

men by their exacting masters in the time of Jeremiah! Nowhere, however, is there a trace of any such procedure, either in the Brandenburg Kirchentag, or in any others out of the Church.

But does not every observer mark the brand of the most arrant Erastianism on the brow of this Church from its cradle unto this day? The title of "*Summus Episcopus*," which it delights to bestow on the prince, even when he may be an unbeliever and not a member of the Church, is no empty name, but is asserted to the full of its signification. In this right the father of the present king enacted a law that no reference should be made to controverted topics in preaching; by which the liberty of prophesying was taken away, that neither Protestant nor Papist should speak or write publicly anything that could be construed as disrespectful to the others;—a law which turned out immensely to the advantage of the Romanist—so that a minister who republished Luther's tract on the Celibacy of the Clergy (which could be now published with advantage in Great Britain) was prosecuted and punished. And in this right the late king appointed a day to be kept in all the churches in honour of Boniface, the man who reduced the German Churches into subjection to the Romish See. You may conceive what abuses besides will flourish where the claim of Head of the Church is not only, as in England, a title, but a regularly exercised right.

But when we place alongside of it the High Church pretensions of the Lutheran clergy, we may conjecture how pernicious such a confederacy is. The Lutheran "Prediger" is more sacerdotal than ministerial; he places more confidence in the sacraments than in the Word, especially of late years; hence the endeavours to reinstate auricular confession; he bestows absolution, and will not allow the Christian people any share in the government of the Church. It is no calumny to say that they are satisfied with external attendance on ordinances, and repel all obligation to inquire after the welfare of individual souls.

The stiffly cherished doctrines of baptismal regeneration and of the bodily presence in the elements leads to such perversion of the sacraments as is enough to bring ruin on any church (1 Cor. xi.);—only to specify that the boys in the upper classes of the Gymnasium are led in a body with their teachers to take the communion; and people who are on any account disturbed in their course of sin, instead of being pointed to Christ, are taught to seek peace at the altar. This is a crying evil.

What shall we say of the Sabbath which the ministers lead the way in profaning?—Should God wink at this? What shall we say of the Apocrypha, to which they are

wedded with such bigotry, that men like Buchsel, in Berlin, call God's word "mutilated" unless it has these impostures bound up with it? What of the mutilation of the Ten Commandments and the omission of the second of the ten words the Lord spake at Sinai as widely as Luther's name is honoured? What of their crucifixes, pictures, altars, candles, crossing of themselves?

But their Erastianism is appearing to be its own punishment. In the providence of God the Lutheran High Church party has been driven to take up a marked and decided antagonism to the people and their constitutional rights in their controversy with the king. In their blindness they are madly widening the gap which already subsists to such an alarming degree between the Church and the body of the people. They adopt the expression that every democrat (that is, friend of the constitution) is a godless person—a style which the enemies of the gospel catch up and improve to their own purposes.—*lb.*

Religious Intelligence.

PRESBYTERIANISM without the animating life is a poor shrunken thing; it never lies in state when it is dead; for it has no body of fine forms, or trapping of imposing ceremonies, to give it bulk or adornment; without the vitality of evangelism it is nothing.—*Hugh Miller.*

MANSE SCHEME OF U. P. CHURCH.—"The Manse-Building Fund of the United Presbyterian Church is making great progress. In the course of a few months it has reached £18,000."

Such is the announcement which we read in a late Scottish paper. The Free Church has already provided her ministers with comfortable manses; the United Presbyterian Church will soon be in the same satisfactory position. When can we make the same announcement with regard to our own Church? We are glad to hear of a few instances in which the people are engaged in Manse-building; but the instances ought to be much more numerous. The work is not nearly as serious as it is supposed to be before it is undertaken. One man can build a pretty comfortable house; why should five hundred or a thousand people shrink from such an undertaking for their pastor?