

The Church.

"HER FOUNDATIONS ARE UPON THE HOLY HILLS."

STAND YE IN THE WAYS, AND SEE, AND ASK FOR THE OLD PATHS, WHERE IS THE GOOD WAY, AND WALK THEREIN, AND YE SHALL FIND REST FOR YOUR SOULS.—JEREMIAH VI. 16.

VOLUME IV.]

TORONTO, UPPER CANADA, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1840.

[NUMBER 11.]

Poetry.

THE COCK-CROW.
From the Monthly Magazine.

Bird who thus breakest on the silence due
Of lonely night, with clamour heard by few
Save the all-watchful Hours, if in their flight,
Thy ghostly trump, most vigilant chanticleer,
They list—and with new fear thro' the night
Ply their untired career.
In this dread stillness, the sepulchral hush
Of life and all the host of living things,
Thy lone far-sounding iteration brings
An echo of the awful waves that rush
Among the sands of that perdition shore
We call the Present, till our time is o'er;
While in the silent intermission shed
Between the hours unborn and newly dead;
Thou chaunt'st the past day's requiem eke the next
Efface it from the busy brain of man,
Who, by a thousand idle cares perplexed,
To the brief limit of his vital span
Hastes as the year-hour that vainly flew,
To be forgotten too!

Lone voice of darkness! Eastern legends say,
That vigil note of thine is never still
Heard in the twilight of the morning grey,
Or when high noon glares on the sultry hill,
When winking Hesper's eyelid in the west
Sheds silence o'er each copse and dewy spray,
When the late owl's self is gone to rest,
And death-like stillness binds each mortal breast,
Thou still hold'st watch with thy perpetual lay;
Counting the hours of ages—through the sound
On sleep's unconscious ear doth rattle rain,
Or in the din of high orb'd noon is drowned:
Still ever in each listening interval
Upon the stillness comes thy constant call,
From undistinguishable distance bound,
Like a far travelling voice of distant years,
That tells of other times to him the note that hears.

Swift at the wakeful call the free thought flies,
With wing unfettered o'er the holy deep
Of immemorial ages: as in leopards
Worlds of the past appear, and men arise
From tombs of other times to live newborn,
The warrior, and the sophist, and the sage,
Back to the fathers of the world's first age,
When that high peak of thine first woke the morn
There was no solemn gloom—no sadness then
In that high lay!

To the strong raptures of primeval men,
Fresh in their secular prime, what was a day?
Life's sun arose with unabated force,
Rejoicing as a giant in its course.

Yet they went by—and other days came on
Times of renown—whose tale hath long been told,
The glory of the Pharaohs—Memphis old,
Ecbatana, or "that great Babylon."
They scaled the heavens in height, and one by one
Went down the steep of ages; in their pride—
Along the glittering stream which mortals call
The world, because it seemeth all in all,
To them who toss amid its foam and noise
Its all-absorbing whirl of cares and joys—
An ever present, ever passing tide,
Which near the edge of one unfathomed fall,
Glides smooth—ere 'tis lost to living eyes,
And so the glory of the world goes by.

That strain of thine was of a different mood,
Once in the dawn of an all-glorious day,
Though dark to mortal sense. The morn gleamed grey
On Pilate's hall—when the Redeemer stood:
To satisfy the strictly righteous law
Unchangeable, which angels read in awe,
Far above earthly thought, of perfect good—
He stood alone—abandoned in that hour
By earth and heaven, to the grave's dreadful power,
But not by his all-righteous fortitude,
Hell triumphed—earth deserted—and heaven wept,
Creation shrank aghast: 'twas then thy note
Found an eternal record, as it smote
On Peter's heart—where faith a moment slept.

Then not in anger but in sorrow turned
The mild sad sternness of much-injured love,
The heavenly searching eye; touching above,
All earthly fear; and Peter's bosom burned
With sense of its unutterable wrong
To god-like goodness in its hour of sorrow;
O could thy clarion for an instant borrow
The sense then wakened in thy matin song!
In that hour of grief's extremity,
The faithful servant, from his master dear,
For one weak moment turned in human fear,
Alas, how long—and by what sins are we
Kept loitering in pure wantonness aloof—
O for a heart of flesh to feel that last reproof!

No trump that ever pealed to human ear,
The loftiest note of victory's high strain
On Marathon—or Cressy's glorious plain—
Was e'er so full of triumph or so shed
No mortal ear aught in its low earth,
To speak of human empire's fall or birth,
Till the last trumpet shall awake the dead,
Bursting the gates of ages; great and small,
The ransomed, but forgotten sons of men,
To meet the eye that looked on Peter then,
At the third note of thy accusing call,
But not, as then, in love and mercy deep;
O for a call to rouse man from his fatal sleep!

THE SIN OF SACRILEGE.

BY JOSEPH MEDE, B. D.

Concerning the sin of Ananias, as appears by the relation already made, it was sacrilege; namely, the purloining of what was become holy and consecrate unto God; not by actual performance, but by vow and inward purpose of heart. For as it is well observed by Ainsworth, on Lev. vii. 16, "In vows and voluntaries, it is not necessary that a man pronounce ought with his lips; but if he shall be fully determined in his heart, though he hath uttered nothing with his lips, he is indebted." And this is no private opinion of mine; the fathers so determine it: St. Augustine, that Ananias was condemned of sacrilege, "because he had deceived God, had been false to him in what he had promised him." And in another sermon, "Ananias purloined and kept back part of the money he had devoted to God." St. Chrysostom, in his twelfth homily, upon this place, "The money, or price of the land, being, by Ananias, devoted to God's service, henceforth became sacred.—And therefore he that, after he had voluntarily sold his estate with a purpose to have all the money distributed for the use of the Church, durst yet, notwithstanding, purloin and take part thereof to his own private use, was clearly guilty of sacrilege." Again, in the same place, "You see that Ananias is most justly charged with sacrilege, because he took back again part of that money which he had made sacred, by devoting it unto God.—St. Jerome, in his eighth epistle, "Ananias and Sapphira were distrustfully covetous, false and double-hearted in disposing of the money they received for the sale of their estate; and being therefore condemned, because that after their vow they presented the price of their estate, as if it had been their own still, and not

God's, to whom they had given it by vow, and withal kept back and reserved to themselves part of that which was no more theirs, but another's, viz. God's; upon these accounts they did most worthily deserve that punishment of death. Nor was this condemning of them to such a punishment, an over-severe or cruel sentence; but an useful, exemplary severity, that others might amend, and fear to transgress in like manner."—Caesarius, brother to Gregory Nazianzen, in his fourth dialogue, expresseth the sin of Ananias thus: "He alienated the money dedicated unto God, being wounded with sacrilege; and when he was asked thereabout denied it." Lastly, Eusebius, in whom we have the current interpretation of the Greek fathers, thus expounds the words of St. Peter to Ananias: "We were far from compelling or forcing you in the least to sell your estate; but when you were pleased of your own accord to offer it as a sacrifice to God, for you afterwards to withhold any part of what ye had given to God for the use of the Church, and to keep it for your own use,—this, without question, is plain sacrilege." And then adds, "And, therefore, they received the punishment due to sacrilegious persons—what's that?—even death itself." Also Asterius, bishop of Amasea, who lived near the time of Julian, in his homily against covetousness, calls Ananias and Sapphira "persons guilty of sacrilege, even in their own offerings."

[After noticing the various interpretations of the words, "lie unto the Holy Ghost," Mede proceeds:]—That sacrilege is a sin against God, and not against men, is plain by the text, "Thou hast not lied," said Peter, "unto men, but unto God." For whatsoever is sacred, is his; yea, to be sacred is nothing else but to be set apart from men's interest to be God's in a peculiar propriety and relation. To steal, then, or alienate that which is sacred, is to rob God, and not man; for he is robbed whose the propriety is, but of sacred things God is the proprietor, and not man. It is an error, therefore, to be observed among the expositors of the decalogue, who rank sacrilege as a sin of the eighth commandment: when sacrilege, as sacrilege, is a sin of the first table, and not of the second—a breach of the loyalty we immediately owe to God, and not of the duty we owe to our neighbour. True it is, he that committeth sacrilege, indirectly and by consequent robbeth men too,—namely, those who live of God's provision: but sacrilege itself is the robbing of God. This is evident by that of the prophet Malachi, (iii. 8), "Will a man rob God? yet ye have robbed me," saith the prophet in the person of God. "But ye say, wherein have we robbed thee? In tithes and offerings." (Ver. 9), "Ye are cursed with a curse; for ye have robbed me, even this whole nation." (Ver. 10), "Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in mine house; and prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it," &c.

The observation of this would be useful in the question of the due of tithes; for the state thereof is not rightly framed when the query is made, whether tithes are due to the ministers of the Gospel, meaning as a duty of the people unto God. We should say rather, tithes are due unto God; for so is the style of the Scriptures: "All the tithes are mine;" these I give to Levi, and not you. God maintains not his ministers at others' charges, but out of his own revenue, which he had reserved to himself: as was well observed by Philo, the Jew, in his book, "De Sacerdotum Honoribus," where, speaking of that honourable maintenance, and without bodily toil, which God had provided for his priesthood, "to take away from them, out of whose labours this maintenance did accrue, all occasion of upbraiding those who, by God's assignment, were to receive it," he saith, "The people were commanded to bring their offerings first to the Temple, that thence the priests might fetch them; it being not unworthy God himself, in token of gratitude for his infinite bounty and benefits, to take some part back again from him upon whom he had conferred so great benefits; and seeing himself, the Giver of all good gifts, stood in need of nothing, it pleased him to transfer that honourable maintenance, which was so returned him by way of thankfulness, upon those that served at his altar and ministered about holy things, (as he gives the reason); because they (the priests) might take that, their provision, without being ashamed, as not coming from men, but from God, the Giver of all good gifts to every one." For they are his ministers, and not the people's; and therefore to receive their wages from their own Master who employs them, and not from them.

The sending of the question thus would make the way to the resolution of the controversy more easy and less invidious, whilst we should plead for God and not for ourselves. For it is not needful that all which is given unto God should be spent upon his ministers; though it be true that their maintenance should be out of his revenue, and that honourable and competent. But there are many other uses for the employment of the sacred revenues;—building of churches; defraying of such as are sent to synods and employed upon other occasions of the church; furnishing of treasures for a holy war; the relief of the poor, the orphan, the widow, the captive, and the distressed; all which belong to Christ's provision.

Thus much of the first observation: now I come to the second, that that which is consecrated to God may not be alienated to other uses. The reasons whereof are—

1. Because none can alienate but he that hath the propriety and is owner; but in things consecrate to God, none hath the propriety but God. For certainly a man cannot be said to have given that unto God wherein he still reserves the title to himself as the owner. He that gives transfers the dominion from himself unto him to whom the gift is made. If therefore that which is given to God be God's, then must those who go about to alienate it, dispose of that which is none of theirs; which, whether it be just or not, let any man judge.
2. To alienate that which is given unto God is a breach of vow or promise made unto him: "A lying unto him," as my text speaks. And if it be a sin not to perform what was vowed in the purpose of the heart only, (as we see it was in the story of Ananias), much more is it to revoke a vow already performed. Nor will it serve turn to say, this reason may indeed concern the person himself that vowed; but doth not take away from the commonwealth or public magistrate their power to dispose of things subject to them. For howsoever it be true, that every private person and his goods are under

the tuition of the public; and the interest the public hath in either cannot be given away by the sole act of a private person: yet in this case that rule hath place which is given by Almighty God, (Num. xxx. 3, &c.), concerning a maiden's vow in her father's house, or a woman's vow under covert—that "if the father or the husband hear the vow, and the bond wherewith she bound her soul, and disallow it not, but shall hold his peace, then the vow shall stand." So when the commonwealth or public magistrate consents to and allows what is done, as in this case it is supposed they do, the vow of dedication is also IRREVOCABLE ON THEIR PART.

Hence, in Scripture it is made an inseparable property of that which is sacred or God's, not to be alienable.—As in Ezek. xlviii. 14, it is said of the portion of land to be laid out for the Levites, "They shall not sell it, neither exchange, nor alienate the first-fruits of the land," (mark the reason), "for it is holy unto the Lord." This was the reason likewise why a Jew might not sell outright his possession in the land of Canaan, but only for fifty years' term, or until the year of jubilee; because the whole land was holy, and God's land, and they but usufructuaries, so saith God, (Lev. xxv. 23): "The land shall not be sold for ever, (or outright), for the land is mine; for ye are strangers and sojourners with me;" therefore, ver. 24, "in all the land of your possession ye shall grant a redemption for the land."—Where he saith, "Ye are strangers and sojourners with me," the meaning is, that as the Gentiles who became proselytes had no inheritance in the land, but dwelt therein as sojourners; so was all Israel in the sight of God, who would have none accounted proprietaries of that land but himself, having acquired it by his own powerful conquest from the Canaanite. For although in the same land some parts were yet in a more special manner the Lord's land, yet comparatively, and *secundum quid*, the whole land was sacred and his: as all Israel was a peculiar and holy people, though the tribe of Levi were in a more special sort the holy tribe.—Now, if that which was but in a more general sense holy and the Lord's might not be alienated, what shall we say of that which is holy and his in the most special manner of all? I speak all this while of that which is dedicate unto God absolutely, and not with limitation or for term of time only, for such dedications I suppose there may be.

Now if any shall ask me whether this assertion—that things dedicate to God are unalienable, admits not of some limitations—I answer, it may; and that in two cases: if either it can be proved, that the donation made unto God were nullity; or showed, that God hath relinquished the right which once he had. But here the water begins to grow too deep for my wading; yet I hope I may see thus much, that whosoever he be that shall plead either of these cases to acquit himself of sacrilege, had need be sure in a point of such moment that his evidence be good, and such as he can shew good warrant for out of God's own book; to go upon bare conjecture will not be safe. And for direction and caution in this case, I will add further, that not every sinfulness of the person who is the donor, nor every fault or blemish in the consecration, makes the act itself void. It appears in the story of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, in that oblation of incense made by the two hundred and fifty princes of the congregation, whose service, though it were so displeasing unto the Lord that he sent fire from heaven to consume them, yet when all was done, he gave this commandment to Moses, "Speak," saith he, "unto Eleazar, the son of Aaron, the priest, that he take up the censers out of the burning, and scatter thou the fire yonder; for they are hallowed. The censers of those sinners against their souls, let them make of them broad plates for a covering of the altar: for they offered them before the Lord, therefore they are hallowed."—(Num. xvi. 37, 38). Mark here; though they were offered by sinful men, and in a sinful manner, and were not to be used any more for censers, yet must they be applied to some other holy use, because they were become sacred by having been offered unto the Lord. So Rabbi Solomon Jarchi saith, "Unlawful for common use, because they had made them vessels of ministry."

My last observation is raised from the judgment which befell Ananias: that it must needs be a heinous sin which God so severely punished, namely, with death; for there is no example to be found again in the whole New Testament of so severe a punishment inflicted by the mouth of the apostles for any sin whatsoever. But this was the first consecration of goods that ever was made unto Christ our Lord, after he was crucified to sit at the right hand of God: and this transgression of Ananias and Sapphira, the first sacrilege that ever was committed against him; wherefore it was requisite that, by the severity of the punishment thereof, he should now manifest unto men what account he made of, and how heinous he esteemed, that sin; that it might be for an example to the world's end unto all that should afterward believe in his name, and beware thereof. So saith St. Hierom, "Ananias and Sapphira most worthily deserved to be so severely punished, viz., with death; because that after their vow they presented the price of their estate as if it had been their own, and not God's, to whom they had given it, and withal kept back and reserved to themselves part of that which was no more theirs, but another's, viz., God's. Nor was this an over-severe and cruel sentence, but a useful exemplary severity, that others might amend, and beware of offending in the like kind." For the first in every kind is the measure of that which follows: and though sacrilege be not since punished by God, as often as it is committed, by such a visible death; yet was it his purpose that by this first punishment we should take notice how great that sin was, and how displeasing in his sight, which was a punishment by the greatest visible judgment that could be.

The like severe example to this, and for the like end, was that upon him who at first profaned the Sabbath-day in the wilderness by gathering sticks, (Num. xv. 32), who by the sentence of God himself was put to death, and stoned by the whole congregation; that the Jews hereby might know, that howsoever the like were not ordinarily afterward to be inflicted for the like sin, yet the gravity of God was still the same that first severity intimated.

Furthermore, it is worthy to be noted, that we find three examples of such a kind of coercive jurisdiction, (if I may so term it), exercised either by our Saviour when he was on earth, or by his apostles; and all three for the profanation of that which was sacred.—The first two by our Saviour himself against those that profaned his temple, by buying and selling therein as a common place: for which, at the first passover after his

beginning to preach the Gospel, he made him a whip, and whipped such profaners out of it, saying, "Make not my Father's house a house of merchandise."—(John ii. 16). Another time, which was at his last passover, "He overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them that sold doves, and would not suffer any to carry a vessel through the temple; telling them, that 'his house was made for an house of prayer, but they had made it a den of thieves.'—(Matt. xxi. 12; Mark, xi. 15; Luke, xix. 45). The third example is this which the apostle Peter exercised upon Ananias and Sapphira for sacrilege. Whereby it should appear that how small account soever we are now-a-days wont to make of these sins, yet in God's esteem they are other manner of ones than we take them for.

Another argument of the heinousness of the sin of sacrilege is, that there was no sacrifice appointed in the law to make atonement for the same, if it were committed willingly and wittingly; but only if it were ignorantly done. For so we have it, (Lev. v. 15, 16), "If a soul commit a trespass, and sin through ignorance in the holy things of the Lord, he shall bring for his trespass unto the Lord a ram without blemish out of the flock. And he shall make amends for the harm that he hath done in the holy thing, and add the fifth part thereunto. And the priest shall make an atonement for him, and it shall be forgiven him." Thus if it were done ignorantly; but if wittingly and presumptuously, there was no atonement appointed for it; though for other sins there be, even to perjury itself. For, as it is in Mal. iii. 8, "Will a man rob his God?"

Another proof and testimony of the heinousness of this sin, is that so ancient a custom in dedications to laud it with a curse: which to be no late custom, (as some may suppose), taken up among Christians, but used both by Jew and Gentile before Christ was born, may appear by that decree of King Darius for the building of the Temple of Jerusalem, which concludes with this excommunication: "The God that hath caused his name to dwell there, destroy all kings and people that shall put their hand to destroy this house of God which is at Jerusalem. I, Darius, have made a decree; let it be done with speed."—(Ezra vi. 12).

From this custom it came, that anathema signifies both a donary given unto a temple, and an accursed thing, or that which hath a curse with it. So in the Hebrew, a thing cursed and destined to destruction, and also a kind of offering or consecration which had a curse laid upon it, namely, a curse to him that should meddle with it. Which kind of consecration had this peculiar, that even the very individual might never be altered, changed, or redeemed upon any terms, (Lev. xxvii. 28); whereas other offerings might, so that a valuable thing or better were given for them. Such a consecration (I mean a *cherem*, or consecration under pain of a curse in the very individual) was that of the City Jericho, as the first-fruits of the conquests of Canaan.

To these arguments I will add two or three examples to this of Ananias, of the punishment of this sin, and so conclude. To begin then with the beginning of all: was not the first sin of mankind, for which himself, his posterity, and the whole earth was accursed, a great and capital sin? But this, if we look well into it, was no other, for the species and kind of the fact, than sacrilege: such the ancient Jews conceived Adam's sin to have been,—namely, a species of theft; as may be gathered from the book "De Morte Mosi," where Moses is brought in deprecating death, and answering God that his case was not such as Adam's, for he transgressed by stealing, and eating what God forbade him to meddle with, and so was justly condemned. But who could Adam steal from save from God only? And, therefore, I say, the first sin of mankind, for the fact was the sin of sacrilege; for whereas among all the trees of the garden, which God gave man freely to enjoy, there was one *non tunc tangeri*, which he had reserved unto himself as holy, in token he was Lord of the garden; man, by eating of this as common, violated the sign of his fealty unto the great Landlord of the whole earth, and committed sacrilege; for which he was cast out of Paradise, and the whole earth accursed for his sake. Might I not say, that to this day many a son of Adam is cast out of his Paradise, and the labour of his hands accursed, for meddling with the forbidden fruit? But to go on.

Achan, for niming [stealing] a wedge of gold and a Babylonish garment, of the devoted thing of Jericho aforementioned, brought a curse both on himself and the whole congregation of Israel.

For the sacrilege of Eli's sons, who, not content with those offerings which God allowed them for their maintenance, robbed him of his spiritus sanctus, by eating the tables, God gave, not only his people, but even the ark of his covenant into the hands of the Philistines.

For the sacrilege of the seventh, or Sabbatical year, God caused his people to be carried captive, and the land to lie waste seventy years. By the law of Moses, every seventh year the whole land was sacred unto the Lord; so that no man that year might challenge any right of propriety, either to sow his field or prune his vineyard, or reap that which grew of itself, or gather the fruits of his vineyard undressed; only he might eat thereof in the field, as at other times any might of that which was none of his, as he travelled by; otherwise every man's field and vineyard was that year free, as well to the servant as the master, to the stranger as the owner, to beasts as well as to men. The same year also were all servants and all debts sacred unto the Lord, and so to be released; whence that year was called the Lord's release.—See Ex. xxi; Lev. xxv; Deut. xv.—This consecration being as much as the foregoing of the seventh part of every man's profits, the covetous Jews for many years neglected the observation thereof; for which sin the Lord, as himself professeth, caused them to be carried captive, and the land to lie waste seventy years without inhabitants, till it had fulfilled the years of Sabbath which they observed not. For their idolatry he gave them into the hands of the Gentiles, their enemies; for their Sabbatical sacrilege he added this unto it, that they should, beside their bondage, be carried captive into a strange country, and their land lie desolate seventy years.

For the sacrilegious profanation of Belshazzar, in causing the vessels of the Lord's house to be made his quaffing-bowls, for himself and his lords, his wives and his concubines, to carouse in, was the hand-writing upon the wall sent; which did so affright him, that the text says, "His countenance was changed, and his thoughts troubled him, so that the joints of his loins were loosed, and his knees smote one against another." And the same night God's vengeance lighted upon him.

Lastly, in the days of the Greek Kings, God gave his own temple and worship to be profaned, and his people

to be trodden under foot by Antiochus Epiphanes, a Gentile king, because they themselves had a little before profaned the same with sacrilegious hands, having betrayed the treasures and offerings of the same unto a Gentile's coffers, and sold the sacred vessels to the cities round about them.—(2 Mac. iii. iv and v.)

PERISHABILITY OF EARTHLY DIGNITY.

Never was there, and never can there be, a restoration by which authority, once absolutely extinguished, can possibly regain its pristine power. When the statue is dragged from the pedestal, the very clamps which fixed the effigy so firmly to the support, have acted as levers in rending and wrenching the marble asunder. Place the image upon the dislocated basis, and it stands but to fall. Titles may be resumed and proclaimed, the voice of the herald drowned amidst the clangour of the pealing bells, the shouts of the multitude, the swelling notes of the clarion, and the blair of the trumpet. Again, upon the tower's battlements, the broad emblazoned banner may be unfurled, and the bright regalia brought forth from their concealment to deck the Monarch returned from exile, and inaugurated upon his paternal throne. Bonfires blaze in the market-place, conduits run with claret wine. Healths are drunk by the kneeling carousers in the banquet chamber. Charles Stuart is in his palace,—but the Stuart King is not restored.

The King never "gets his own again." The broken bone will knit, and become even stronger than before the fracture; but, if the sceptre be once snapped asunder, the soldered stem never possesses the toughness of the original metal,—its solidity is destroyed.

But is there any reason to wonder, if the devices of mortal man, the shadows of a shade, are seen to waste and wane away? Should we sorrow, because the stability of the everlasting hills is denied to the fabric raised upon dust and ashes? Must we not confess the truth, and submit, without repining, to the wisdom of the dispensation which decrees that when human institutions have once arrived at their fatal term, they never can be revived. During the convulsions which alter the level of society, new opinions have been adopted, new habits have been assumed.—Young spirits have arisen, confident in their own untaught conceit; whilst ranks of contending champions have sunk in the grave. Diversified as the human countenance is, by feature and expression, the human mind is still more varied by temper, education, rank, position, and intellect. Providence works by eliciting modes of thought, not cyclical, but successive; and in which man freely acts, though without the power of controlling their evolution. No era which has once gone by, can ever be brought back. Individuals are never reproduced; and the creatures, not merely of the last age, but of the last year, or even of the yesterday, will never more be found together.—*Sir Francis Palgrave.*

THE INCONSISTENCY OF DISSENTERS HOSTILE TO THE ALLIANCE BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE.

From Essays on the Church.

The Directors of the London Missionary Society, among whom are found nearly all those writers and preachers who are now so actively denouncing all "connection between Church and State," and all "interference of rulers in matters of religion,"—these very Directors found no difficulty in writing to the Sovereign of a Polynesian state, "advising him to banish the national idol, and to attend to the instruction of the Missionaries."* And when two of their body were deputed to make an official visit to these islands, they report:—"We had a long interview with the King (of Hawaii), in which we urged upon him the propriety of publicly adopting Christianity as the religion of his dominions."† And we find that one of the Sovereigns ordered the head men of all the districts under his command, to have it proclaimed, by a herald, "All people must regard the Sabbath; where schools are established, all the people must learn." Nay, these same gentlemen cannot conclude their view of the state of New Holland, without observing that, "the want of regular means of grace among our own countrymen and their families, (colonists as well as convicts,) throughout the greatest part of the immense tracts of land in the course of clearance, and where population is rapidly increasing, must be accompanied by evils, daily growing more inveterate and difficult to remedy; even when greater exertions shall be made to maintain and propagate Christianity among the progeny of those who are in courtesy called Christians, who constitute no small part of the aggregate community here. Scattered, however, among the remote villages and farms, there are numbers of young people who would be glad to hear the gospel, had they the opportunity. We merely state the fact, laying the blame at no man's door. It is, however, deeply to be lamented that Protestant governments take so little care to convey the knowledge of the true religion, wherever they carry their arms, their commerce, or their arts in colonization."

It would seem, then, that even non-conformists themselves, when placed in circumstances which allow them to take a rational view of the question, quietly abandon all their refinements and distinctions, and take no more of opinion in pursuing religion without establishing it." They can see then, when no petty jealousies dim their sight, that the chief means possessed by a Sovereign,—the main part of the "ten talents" intrusted to his care, consists in his regal power, and influence, and authority; and that to place all these means in abeyance when any subject connected with religion came before him, would be as irrational and as blameable as any sin of omission possibly could be.

OUR FORM OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

A long and uninterrupted enjoyment of blessings, is apt to extinguish in us that gratitude towards the author of them which it ought to cherish and invigorate; and justice is less regarded, when she maketh these her awful processions through the land, preserving peace and tranquillity in our borders, because she maketh them periodically and constantly. Far different would be our sensations at such times, had sad experience ever taught us what it was to see government unhinged, to want the protection of regal power, and the due execution of laws by those to whom that power is delegated, "for the punishment of evil-doers, and the praise of them that do well." The course of nature often glides on unobserved; and the sun himself shineth unnoticed, because he shineth every day. "Since the time that God did first proclaim the edicts of his law," says the excellent Hooker, "heaven and earth have hearkened unto his voice, and their labour hath been to do his will. But if nature should intermit her course, and leave altogether, though it were but for a while, the observation of her own laws; if those principal and mother elements, whereof all things in this lower world are made, should lose the qualities which now they have; if the frame of that heavenly arch, erected over our heads, should loosen and dissolve itself; if celestial spheres should forget their wonted motions, and, by irregular volubility, turn themselves any way, as it might happen; if the price of the lights of heaven, which, now, as a giant, doth run his unwearied course, should, as it were, through a languishing faintness, begin to stand, and to rest himself, if the moon should wander from her beaten way, the times and seasons

* Ellis's Polynesian Researches, v. ii. p. 526.
† Tyerman's and Bennet's Travels, v. i. p. 459.