

LIBRARY
JUN 22 1881
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE TWO ANOINTED ONES;

OR,

CHURCH AND STATE.

A SERMON

DELIVERED IN THE MEETING HOUSE

OF THE

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH IN PHILADELPHIA,

ON THANKSGIVING DAY,

NOVEMBER 24, 1881.

✓
BY GEORGE DANA BOARDMAN,
Pastor.

PHILADELPHIA:

1881.

Published at the request and at the expense of a Member of the
First Baptist Church, Philadelphia.

THE TWO ANOINTED ONES;

OR,

CHURCH AND STATE.

"Then answered I, and said unto him: What are these two olive trees upon the right side of the candlestick, and upon the left side thereof? And I answered again, and said unto him: What be these two olive branches which through the two golden pipes empty the golden oil out of themselves? And he answered, and said: Knowest thou not what these be? And I said, No, my Lord. Then said he: These are the two anointed ones, that stand by the Lord of the whole earth.—ZECHARIAH, iv, 11-14.

The Prophet's Vision.
Zech. iv.

It was about the year 519 before Christ. Many of the Jews had returned from the Babylonian captivity. Zerubbabel, prince of the house of Judah, was the chief magistrate, and Joshua, son of Josedech, was the high priest. Engaged in rebuilding the temple, they were greatly strengthened by the courageous exhortations

of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah. Our text sets before us one of these inspiring utterances. Zechariah the seer, rapt into the prophetic state, beholds a remarkable vision; he sees a golden seven-branched lampstand or chandelier; on the top of it is a bowl or reservoir for oil; from the bowl proceed seven pipes, to feed the seven lamps; on the right and on the left of the candelabrum stand two olive trees, from each of which proceeds a golden pipe for the flow of oil from the trees into the reservoir on the top of the lampstand. Such is the prophet's vision. If I interpret it rightly, the meaning is this: The golden seven-branched chandelier symbolizes the kingdom of God; the flowing oil symbolizes the grace of God's Spirit; the two olive trees symbolize Joshua, the priest, and Zerubbabel, the magistrate; or, rather, the priestly and kingly orders—these being the two anointed ones who stand before the Lord of the whole earth.

Theme: Church and State. Accordingly, the prophet's vision suggests for our consideration the following theme: *The Relation of the Church and the State*. The topic, I think you will admit, is suited to Thanksgiving-day.

Jesus and the Tribute
Question
Matt. xxii. 15-22.

At the outset, let me recall to your memory an incident in the Redeemer's life. It occurred on one of the days of Passion Week. His enemies, chafed into fury by the spirituality of His teaching and the purity of His character, and stung into an agony of envy by His growing popularity, had determined upon a combined and desperate assault. And yet they did not dare to lay hands on Him, for they feared the multitudes, because they took Him for a prophet. But they resorted to a policy more wily, and for this very reason more promiscuous of success: they took counsel how they might entangle Him in His talk. Ah, words are the weakest point in the citadel of the soul. Their first attempt was to entrap Him in a political snare. Accordingly, the Pharisees—leaders of the intensely Jewish, anti-Roman party, and the Herodians—partisans of Herod, the ally of Rome, for a moment laid aside their enmities, and, taking counsel together, concocted what they imagined would prove a most embarrassing question. They feign themselves to be righteous, coming to Him as earnest inquirers, seeking His judgment as to the rightfulness of acknowledging the Roman authority by paying over to Cæsar the

hated tribute-money, or poll-tax, that they might catch Him in His words, and take hold of His speech, so as to deliver Him up to the authority of the Roman governor. And so they craftily say: "Master, we know that Thou art true, and carest not for any one, for Thou regardest not the person of men, but of a truth teachest the way of God; tell us, therefore, what thinkest Thou? Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar or not? Shall we give, or shall we not give?" It was, really, an adroit question. If He should answer, "Yes," thus deciding for the Romans and against the Jews, He would array against Himself the entire population of His countrymen. If He should answer "No," thus deciding for the Jews and against the Romans, He would array against Himself the civil power of Rome. In either event there seemed no possible way of escape. But the Galilean was, as always, easily equal to the crisis. Perceiving their wicked craftiness, He said unto them: "Why tempt ye Me, ye hypocrites? Show Me the tribute-money; bring Me a *denarius* (a Roman coin, worth about fifteen cents), that I may see it." They bring Him a *denarius*. Pointing to the emperor's effigy and name and titles inscribed on the coin, He asks:

"Whose is this image and superscription?" They promptly answer: "Cæsar's." The very fact that the Roman *denarius* passed as current coin in Palestine was a virtual recognition of Cæsar's authority. Accordingly, to the crafty question of His foes, the Lord replies: "Render, therefore, unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's." The reply is intentionally incomplete, for Jesus uniformly declined all political discussion and interference, virtually saying here what He had already said to the

Luke xii. 14.

litigant of Capernaum: "Man, who made Me a judge or a divider over you?" But incomplete as His answer was, it routed His adversaries. When they heard His saying, they were not able to take hold of it before the people, and they marvelled at His answer, and held their peace, and left Him, and went their way. But let us ponder the Lord's answer somewhat in detail.

I. Render to Caesar
Caesar's things.

And, first: "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's." Then, according to Jesus Christ, Caesar does have his things. And having them, they must be rendered unto him. The origin of Civil Government is a problem which

has baffled the ingenuity of subtile intellects in every age. The principal theories in this matter may be reduced to two. The first theory—recognizing Civil Government as an external fact, existing independent of men's wills—traces its origin back to the Paternal or Patriarchal system of rule. This was the view maintained by the Tories and the great body of Churchmen under the English Stuarts, and on which they founded their famous doctrines of the divine right of Kings, and of passive obedience, or absolute non-resistance. The second theory—regarding Civil Government as a creature of men's wills—represents it as a Social Contract. Just as two or more men unite together for certain purposes of business, and pledge themselves to obey certain rules mutually agreed upon, which rules are binding so long as the contract stands, so Civil Government is conceived of as a compact between each and every citizen. This is the common theory. Thus the Parliament which deposed James II. declared by solemn vote that James had "broken the original contract between King and People." Thus also we read in the Constitution of Massachusetts: "The body politic is formed by a voluntary association of individuals: it is a social compact by which the whole people

covenants with each citizen, and each citizen with the whole people, that all shall be governed by certain laws for the common good." Now, this theory, as you perceive at once, does not explain at all the origin of Civil Government. Besides, it would be a difficult matter for even the astutest lawyer to ascertain the day on which you and I, as citizens of the United States, entered into any such contract, or to state the terms of the contract we agreed upon; to say nothing of the fact that Government has rights which no contract among the subjects can confer. The theory is, as the old schoolmen would have said, a simple *ens rationis*, or creature of reason. Yet, like some other figments of law, as, for instance, "The State is a person," "The King never dies," this theory, that Civil Government is a social compact, has certain advantages; it is a convenient form for expressing political and legal principles.

Now, Holy Scripture cuts short all these speculations by positively asserting that Civil Government is of Divine origin, and consequently of Divine authority, and this it asserts in the broadest term; for, while it explicitly defines the duty of the subject, it does not define the nature or structure of the

particular government to which that duty is owing. Listen to a memorable paragraph from the thirteenth chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans:

Rom. xiii. 1-7.

"Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers; for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God: therefore he that resisteth the power, withstandeth the ordinance of God; and they that withstand shall receive to themselves judgment: for rulers are not a terror to the good work, but to the evil; and wouldest thou have no fear of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise from the same; for he is a minister of God to thee for good: but if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is a minister of God, an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil: wherefore ye must needs be in subjection, not only because of the wrath, but also for conscience sake: for for this cause ye pay tribute also; for they are ministers of God's service, attending continually upon this very thing: render to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor."

It is the Apostles' echo in multiplied reverberations of the Master's commandment: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." And what is specially worthy of being noticed in this connection is, that this

was the teaching of our Lord and His Apostles, living though they were under the murderous despotism of the Cæsars; in the crimson days of a Tiberius, a Caligula, a Claudius, a Nero, and a Domitian.

Not but that they availed themselves of their legal rights. For example, when Paul and

Acts xvi., 19-39.

Silas were scourged, and imprisoned in the dungeon of Philippi, and the magistrates awoke to the fact that in thus punishing them they had acted illegally, and sent sergeants to the jail, saying: "The magistrates have sent to let you go; now therefore come forth, and go in peace;" Paul sternly replied: "They have beaten us publicly, uncondemned, men that are Romans, and have cast us into prison; and do they now cast us out privily? nay, verily; but let them come themselves and bring us out." And again:

Acts xxii., 24, 25.

when the chiliarch of the Roman cohort, stationed at Jerusalem, commanded that Paul should be examined by scourging, the Apostle said to the centurion who stood by: "Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned?"

But while Paul thus asserted his civic rights, he, like his Master, enjoined profound loyalty both to the idea

and to the fact of Government. Ponder a little in detail his statement of political duties, as set forth in the paragraph just quoted from his letter to the Romans.

First.—Civil Government is a Divine institution: "Let every one submit himself to the higher powers: for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God." That is to say: We are to accept Government as a divine fact, which exists as soon as, and wherever, men exist. There never has been a nation so degraded that it had no government. There has never been a nation so advanced that it intentionally based its government on the idea of a social compact, except as a figment of law. Men never have lived, and men never will live, and this simply because men never can live, without government. Government is a divine fact; just as light, or gravitation, or man himself is a divine fact. God created light; God established the principle of gravitation; God brings man into being; God makes government. We shall never be able to trace the origin or basis of Civil Government further back than was done more than two thousand years ago, by the great philosopher of Stagira: "It is manifest," says Aristotle, "that the State is one of the things which exist by nature, and that

"man, in virtue of his very being, is a political animal" (*ἄνθρωπος φύσει πολιτικὸν ζῷον.*)" And a greater than Aristotle has declared, as in our passage: "The authorities which exist have been ordained by God." That is to say: the fact of Civil Government is not a creature of human will; it is a divine institution, existing wherever men exist. Accordingly the question is not one *de jure*; the question is one *de facto*. Those who are in authority are to be obeyed within their sphere, no matter how or by whom appointed; and this because Civil Government is a divine ordinance. The powers that be are ordained of God; not because they chance to have been justly installed; not because they chance at present to be justly administered: but because they are the Government; and Government is a divine institution. Or, to recur to Zechariah's vision, Civic Authority is one of the two olive trees or anointed ones that stand before the Lord of the whole earth. For, according to the divinely ordained custom for Israel, kings, not less than priests, on their inauguration, received the sacred unction, or anointing, from the Lord. In this very passage of Paul to the Romans, he three times speaks of magistrates as being God's "ministers."

Again: Resistance to Government is resistance to God: "Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the authority, resisteth what God has ordained."

And now you burst upon me with a question: "If the powers that be are ordained of God, and if whoever resists the powers resists the ordinance of God, how then can revolutions ever be justified? What redress have we when tyranny becomes absolutely intolerable? Will you carry your doctrine of loyalty to the extreme of pronouncing, for instance, our own American Revolution an act of treason rather than of patriotism?"

I will not undertake to answer these questions flippantly. They are among the most momentous that history, or the possible fortunes of our own dear land, can put to the Christian patriot. Let us, therefore, survey the matter as becomes thoughtful, conscientious, Christian lovers of country.

In reply to the question, whether resistance to Government can ever be justifiable, I answer that the question belongs to the domain of casuistry, or cases of conscience. All will admit that revolutions are not the ordinary conditions of society, but that they are exceptional cases. We cannot, therefore, argue from them; for it is manifestly absurd to deduce a rule

from an exception. Again: all will admit that if revolutions are ever justifiable, they can be justified only on the plea of necessity. If the plea of necessity holds good, it holds good because "Necessity knows no law." But who is to be the judge when a revolution is a necessity? Evidently, the question is one in casuistry; and questions in casuistry are proverbially the most puzzling of all problems. The remark is pre-eminently true of the subtleties of the law. "Law," said Dr. Johnson, "is the science in which the greatest powers of the understanding are applied to the greatest number of facts." No formula then can be enunciated that shall exactly apply to cases of revolution. Evidently, the line which separates the patriot from the traitor is sometimes very narrow and delicate. "A good action," says Lord Macaulay, "is not distinguished from a bad action by marks so plain as those which distinguish a hexagon from a square." Take the case so often submitted to our juries—that of killing, when the defendant urges the plea of self-defense. Now, if the evidence is that the killing was in self-defence, the law, as you are aware, recognizes the validity of this plea, and pronounces the homicide justifiable. But what lawgiver, what jurist, will dare to fix, with perfect

precision, the limits of self-defence? Will you show me the law which measures the precise amount of jeopardy to which the defendant must be exposed, in order to justify the killing? But, because the law cannot, from the very nature of the case, measure the precise amount of necessary jeopardy, are we prepared to affirm that all cases of killing in alleged self-defence are, on the one hand, justifiable homicides, or, on the other hand, murders? Evidently, each case is peculiar, and must be decided by itself, and decided too on an exhaustive view of all the circumstances belonging to the transaction. The general principle of these remarks may be applied to cases of resistance to Government: remembering, however, that in the latter cases, the materials for our decision are vastly more complicated, since no revolution is justifiable till every means of constitutional redress has been exhausted; and this, as the English revolution of 1688, and our own colonial struggle show, is not the work of a day or a year. The question, as I have said, is one that belongs to the domain of casuistry. It is very much like the question which sometimes arises, whether or not a child is ever at liberty to disobey his parents. I believe that there are cases in which the people are justified in

resisting the Government, even though Civil Government is a divine institution; just as I believe there are cases in which the child ought to disobey his parents, even though the parental authority is of divine origin. But it is not needful that I prosecute the point further. I have adverted to it, not because it is specially pertinent to the object I have in view, but because I wished to obviate the objection which might have been urged that I had not surveyed the matter in all its bearings.

Meantime, observe this salient point: Under the ordinary conditions of society, resistance to Government is resistance to God Himself; and this for the simple reason that Civil Government is a divine ordinance. "Whoever resisteth the powers resisteth the ordinance of God."

Again: Since Civil Government is of divine origin and authority, we, as Christians, should cheerfully sustain it with our pecuniary and moral support: "For this cause, pay tribute also; for they are ministers of God's service, attending continually upon this very business: render to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due; custom, to whom custom; fear, to whom fear; honor, to whom honor." In other words, participation in civic affairs or politics is a religious

duty, and this because civil government is a divine institution. And if this was true under the despotism of the Cæsars, how much truer under a democracy! Of the American State it may be more truly said than of any other nation: "We are members one of another." The sphere for the perfectionation of national character is not the monastery, but the polling-place. See to it, then, my countrymen, what kind of men those are who are nominated for public office. The disgrace and crime of our American politics is this: our rulers, practically speaking, are elected, not by the citizen, but by venal tricksters in the primaries and jobbing nominees at the polls. Thank God, a brighter day seems to be dawning. Not that I would court cheap applause by joining in every hue and cry for "Reform;" even pirates may sometimes flaunt an honest flag. But signs are not wanting that the American people are waking to the fact that there is something nobler than to be a party man: it is to be a free man. Nominate, then, for office, I implore you, our best men, whether Republicans or Democrats, incumbents or reformers. Elect none but men of unquestioned personal probity; men who scorn bribery in whatever direction it approaches, or however innocent the guise it assumes;

men who have the courage of personal convictions; men whose instincts, as well as professions, are on the side of honesty, and equity, and temperance, and purity, and brotherhood, and reverence; men who, like the statesman Daniel in Babylon, dare to be seen kneeling with their faces towards Jerusalem. This is the great demand of our times. We want to see in this last quarter of the nineteenth century of our Lord, and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and fifth year, Christian statesmen, who, like our lamented Garfield, dare bring the principles of the gospel of Jesus Christ into the arena of politics. We want to see legislation conceived and executed in the spirit of the Lord of Souls. We want to see in our executive chairs, national, and State, and municipal; in our cabinets; in our congresses, and legislatures, and city councils; on our seats of tribunal, men who fear God, and keep His commandments; men who dare to make the Star-spangled Banner not merely the symbol of unstained honor and commercial integrity and universal liberty and generous education and national glory; but also the symbol of Christian civilization, and a beacon to the cross of the Galilean. Then shall the voice of the people be indeed the voice of God.

II. Render to God God's things.

And so we are prepared for our second lesson: "Render unto God the 'things that are God's.'" Then God, not less than Cæsar, does have also His things. And having them, they must be rendered unto Him. While Cæsar, or Civil Government, is a divine ordinance, being a minister of God's service, so also is His Church, in virtue of her being the representative of His Son Jesus Christ. The Church of the living God is the other of the two olive trees, or anointed ones, that stand before the Lord of the whole earth. But it is not needful that I argue this point, as I did the other; for it is the warm confession and meek boast of all Christians that the Church of Immanuel is in an eminent sense a divine institution.

Nevertheless, I would loiter for a moment to press this duty of rendering unto God the things that are God's, not less than unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's. My countrymen, I fear that we are better patriots than Christians. You denounced the late rebellion, and put forth your sublime might to crush it, and, I thank God, you succeeded. You demanded that Cæsar should have his things, and Cæsar, by the might of your prowess, did receive them. But how

about your rendering unto God the things that are God's? For He is the King of kings, the Lord of lords. Will you be loyal to Cæsar and disloyal to Cæsar's Cæsar? "But wherein have we been disloyal 'to God?'" you ask me. Let me answer in the words of an ancient prophet: "Will a man rob God? Yet

Mal., iii., 8, 9.

"ye rob Me, saith the Lord of hosts. "And ye say: 'wherein do we rob "Thee?' In the tithes and the offerings; ye rob Me, "even this whole nation." Do you feel this to be an unjust charge? Ponder then this one fact out of many similar ones: Although we profess to be a Christian nation, devoting our all to Jesus Christ, yet, for every one dollar we put into His treasury, we put a million into our own. For, friend, who lent you that property? who bestowed on you that capacity? who blesses you with health? who spares you from moment to moment, from Thanksgiving-day to Thanksgiving-day? who enriches you with golden opportunities? And yet ye

Phil., ii., 21.

seek your own, not the things of Jesus Christ. Ay, this whole nation robs God in the tithes and the offerings. Words fail you to express your abhorrence of defaulters; why are you not exasperated with yourselves for being defaulters to

God? More than this: he who robs God is on the way towards robbing man. Here is the real secret of the defalcations which so often startle our ears, and dislodge our confidence in one another. Loyalty to God is the best guaranty of loyalty to man, or patriotism. Render unto God the things that are God's, and you will render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's.

But let me resume my argument. Although the Church, as being God's representative in the world, is, like the State, a divine institution, yet the two institutions are, or at least were divinely meant to be, entirely distinct.

III. Separation of Church and State.

And so we pass to our third lesson: The separation of Church and State. Recall the prophet's vision of the golden candlestick: while there was but one chandelier, there were two olive trees; while each emptied the oil out of itself, through its own golden pipe, into the common reservoir, on the top of the lamp-stand, the two trees stood apart, the one on the right of the candelabrum, the other on the left.

It is a great lesson for all those devout spirits who, in their longing for the speedy triumph of Christianity, would crave the alliance of the State. That the Church

should be enthroned as the confessed mistress of the world; that she should visibly wield its civic powers, dictating its rulers, and legislations, and policies; that the mitre and the crown should encircle the same brow, and that brow her own, so that where the crozier had failed the scimitar should not; that emperors should be her chosen patrons and defenders, and her throne be borne in resplendent state on the shoulders of princes: this has always been a favorite dream of many of God's chosen ones. The dream of such a City of God especially beguiled the flaming heart of the great Augustine.

But such a dream has ever led into peril. Would God that the Church had always profited by the story

Matt. iv, 7-10.

of Satan's temptation of Jesus on the mountain. In the secularizing of Christianity by the allying of Church and State; in the smothering the spirituality of Christ's kingdom by the patronage and championship of political sovereignties; in the soiling her purity and the fettering her energies by the selfish and slippery policies of state-craft; in the invoking the arm of the civil power to maintain and propagate her faith; in the decreeing that non-conformity to her ritual shall be heresy, and

liberty of conscience shall be treason ; in the opening of Parliament chambers to her mitred dignitaries ; in the filling earth's cabinets with her cardinals and legates and nuncios ; in the enriching her coffers with the levies of her fiefs, and the tolls of her imperial lieges ; in her cross and keys emblazoned on senate-house and post-office ; in the canonading of her St. Angelo on Easter morning ; in the insisting that the word "God" or "Christ" shall be inserted in the National Constitution ; in brief, in the demanding legislation in behalf of the Church : in all this we see the devil's victory over the Church at precisely the point where the devil was vanquished by the Church's Master.

And as the devil promised to Jesus that he would give Him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them if He would but make His own kingdom a worldly one, so he has often fulfilled that promise in the case of those who have yielded to his temptation. But his gifts have proved to be satanic gifts indeed. As long as the Church insisted on the spirituality of Christ's kingdom, while as yet her ministers went forth without purse or sword, preaching that kingdom which is not food and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy

Rom. xiv, 17.

Ghost ; so long was the Church comparatively pure in doctrine and in practice. But when her success began to arrest the attention of the rulers of this world, and they saw that her influence was to be courted, and when she yielded to their seductive proffers of aid ; then a tide of impurity began to set in which ere long submerged her in all manner of filth and abomination. The most ominous day the Church ever saw was the day when Constantine the Great, having renounced heathenism, proclaimed himself the imperial patron of Christianity and defender of the Faith. That alliance of Church and State set back the Church for centuries, and to this day she is reeling beneath the satanic stab she then received. Ay, it was Church and State, Caiphaz and Pilate, that crucified the Lord of Glory.

No, Church of the enthroned Immanuel, thy resources are too great to need the decrees of earth's Caesars. Put not then thy confidence in princes. Go not down into Egypt for help, or cross to Assyria for horses ; trust not in chariots because they are many, or in horsemen because they are strong. O Lord, in helping there is with Thee no difference between the mighty and the powerless. We rest on Thee, and in Thy name

Psalm cxviii, 8 : Isaiah xxxi, 1 : II. Chron. xiv, 11 : Psalms xx, 5 ; lx, 12.

we set up our banners. Through God we shall do valiantly; for it is He who will tread down our enemies.

IV. Reticulation of
Church and State.

Nevertheless, we are to learn in this connection a fourth important lesson: It is the interrelation of Church and State. Although there were two olive trees, the one standing on the right of the golden candelabrum, and the other on the left, yet they both had golden ducts through which they emptied the oil out of themselves into the common reservoir surmounting the golden chandelier. Church and State are separate, yet they have a common mission, and a common focus: supply of oil for the one candlestick of Christ's kingdom. The relation of Church and State is not the chemical union of hydrogen and oxygen in a molecule of water; it is the local mixture of nitrogen and oxygen in a molecule of air. Or, to take a better illustration from organic life, the relation of Church and State is not the vital union of spirit and body, but the corporate relation of the two arms in the one body; the Church serving as God's right hand, and the State as God's left. Church and State, in their ideal workings, are absolutely distinct, yet mutually reticulant, forming one warp and woof in God's scheme

for human redemption. The high-priest Aaron and the legislator Moses, the prophet Ezekiel and the statesman Daniel, the pontiff Joshua and the governor Zerubbabel—these are the two anointed ones, who stand before the Lord of the whole earth.

Occasion for Thanks-
giving.

Lastly: In this inter-blending yet separation of Church and State, we Americans, more than any other nation, have special reason for national thanksgiving. We are graciously spared the European incubus of a State-Church. Thank God, we know nothing of State-bishops, and chapters, and deaneries, and stalls, and canonries, and prebendaryships, and benefices, and incumbencies, and livings, and curacies, and vicarships; nothing of tithes, and church-rates, and advowsons; nothing of church-yard disputes. In this respect, at least, the American people is history's ideal nation. The very proclamation which has gathered us here to-day is not the command of our Chief Magistrate, but his invitation. Thank God, the Old World is beginning to learn our American ways. Not the least of the many and shining virtues of that transcendent statesman of motherland, William Ewart Gladstone, is the fact that, churchman

though he is, he has disestablished the Church of Ireland, and is hastening the way for the disestablishment of the Church of England. Ere long, whether that consummate statesman lives to see it or not, the bishops or lords spiritual of the Upper House must vacate their seats in Parliament, to wear their lawns on the Episcopal thrones of such cathedrals as may be left. Even in the priest-ridden States of the Roman Church, poor Leo XIII. is seriously thinking of abandoning the politico-sacerdotal throne of the great Hildebrand, to seek refuge in some little Malta, where he may solace himself by going through with the wretched pantomime of a mock royalty.

Tribute to Baptists.

Brethren, it is cause for justest felicitation that, among the many noble champions of a Christianity unentangled by State alliances the foremost and bravest have been those who were identified with our own faith and order. At the very time that Puritan John Knox was proclaiming the right of the civil magistrate to prosecute those whom he called heretics because they were not Presbyterians, Baptist churches in Great Britain, Germany, and Holland were protesting against all prosecutions

whatever, grounded on conscientious divergence. At the very time Puritan John Robinson was maintaining the power of the civil magistrate to compel every member of the community to join himself to a Christian church, Baptist John Smyth opposed him, declaring that the magistrate had no right to "meddle with matters of conscience, or compel men to this or that form of religion, because Christ is the king and law-giver of the church and conscience." At the very time that the Puritan fathers were banishing from Massachusetts Bay all who would not subscribe to their articles of faith, Baptist Roger Williams, himself one of the banished ones, was heroically proclaiming his doctrine of soul-liberty, and founding a political commonwealth, which, for the first time in the history of the American Church, incorporated among its fundamental principles absolute freedom of conscience, and total separation of Church and State. In 1815 the Philadelphia Association met with our own First Baptist Church. Dr. William Staughton was moderator, and Dr. H. G. Jones, clerk. Among those present were two of my illustrious predecessors in the pastoral office, Dr. William Rogers and Dr. Henry Holcombe. In the course of the sessions, Rev. James Patterson, a member

of the Sansom Street Church, presented "a communication from their Presbyterian brethren, respecting the profanation of the Lord's Day, and requesting the co-operation of their Society to procure, by legislative interference, a more strict observance of the same." The Association thereupon

"Resolved, That this Association, acting upon principles which have guided them, and which they hope ever to hold sacred—principles which lead them to regard every exercise of civil power to enforce the institutions of religion, as the assumption of an illegitimate prerogative, cannot as a religious body make any application to the legislature upon that subject; but being with their brethren deeply sensible of the disgrace brought upon the community, by the practise of which they complain, as an outrage against divine authority, and confirmed by experience in the opinion, that such conduct is detrimental to the best interests of civil society; they recommend as Christians and as patriots to every member of the churches in connection with them, that they seek the redress of this grievance by every means arising to them from the social compact which may not infringe upon religious liberty; and labor all to illustrate and enforce by their conduct as citizens of this commonwealth and citizens of Zion, the propriety and the beauty, the social good and the blessedness which must result from the due observance of a day ordained by the wisest and the best of Legislators."

All this I say, brethren, not in any spirit of sectarian boasting, but in fidelity to the facts of history.

Let us then, as American Christians, thank God for the Church; for the State; for the separation of Church and State; for the co-operation of Church and State as ministers of God's service.

"Give unto the Lord, ye families of people,
Give unto the Lord glory and strength;
Give unto the Lord the glory due unto His name,
Bring an offering, and come into His courts."

Psalm xcvi., 7, 8.

Bring the offering of adoration; for He is a great God, and a great King above all gods; the offering of thanksgiving; for He is the giver of every good and perfect gift: the offering of brotherly love; for He is the Father of us all.

"Oh come, let us worship and bow down,
Let us kneel before the Lord, our Maker;
For He is our God;
And we are the people of His pasture, and the flock of His hand."

Psalm xcv, 6, 7.

Isaiah lx., 18.

So shall the King of kings call our walls, Salvation; and our gates, Praise.