

sion:—"It is the pulpit, (the every day preaching of the gospel) that must fertilize the soil that is to yield the crops?" Let us be instant in season and out of season in so fertilizing; but that being done, it is well when the rest of the cultivation can be left to other hands. God speed such husbandry.]

Gleanings.

ANTI-STATE CHURCHISM OF THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER.

It is well known that Mr. Gladstone, the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, belongs to the party in the Church of England who can scarcely endure the connection between Church and State, on account of the restraints under which Churchmen are necessarily held by the spiritual supremacy of the Sovereign. It is somewhat curious that his recently-appointed successor, Sir George Cornewall Lewis, is also unfavourable to Church and State connection, as the following passage from his work, entitled "The Influence of Authority in Matters of Opinion," will shew. It will be seen, however, that his voluntarism, if we may use so strong a word, is based merely on expediency:—

"The general result at which we arrive is, that although the promotion of religious truth, and the repression of religious error, are universally admitted to be desirable objects, yet the State is not able, by the means at its disposal, to compass them effectually; and that not only will its attempts to attain it be wholly or in great part unsuccessful, but that they will be attended with serious incidental evils. For the fruitless efforts made by the State are not merely so much labour wasted; the attempts to propagate its own religious creed disturb civil society; they aggravate the existing dissensions and animosities of the rival sects, and create new causes of discord which would not otherwise have existed . . . There is nothing in the constitution or essence of a State which is inconsistent with its being a judge of religious truth, but it discharges this duty ill. It is capable of doing the work of the Church, but the work is better done by the Church without its assistance. The State ought to abstain from the assumption of a sectarian character, and from undertaking to decide on disputed questions of religious truth, for the same reason that it ought to abstain from carrying on trade or manufactures. (This is bad, but better than the Confession of Faith Chapter xxiii., Section 3.) It is capable of trading, but it makes a bad trader; it is capable of manufacturing, but it makes a bad manufacturer. So the State is capable of acting the part of the theologian, but it makes a bad theologian. Hence it is a manifest sophism to infer that, because a person does not wish to see the State undertake the promotion of religious truth, he is indifferent or hostile to religion. . . . All experience shows that, where this intimate union of the Church and State exists, instead of the Church spiritualizing the State, the State secularises the Church. When the political and ecclesiastical powers are exercised by the same hands, the former are sure to prevail over the latter. Practically, the religious theory of Government will end in perfect Hobbism; and therefore, no enlightened friend to religion will seek to confound the province of the State with that of the Church, or to confer upon the State spiritual, and upon the Church, political functions."

DECREASE OF THEOLOGICAL STUDENTS.

Rev. Mr. Tarbox, Secretary of the American Education Society, lately made some very interesting statements at the meeting for prayer for colleges in Boston. During the last ten years, he stated that the Colleges in New England had been growing steadily but not rapidly. In 1840 there were 2000 students; now 2300. In the Theological Schools the tendency has been strikingly the other way. In 1840, in the five Orthodox Theological Schools in New England, there were 322 students. This year we have but four schools, and but 190 students. At the period first