

Church with the State, and commenced those anti-christian measures by which a great portion of it from that period to this has been crippled and enslaved. There can be no doubt that the principle of a civil establishment of the church which many good men still advocate, is Anti-christian,—nay is the very root of Anti-christ.

The monarchs of Great Britain, in particular, for many generations past, have claimed and exercised a right to legislate in ecclesiastical matters. This prerogative (unwarranted by Scripture) was not renounced, as it ought, at the Reformation, nor is it fully renounced at this day.

It is a curious fact that the Kings and Queens of Great Britain, holding many pompous titles, have among others that of "Defender of the Faith," given to Henry VIII. in consequence of his having written a Treatise in defence of Popery. When that monarch became Protestant he retained the title, and it has been held by his successors ever since. It is, however, indicative of a right on the part of the civil magistrate to interfere with ecclesiastical matters which is not sanctioned by the Word of God.

It is narrated by Dr. Merle D'Aubigné, that when Henry received this title he was quite over-joyed, and so highly valued it as to say that he would not exchange it for all London and twenty miles round. The King's fool happened to enter the apartment at the very time, and enquired the cause of his majesty's transport. "The Pope," said Henry, "has named me Defender of the Faith." "Ho, ho, good Harry," replied the fool, "let you and me defend one another, but take my word for it, let the faith alone to defend itself." "An entire modern system," says the celebrated Genevan Historian, "is contained in these words. In the midst of general intoxication the fool was the only sensible person." We are of Dr. D'Aubigné's mind, and rejoice to know that his sentiments on this question (as on others) are in unison with those of our church. We have here the entire essence of Voluntaryism, in opposition to the views of the advocates of church establishments. Religion requires no defence from men. The defence of the mightiest monarchs of the earth is unnecessary. If religion, or the faith of the church, is simply let alone, it will defend itself. Divine truth is under the guardianship of its almighty author, and it can never be brought down, or obliterated, by finite agency; and at the same time, it is altogether independent of finite agency for its preservation. *Magna est veritas et prevalebit.* Our brethren of Established Churches, and, surprising though it be, more loudly still, our brethren of the Free Church, on this point, make a mighty ado about a civil sanction to Christianity,—a religion established by civil law, and if this cannot be in every case, at least the shield of the magistrate's protection cast over the church for its defence. It is all a figment,—a castle in the air,—a vain delusion! It has never tended to defend, but always to corrupt and destroy the church. It is an insult to the Church's King to suppose that his kingdom, which is not of this world, requires the aid of civil power to sustain and defend his cause. This is but a remnant of Popish usurpation. It has sometimes been well-meant; but it is injudicious and hurtful policy. "The best service which the magistrate can render to the Christian church," as was laconically observed by the eminent and pious Dr. Wardlaw, "is to let it alone." To quote from the fourth lecture on National Church Establishments by this distinguished minister, and in answer to the question—"What is the magistrate's province in regard to religion," he says:—"His true and legitimate province is to have no province at all. As a man he is bound to believe the truths and obey the precepts of the Word of God. As a magistrate he is bound to fulfil all his official functions on Christian principles, from christian motives, and according to christian precepts, as every man is, in every condition, and every relation of life. But authority in religion he has none. Religion has authority over him, the same as it has over all; but in it, or over it, or over his subjects in aught that pertains to it, his authority is null. If he exercises it, it is the exercise of power without right. The example and the influence of a truly religious king may be emi-