



# Bodleian Libraries

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

This book is part of the collection held by the Bodleian Libraries  
and scanned by Google, Inc. for the Google Books Library Project.

For more information see:

<http://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/dbooks>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-  
ShareAlike 2.0 UK: England & Wales (CC BY-NC-SA 2.0) licence.

10

# CHRIST AND CÆSAR;

OR,

THE CARDROSS CASE VIEWED IN THE  
LIGHT OF GOD'S WORD.

BY THE

REV. ROBERT BUCHANAN, D.D.,

FREE COLLEGE CHURCH, GLASGOW.

GLASGOW:

DAVID BRYCE, BUCHANAN STREET;  
EDINBURGH: W. P. KENNEDY. LONDON: J. NISBET & CO.

---

PRICE THREEPENCE.



# CHRIST AND CÆSAR;

OR,

## THE CARDROSS CASE VIEWED IN THE LIGHT OF GOD'S WORD.

A DISCOURSE PREACHED IN THE FREE COLLEGE CHURCH, GLASGOW,  
ON SABBATH, NOV. 18, 1860,

BY THE REV. ROBERT BUCHANAN, D.D.

---

"If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend : whosoever maketh himself a king,  
speaketh against Cæsar."—JOHN XIX. 12.

---

It was ordained by last General Assembly, that on this particular Sabbath, the ministers of our Church should call the special attention of their people to those great Scripture principles, for the vindication of which she renounced, in 1843, her civil establishment, and formally withdrew from her alliance with the State. This appointment has come to possess a peculiar appropriateness, and a very marked significance, from an event which has taken place within the last few days. I need hardly say that I allude to a decision just pronounced in the courts of law. That decision, if finally sustained and confirmed by the supreme civil tribunals, will strike a death-blow at the spiritual independence of our church,—paralyze the exercise of her discipline,—and practically subvert, on a vital and fundamental point, the sacred rights of conscience, and those grand principles of religious toleration, which have been hitherto recognized as lying embedded in the very heart of the constitution of this free realm, and as constituting, to all nonconformist churches, the bulwark of their liberties. I make this statement deliberately, and with very solemn feelings. I need not add, that I make it with no other sentiments than those of respect and deference towards the judicial authority from which

the adverse sentence has proceeded. It is painful to be brought into collision with any class of men; and especially with those who speak from the seat of justice, and whose office it is to explain and administer the law of the land. For a Christian church, especially, to be compelled to assume an attitude of opposition to men occupying such a place, is to be subjected to a very grievous trial. Nothing is more easy than to misrepresent her motives, and to cover with odium her conduct, in taking up such an attitude; and it requires both much candour and much intelligence to protect her, in such circumstances, from being at least misunderstood. Those who are old enough to remember the long, arduous, and agitating struggle of this very kind, which preceded our ever-memorable Disruption, will not need anything in the way of illustration, to enable them to appreciate the force and fitness of such remarks as these.

But at the same time the very knowledge and experience they acquired in connection with that former and most eventful contest, can hardly have failed, in some measure, to prepare them for the state of things at which we have now arrived. It is simply the old controversy in a slightly altered form. Again, as before, it is the spiritual freedom of the church that is in question. That freedom consists in the complete exemption of her spiritual office-bearers, in the exercise of her government and discipline, from all dictation, or authoritative interference, other than that of the Lord Jesus Christ, her only Head and King, speaking to them in His Word, and guiding them by His Spirit. In this definition of that which constitutes the rightful liberty of a Christian church, it is not of course implied or intended that she is entitled, under cover of the plea of dealing with spiritual things, wantonly and maliciously to assail the character either of her own members, or of others beyond her pale. She has nothing to do to judge them that are without. Her Divine Master gave her no such commission. And if, therefore, she attempts to strike with her censures those who have not placed themselves voluntarily under her jurisdiction, she is usurping an authority against which, those on whom she thus seeks to bring it to bear, may most justly demand protection from the civil power. And again, if even, as regards those

---



who are legitimately within the sphere of her jurisdiction, it can be alleged and proved that the matters in respect of which she puts forth her authority over them are not spiritual matters at all,—are not matters which fall under the proper cognizance of a spiritual court;—or if even though they be of this character, she is making them a mere pretext or handle for accomplishing some sinister and malicious end,—it equally holds true, that against such a grievance, redress may most justly be sought at the hands of the civil power.

But having thus cleared our definition of what constitutes the rightful and scriptural freedom of a Christian church, from all such perversions or abuses of its true meaning and import as these,—it remains that there is a field which is exclusively her own, and into which no external human power may intrude, without trenching both on the sacred rights of conscience, and on the exercise and integrity of that authority which the Lord Jesus Christ, as the Head of the Church, has reserved to Himself alone. It was on this ground our church took her stand in the great conflict with the courts of civil law, which preceded the Disruption. It was to maintain this ground inviolate, that she surrendered to the state all those temporal advantages and emoluments which it had conferred upon her; and cast herself, for her support, on the voluntary offerings of her own people, and on the protection and blessing of her heavenly King.

When that great evangelical and reforming movement began, out of which the church's former struggle with the civil courts arose, nothing was further from the mind of those who took part in the movement, than either the originating of that struggle, or the bringing on of that separation of the church from the state, in which it ended. They were seeking, solely and exclusively, the greater efficiency of the church, and a more thorough enforcement of her own constitution and laws. But though *they* saw not the end from the beginning, God saw it: and, seeing it, He permitted events to take that course out of which there has sprung a far greater good to His own cause and kingdom, than could, probably, have been reached any other way.

Perhaps it is a similar evolution of His wise, righteous, and

gracious providence, of which we have again the earlier steps before us. Most certain it is, that in performing that act of discipline which has given occasion to this new conflict with the courts of civil law, nothing could possibly have been either less expected or less desired by the church, than the result that has actually followed. Her sole concern and object, in deposing from the ministry a man proved guilty of drunkenness and of other moral offences, was to keep the communion of Christ's house pure; and with that view, faithfully and honestly to execute the law of her Lord. But though *she* knew not what was to follow, it was known intimately to her God: and He is ever wonderful in counsel, and excellent in working.

If it be His will that this new form of the old conflict for His church's rights and liberties, shall be suffered to run a course, as long and as agitating, it may be, as the other which preceded it, let us be assured He has some design of corresponding magnitude and worth to be thereby served. Certain it is, that the great question of the right relation between the kingdoms of this world and the spiritual kingdom of Christ, is one which civil rulers, and very many even of the churches of Christ themselves, very imperfectly understand. If, on the one hand, in the church of Papal Rome, many things have been wrongfully claimed for Christ's pretended vicar, which rightfully belong to Cæsar: it is as true, on the other hand, that in the case of not a few Protestant kingdoms, many things are wrongfully claimed and usurped by Cæsar, which rightfully and only belong unto God. It ought, therefore, neither to surprise nor to grieve us, if we see a contest recommenced, which in proportion as it grows and spreads, and gains force and power, in a country like this, cannot fail to exert a most important influence in the way of enlightening, on this grand subject, the world at large. There is, perhaps, no country so well prepared as our own, to bring to the discussion of this grand question of the mutual relations and duties of the state and the church, all those elements of scriptural knowledge, and practical experience, and deep, religious earnestness,—out of which its right and permanent settlement must ultimately come. Let us cheerfully accept, therefore, the place, however trying and responsible

---

it may be, which Providence seems to be preparing to assign to us, in connection with the assertion and elucidation of principles which must be cleared up, and recognized, and established, if ever the kingdoms of this world are to become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ.

I feel that this is a long and somewhat unwieldy introduction to the discourse that is to follow. It seemed to me, however, that in the actual circumstances of the case, it could not be dispensed with. It will help at least to show that the subject of my text, and which I am now about to handle, has not only an intrinsic and imperishable interest and grandeur of its own, but that it has, in addition, this peculiar and pressing claim upon our notice—that it is, *for us*, emphatically “the *present truth*.”

In dealing with such a question as the one before us, it is of the utmost consequence to get, if we can, at the real source and secret of those encroachments which, in all ages, the civil power has been so constantly making upon the free action of the Christian church. It is true, indeed, that these encroachments have not always sprung from one and the same cause; nor has the fault, by any means, been altogether or uniformly on the side of the state. Its interferences have not unfrequently been provoked, sometimes almost necessitated, by the encroaching spirit of the church itself. In this respect, as in many others, the Church of Rome has by its arrogance and intolerance done much to create an unintelligent but most injurious prejudice in many minds, against even the most legitimate rights and liberties of the Church of Christ. But altogether apart from those jealousies which Popery has done so much to awaken in the minds of civil rulers against ecclesiastical authority in general,—jealousies in regard to which even Protestant churches have not always been entirely free from blame,—it is beyond all question true, that at every period of the church’s history, civil rulers and their courts of law have shown a disposition to disallow to the Christian church the free exercise of its own peculiar powers and functions; and to fetter it with restraints and coercive interferences which, in many countries, have to a large extent robbed it of its peculiar character as a kingdom not of this world; and have

---



degraded it into a mere appendage, often into a mere tool of the temporal power. To what is this to be ascribed? How is this unquestionable fact—which stands out conspicuously on the face of all history—to be explained? The answer to such inquiries, I firmly believe, may be found, by every thoughtful and dispassionate mind, in the words of our text. The true theory of that incessant interfering with the free action of Christ's church on the part of kings and governments to which I have alluded,—is precisely the theory that was propounded to Pilate by the enemies of our Lord, and the application of which, in his case, resulted in his being condemned and crucified. “If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend: whosoever maketh himself a king, speaketh against Cæsar.” Here, in the very outset of the Christian church's career, and in connection with the proceedings of her glorious Head and King himself, we have the assertion of the very principle which lies at the bottom of that opposition on the part of the civil tribunals, which, in the carrying out of her lawful authority and duty, our own church has met often in days gone by, and is meeting with at this present hour.

For the opening up of this deeply important subject—let us, *in the first place*, consider the charge which is brought in our text by the Jews against Christ and his church. In the *second place*, let us attend to the fallacy by which the charge is pervaded. And in the *third and last place*, let us mark the bearing which the text has upon that conflict for her spiritual rights and liberties in which our church has come, in the providence of God, to be once more involved.

I. In the first place, let us consider the specific charge which is here brought by the Jews against Christ and his church. They accused him of making himself a king; and, by so doing, of committing treason against Cæsar the Roman emperor, who was then the ruler of Judea. In the grossness and carnality of their minds, the Jews in general had no other idea of their expected Messiah, than that he was actually to be a great and illustrious temporal prince; under whose reign their particular race were to be exalted to a position of pre-eminence and power above all the other king-

---

doms of the world. It was not a mere invention therefore, this charge of theirs. Knowing as they did that Jesus actually claimed to be their national Messiah, they took for granted that he did mean, in their own sense of the expression, to challenge for himself all those prerogatives and powers that must necessarily belong to a king of Judea,—and pre-eminently to such a king as they assumed that their Messiah was destined to be. It was not on this account that they had any objection to Jesus. Their objection lay in this, that he did not at all realize their views and expectations on the subject of Messiah's kingly character. They hated him, not because he made himself a king, but because he was not the sort of king they looked for and wished to have. In his outward estate he was too lowly and unpretending—too entirely destitute of that earthly pomp and grandeur which they regarded as essential to their Messiah's glory and to their own; and, worse still, in their estimation, than this—he was far too pure, and spiritual, and truth-loving, and far too uncompromising in his reprobation of their hypocrisy and wickedness—to be tolerable by men of their ungodly spirit. It was this intense personal hatred of Christ, and not any concern for the safety of Cæsar's throne, that moved them to bring against him the charge of treason at Pilate's bar. It was the sort of accusation which the Roman governor was most likely to understand, and which he was most likely to regard as serious. It was therefore the charge which promised to be the most serviceable for their murderous design; and had the charge been true in their sense of it, neither its relevancy nor its force could possibly have been denied. Undoubtedly, whosoever in that earthly and human sense, made himself a king, might well be regarded as speaking against Cæsar. No true sphere can have more than one centre. No body politic can have more than one supreme head. An *imperium in imperio*—a government within a government, is a contradiction. To tolerate it, would be to sanction anarchy and civil war. It was, however, of doing this very thing that Jesus was accused; and it is of doing this very thing that his church, ever and anon, is accused to this day. It is, moreover, just on the assumed ground that it is the duty of the civil power to prevent our own church from doing this very thing, that the decision of the courts of law, to which

I have alluded in the outset of this discourse, was the other day pronounced. The sentence that was delivered by the church, and in virtue of which she deposed from the office of the holy ministry, a man charged with, and publicly proved, to her satisfaction, to be guilty of flagrant immoralities, "being a spiritual act done in the ordinary course of discipline by a Christian church"—she holds that it is not competent for the civil courts to reduce it, and to set it aside. That principle, the civil judge has expressly rejected and disallowed. He has done so, because he thinks that to sanction it, would be to sanction, substantially, the setting up of a government within a government—the setting up of a kingdom within a kingdom. And, consequently, that were he to allow what the church claims, he would not be acting as Cæsar's friend—would not be, that is, discharging his duty to the temporal sovereign of this realm.

II. The question therefore is—and this brings us to the second thing proposed, viz., to the consideration of the fallacy which pervades the charge brought by the Jews against our Lord—Is this charge true—true in their sense of it—true in the only sense that could justify Christ's condemnation under it? If it was untrue in the case of the church's Head, it will not be difficult to show that it is equally and necessarily untrue in the case of the church itself.

Did Christ then, as the Jews affirmed, and in the sense in which they affirmed it, make himself a king? That He did in some sense make himself a king is undeniable; for He himself with great emphasis and solemnity avowed that He did. When Pilate, acting on the accusation of the Jews, put to him the question—Art thou a king then?—He answered explicitly thus, "Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth" (John xviii. 37). So far from denying it, he tells the Roman governor to his face, that the very end of his taking on him our human nature, and coming down into this world of ours at all, was to assert and assume kingly authority and power. But, at the same time, he made Pilate distinctly aware that his kingly character and claims

---

were not of a kind that in the least conflicted with the rights and authority of Cæsar. "My kingdom," said He, "is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence" (John xviii. 36).

These significant words furnish a complete and conclusive answer to the accusation of the Jews, by laying bare the utter fallacy on which it proceeds. Their accusation assumed that Christ's kingdom was of this world—a kingdom of the same material and earthly kind as Cæsar's own. Had it been so, it could not possibly have been set up without bringing Christ and his followers into direct collision with the Roman authorities. The civil ruler beareth not the sword in vain. It has been given to him by God, to resist and punish all who oppose themselves to his rightful authority. And, had Christ's kingdom been of this world—an ordinary earthly kingdom—he would have employed the usual means to establish and uphold it. "Then," said He, "would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered unto the Jews" (John xviii. 36). But he had expressly forbidden them to do so. "Put up thy sword again into his place," said he to Peter, when he had rashly drawn it in his Master's defence, "for all they that take the sword" (that take it, *that is*, in my service, for which it is altogether unsuited, and in connection with which it has no place), "shall perish with the sword" (Matt. xxvi. 52). By this broad and palpable fact did Christ proclaim the fundamental distinction between his spiritual kingdom, and the kingdoms of this world.

The kingdoms of this world take to do with material and earthly things, such as person and property. The kingdom of Christ takes to do with spiritual and heavenly things, such as the soul and salvation. This kingdom of His, therefore, is altogether diverse from that of Cæsar. It is indeed in the world, but it is not of the world. Its laws, its ordinances, its offices are all from heaven. Its rewards and punishments are both, alike and exclusively, spiritual. Its subjects become such, not by parentage or geographical position, but by a faith which is the gift of God; in other words, by virtue of a spiritual union with Christ himself.

From all this it follows, obviously and of necessity, that Christ's



kingdom is no rival kingdom to that of Cæsar. The sphere of the one is altogether different from that of the other, and therefore, if only each keeps to its own sphere, not only they need not, but they cannot come into collision. Collision can never by possibility arise, but either by reason of the Church invading the sphere of the State, and taking upon herself to deal with men's earthly rights and interests; or by the State invading the sphere of the Church, and taking upon itself to deal with things spiritual—with those things which belong to conscience and the concerns of the soul.

III. And now, in the third place, let us mark the bearing which the text has upon that conflict for her spiritual rights and liberties in which our church has come, in the providence of God, to be once more involved. It is sufficiently plain that our Lord's controversy with the Jews and with Pilate had reference to his church. *That* is his kingdom. In setting it up, the Apostles were his servants. They were to set it up, not with carnal, but with spiritual weapons. And accordingly, when immediately before His ascension to heaven He gave them their final commission, it was in these terms: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo! I am with you always even unto the end of the world" (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.) This commission manifestly had reference to the visible church—to the bringing of men, not only to the personal and saving knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus, but to the making of an open and public profession of their faith in that truth, in the face of the world. It implied and required, in a word, that his disciples should be organized into a spiritual society, subject, in things spiritual, to himself alone; bound to observe all things whatsoever He had commanded. Accordingly when, not long thereafter, certain of these same servants of this spiritual King were interrupted in the execution of his commands by the civil rulers of Judea, they told these rulers, respectfully but firmly, that they were not at liberty, in

---



this matter, to yield them obedience: "Whether it be right," said they, "in the sight of God, to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye; for we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard" (Acts iv. 19, 20). In other words, they pled as their vindication for carrying on that spiritual work in which they were engaged, even at the expense of disobeying the civil power, the higher obligation under which they lay to obey God. It was quite possible, indeed, that in carrying into effect the commands of Christ, their proceedings might indirectly and even powerfully affect civil society, and tell on the position and reputation which particular men held in it. In point of fact, the civil rulers of Judea made use of these very considerations, as reasons for restraining the Apostles in the exercise of their spiritual duties. "Did we not straitly command you," said these rulers to the Apostles, when they had again summoned them before the civil tribunals, "that ye should not teach in this name, and behold ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intend to bring this man's blood upon us?" But still Peter had no other answer than the former one to give: "We ought to obey God rather than man" (Acts v. 28, 29.) To disturb civil society was not their aim. To bring its rulers into odium was not their aim. Their aim was to set up and extend and uphold the spiritual kingdom of Christ, and thereby to save perishing souls. If certain results connected with men's temporal interests, or with those of civil society, indirectly followed from their proceedings, the fact must be ascribed to the relation which God himself had established between things spiritual and heavenly, and things material and earthly. But these two classes of things must not, on that account, be confounded the one with the other; nor must civil rulers seek, on that account, to invade the spiritual province of the church, which is the kingdom of Christ. Christ himself, rather than suffer it, submitted to die upon the cross. His Apostles, rather than suffer it, submitted to bonds and stripes, and imprisonments and death. Our godly forefathers, rather than suffer it, took joyfully the spoiling of their goods, and endured the dungeon, the rack, and the stake. Our own ministers, seventeen years ago, rather than

---

suffer it, gave up their earthly all—their pleasant homes and legally-secured incomes, and have many of them ever since, and with cheerful contentment, been enduring comparative poverty as the consequence; while our people, for the same reason, have made personal sacrifices of their time and labour and worldly means, such as have made our church the wonder of the world. Strange indeed it were if, after all this, we did not refuse, at all hazards, to suffer it now.

And here let me briefly show, that it is truly that old and most sacred struggle which has been again renewed.

Let it be observed, then, and distinctly noted, that the principle which has been laid down in the recent decision, is shortly and simply this—that “spiritual acts done by a Christian church, in the ordinary course of discipline, may be reduced”—that is, may be reversed and set aside by the courts of civil law. Let it be further observed, that the doctrine thus propounded, and in the form of a legal judgment, has no reference to any one particular case. It is broad and general. It applies to all spiritual acts whatsoever: to every possible act which belongs to the spiritual government and discipline of a Christian church. For example, we read in the fifth chapter of 1st Corinthians, of a member of the church at Corinth, who had been living in gross and heinous sin, and that Paul, speaking by inspiration of God, commanded his excommunication. “In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ,” said he to the spiritual rulers of that church “when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.” Now, in regard to any such sentence, pronounced by any Christian church in this kingdom, the recent decision declares that it is competent for a court of civil law to reduce it, to declare it illegal, and to undo it. That is to say, the courts of civil law, to which Christ has given no authority in spiritual things, and no right to rule in the house of God, hold themselves entitled, notwithstanding, to review and reverse the spiritual sentences of the Christian church.

The church deposes a minister for immorality, or excludes a member, for similar reasons, from the Lord's table. The civil court claims to itself the right and power to declare these sentences to be illegal, and to draw its pen through them.

It is quite true that the civil court evidently hesitates as to the way and manner in which it would venture to give practical effect to this tremendous doctrine: and no wonder. But this does not, and cannot affect the nature and import of the doctrine itself. The doctrine claims for the civil court full competency and right to reverse sentences in matters spiritual, pronounced by the church, in the ordinary exercise of her discipline, upon her own office-bearers or members, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. It claims the right to do this, even where there is no allegation that the church court has been actuated by malice or sinister design. It claims the right to do it, on the bare and naked plea that some civil injury is alleged, and that in its judgment there was no sufficient warrant for the spiritual censure out of which that alleged civil injury indirectly arose. In other words, it holds itself entitled to take out of the hands of Christ's church, the ultimate settlement of the question as to what those circumstances are, in which the members or office-bearers of the church, ought to be either received into it or excluded from it. And further, that in the event of its judgment differing from that of the church on such a point, it holds itself entitled thereupon to decree that either the church must undo the spiritual sentence she had pronounced, or, at the very least, be coerced by pains and penalties for refusing to do so. In one word, it holds itself entitled to require, that in a matter in which the conscience of the church binds her to obey God, she shall do violence to that conscience, and consent to obey man.

And what, it may be asked, is the principle on the strength of which this right to control the discipline of Christian churches is claimed by the civil tribunals? It is simply the old principle upon which our Lord Himself was condemned and crucified—the principle that to recognize the right of the church to exercise an independent jurisdiction, even in matters the most purely spiritual, is to speak against Cæsar. To say, in defence of this principle,

---

that the spiritual sentence of the church draws after it some civil consequence, or affects some temporal interest, is simply to adduce, in a much feebler form, the argument which was used for the same purpose by the civil tribunals of Jerusalem, when they assumed authority to stop the preaching of the gospel. The preaching of the Apostles was bringing into question,—the civil rulers of Judea said,—the justice of the sentence by which the Saviour had been put to death. It was agitating society as to the conduct of the civil rulers themselves, in that momentous proceeding. It was thus tending to damage their influence with the people. Here was a great civil interest most powerfully affected by the purely spiritual acts of the servants of Christ. But did that fact justify the civil authorities of Judea in taking it upon them, to say that Christ's authority and command must be set aside, and that the preaching of the gospel must cease? It is essentially the same question with which we are dealing at this hour. To depose a man from the ministry—or to exclude him from the Lord's table,—is undoubtedly to affect his civil interests. In the case of the minister it may involve the loss of his living. In the case of the member of the church, it may involve the loss of his reputation, and thereby, perhaps, may lead indirectly to his losing some worldly advantage which he previously enjoyed. And if, therefore, *this* be enough to entitle the civil tribunal to reverse and set aside the spiritual sentence the church had in such cases pronounced,—it simply and obviously follows that the church's right of discipline is taken utterly away. If exercised at all on such a footing, it is exercised in subordination to Cæsar and not to Christ. The church, if she submit to such a state of things, becomes of necessity the mere servant of men. If she refuse to submit to it, she passes at once into the fires of persecution.

It is obvious that I cannot enter further into the details of such a question here and now. Enough, I trust, has been said to show that the crisis which has arisen is one of the gravest kind: and which will require the immediate and earnest and prayerful consideration of our church,—and not of our church alone, but of all the other churches in the land. To find ourselves involved in

such a conflict, is both a great grievance and a great surprise. We had hoped, and surely not without reason, that in paying the great price of the Disruption, we had made good our title to the undisturbed exercise of those spiritual rights and liberties which, it had been made painfully and conclusively manifest, were no longer to be found within the pale of the Established church. We were told, indeed, by those who then opposed and successfully resisted our church's claims to spiritual freedom, that if she wished to enjoy it, she must give up her connection with the state. She accepted the alternative, trying though it was.

To surrender those earthly things which the state had conferred was to suffer, but to surrender those heavenly prerogatives which she had received from her divine King and Lord would have been to sin. Between two such alternatives she could not and she did not hesitate. It would seem, however, that her faith and patience upon this great question are to be still further tried. The freedom denied to her as a national church establishment, it is now attempted to deny to her as a church altogether unconnected with the state, and depending for her temporal support on the means voluntarily provided by her own members alone. In other words, the doctrine is now laid down for the first time since the days of the Stuarts, that the civil power is the fountain of all authority—ecclesiastical and spiritual as well as civil and temporal; and that the claim of any church whatever to hold and exercise spiritual jurisdiction directly from Christ, and in subjection to Him alone, is to be denied and disallowed within this kingdom.

That man must know little of the spirit that animates the Christian churches of this land, and little of the deathless vitality and celestial energy of religious convictions, who imagines that such a doctrine can have effect given to it without kindling a fire which it may be difficult to quench, and setting forces in motion, the sweep and course of which no human prescience can foretell. But the Lord reigneth, and therefore let the earth rejoice. He sitteth upon the floods. He is "king in Jeshurun." He can make the errors and follies, as well as the wrath of men, to praise him. It must needs be that offences will come. The floods may lift up

---



their voice, but the Lord on high is mightier than the noise of many waters, yea, than the mighty waves of the sea. Even if this new conflict, on which apparently our church is entering, should prove tenfold more trying and severe than any other that has preceded it, who can tell, as was in substance touchingly and beautifully said in a time of great trouble by one of old, whether the sound of these many waters, and the noise of these mighty thunderings, may not prove but the prelude to the softer and sweeter strain of the harpers harping with their harps, filling this whole land with melody and mirth, and proclaiming the name of it to be "Jehovah-Shammah"—the Lord is there !