we could do the same healing and prophetic work as they did.

This teaching, as I said, had an awakening and unsettling effect on certain parts of Scotland and among Irving's own congregation. Cases of strange faith-healing did actually take place, which Irving at once accepted as a ‘sure proof’ of the baptism of the Holy Spirit as at Pentecost. Thereafter, in answer to his fervent prayers, people in the audience began to speak with tongues and to prophesy. The gift of healing—thus claimed and actually verified in some nervous cases—is an interesting anticipation of what

<sup>1</sup> Carlyle, *Miscellanies*, vol. ii, ‘Death of Edward Irving’

## THE CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH

Christian Scientists have claimed to exercise in our own day. Strangely enough, Irving spoke of disease, like them, as a kind of 'sin' or 'foolish belief,' almost in Mrs. Eddy's own words. But he had none of her 'denial of matter' or 'denial of evil' or 'denial of disease.' He, too, claimed that the spirit could control the flesh—which we all accept as reasonable—but he was wise enough to admit that the 'flesh,' so-called, was just as real and as God-given as the spirit.

The Catholic and Apostolic Church has had no great history. It has possessed little power or popular appeal, mainly because it differed from other churches only in its emphasis on the immediate Return of the Lord and the need to recall 'the conditions of the apostolic days' and recapture the lost spirit of the past. Moreover it did not go out even in its early days to evangelize, but only to 'bear witness,' both to the Church and the world, that Christ's advent was coming soon. It has therefore taken little or no part in the affairs of the world or in the reform of social conditions; for like all these other adventist faiths, it believed that the present world was coming to a quick and sure end. All that was necessary was to be 'ready for the Lord.' Its Apostles and Prophets and Ministers were not in any sense *evangelists*, to influence and win the world from sin and passion, but merely *witnesses*, pointing to the sure coming 'Day of the Lord.' As they themselves said, they stood in the world, not to change it slowly by their devoted labours, but to assure it that the end was near.

Under their early fervour, the members attempted to revive and recall the state of feeling and the 'gifts' of the first century, which they believed were a *permanent possession* of the whole Church. Since Christ was coming

immediately, they held that God's will was to choose again *Twelve Apostles*, who would do the works and the signs of the original apostolate. All this, in the deepest sense, is an attempt to recapture the rapture and power of Pentecost, and to re-live the past. The question is—*Can it be done?* Would it be desirable in our age, if it could be done? Has there been no deliberate leading of the Holy Spirit during these twenty centuries? 'Back to Jesus' may be a good cry; but 'Back to the first century' is not. This happens to be the twentieth century. Can the wonder, the mystery, the miracle of apostolic days be revived now? The only answer is that wherever it has been tried artificially—and it is bound to be more or less artificial—it has signally failed.

## 4

The constitution of the Church is an attempt to revive the so-called *fourfold ministry* of the first generation after Jesus.

(i) In the first place, in obedience to a prophetic communication, *Twelve Apostles* were appointed, who were believed to possess and exercise the original gifts of Christ's chosen disciples. They were invested with special spiritual privileges and prerogatives. They alone could 'lay on hands' and ordain others to service. They alone could unfold the 'mysteries of God' to the waiting Church, and decide on all questions of discipline and order. Even when the 'prophets' spoke, their messages had to be interpreted and authenticated by these Apostles. Their main function, however, was for 'the ingathering of the nations' at the approach of the Lord. They went out on apostolic journeys, not to preach and evangelize and convert, but simply to bear

their testimony before the nations that the Day of the Lord was at hand. Once this testimony was given, they were ready to wait for the coming Advent. They taught nothing new or different from the recognized Church, but only this message of *perpetual readiness*. To-day, these Twelve Apostles have died, and the Church is faced with the fact that its early expectations and predictions have been gravely falsified. No new apostles have since been appointed—which is perhaps the best, if the saddest, proof that they now admit the failure of their testimony.

(ii) *The Order of Prophets*. The function of the Prophets, to use their own phrase, consisted chiefly of 'exhortations to holiness, openings of prophecy, and explanations of symbols.' It was among them, in earlier days, that the 'gift of tongues' in unknown languages was chiefly prominent. They proclaimed the need of the 'College of Apostles'; and they announced the various changes in practice and ritual which, when approved by the 'Apostles,' were accepted in their rather elaborate services.

(iii) *The Order of Evangelists*. Their work consists in declaring the truths of Christ's gospel and bringing home to the Church the message of the Apostles. They are Evangelists, not in the sense of winning the pagan and the indifferent to become Christian, but rather to convince all Christians that the day of the Lord's Return is at hand. Thus they are not Evangelists of the world so much as Evangelists of the Church.

(iv) *Pastors and Teachers*. This represents a kind of 'local priesthood' in the various individual congregations, and consists in the case of each congregation, of the 'bishop,' 'angel,' or chief pastor, with the elders and deacons. The 'angel' of the Catholic and

Apostolic Church corresponds, in a partial way, to the 'bishop' or leader of other denominations.

The Church's ministry has never been professional, but has been composed in large part of noted people who have been engaged in ordinary business or professions. The needs of the Church are maintained by tithes, the people being understood to contribute a tenth of their income for the support of work and ordinances.

Strangely enough, the services in each congregation to-day are deeply liturgical and formal. The ritual is very elaborate; and the forms of worship have been appropriated from ancient sources, chiefly Eastern models. 'The liturgy, dating from 1842, is mainly based on the recognized Greek, Roman, and Anglican liturgies, with additional prayers. Lights and incense are used; and the vestments (surplice, alb, chasuble, and stole) are similar to the Roman communion.'<sup>1</sup>

This point alone shows how little Irving had to do with the formation and build of the Church. His simple Presbyterian soul would have had no part or parcel in this most diverse and elaborate symbolism and ritual. But the people whom he attracted to him, eclectics from every strange church, were the originators of this diverse ceremonial. It all seems so odd and contradictory—on the one hand, the simplicity of the early passion and power of the Apostolic days; and on the other hand, this elaborate ritual gleaned from the third and fourth centuries, when the church began to model itself on the political grandeur of the Roman Empire.

The Catholic and Apostolic Church is not one that calls for any criticism, and certainly invites no hostility. It has not been aggressive in any way—indeed, one

<sup>1</sup> *Chambers's Encyclopaedia*, article 'Catholic and Apostolic Church'

might complain of it on that score. It has had almost no *missionary* or converting zeal. It has never professed to stand as one church against other churches, but only as a witnessing community within the other churches. In early days, it did not ask its members to leave other communions but only to be 'revived' in their own communion by a zealous expectation of the Coming Lord.

## 5

In summary may I be allowed to refer to three points :

(i) All millennial expectations of the nearness or immediacy of Christ's Return have proved themselves to be dangerous and unsettling. They lead to foolish judgments, and almost seem to *command* God regarding His own plans. It is right for all Christians to look for God's consummations of His own promises, praying and working for the coming of Christ's Kingdom. But to go preaching that Jesus is coming now or soon, here or there, is not true to New Testament teaching. I have been amazed at the number of new disruptive religions, spoiling the Church's peace and unity, which owe their origin entirely to some unbalanced expectations regarding the Second Advent. There is hardly a new religion nowadays that is not founded on some queer millennial expectation of the immediacy of Christ's Return. The fact that these foolish predictions have been falsified throughout the centuries should make us regard all advent and millennial claims with grave suspicion.

(ii) A return to 'early apostolic conditions,' when analysed, is really an attempt to turn back the hands of the clock. The conditions of that day cannot be

recalled in this. But further, this attempt amounts to a subtle denial of the leading of the Holy Spirit. Accepted in our hearts, He will suggest and invent new plans for new occasions. Surely the Holy Spirit does not need to plagiarize His own past !

(iii) I find it very difficult to reconcile or harmonize the wonder and fervency of the first century with the elaborate and ornate rituals of the second and third, as adopted by this communion. I do not wonder that the fire and passion of the Catholic and Apostolic Church has been strangely damped. Its symbolism and its ritual—arbitrarily adopted, and not laden with any of the mystical meaning of the Greek and Roman churches from which they are taken—would damp anything ! It is comparatively easy, even for a ' humble Presbyterian ' like myself, to understand and appreciate much of the hidden mystical meaning in many of the rites and the symbolism of the Greek and Roman churches ; they are laden and rich with ancient traditions. But what possible meaning can these ' adopted ' rites have for a church that simply votes to have them, just because they seem impressive ? One might as well adopt the ceremonies of the Incas of Peru ; they too might be impressive, but they would be equally empty of all special meaning. In any case, the fervour, expectancy, and miracle of the apostolic days can only live under the simple and natural conditions of their own times.

Early Christianity came out of a religion of ritual—Jewish ritual. It burst the bonds, for no ritual, then or now, could contain the free natural joy and power of these early days. Only when the Church cooled, did ritual return. It always tends to do so when spontaneity departs. I would humbly suggest to my

## THE CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH

Catholic and Apostolic brethren that it is mixing oil and water to combine one of the most elaborate symbolisms of the present day with the wonder and the boundless simplicity of the early Apostles. When one expects so eagerly the glorious Return of the Lord—as the founders of their Church once did—one does not declaim to Him in a choice literary Collect! The early ‘unknown tongues’ and the extinct ‘prophecy’ were more in harmony with this mighty Hope.

I understand that the Catholic and Apostolic Church desires no new mission and no converts. It accepts the main doctrines of the Protestant Churches. The one thing that called it into being—its expectation of the immediate return of Christ—has now passed from its creed. To my mind it has now nothing distinctive to proclaim. Its voice, once strong and stirring, is now either subdued or silent. None the less we still honour the zeal that called it into being, and especially the arresting power of Edward Irving, that great ‘voice,’ whose ashes now rest quietly in the land and the church he always loved.