

Self—or the Saviour.

BY REV. THOMAS L. SWABER.

"Not I, but Christ that liveth in me. When Paul said that, he meant that the 'old man,' the rebellious soul of Adam, had been wounded to death at Damascus; ever since that time there had been a 'new man' going about preaching the word, establishing churches, and bearing bitter persecutions. In this new man, and through him, lived and spoke the Lord Jesus Christ. The old self-life was gone. In its stead came Jesus. It was in one important sense true that the Redeemer lived again on earth, in every heroic word and holy deed of Paul, His representative.

Jesus lives again in every faithful follower. This is what our blessed Master promised when He said, "Lo! I am with you always." Christ is in every true believer, except that man be a reprobate. Jesus was in McCheyne when he wrote, "Oh! how sweet it is to work all day for God, and then to lie down under His smiles—to be kept in perfect peace, happy to be one with Christ." He was in Hedyer Vickers when he exclaimed, "In Jesus I find all I want of happiness, and as month after month rolls by, He is becoming more and more lovely in my eyes, and precious to my soul." It was the Christ living in Levi Spaulding, who went on a foreign mission to the perishing heathen. Jesus spoke through Guthrie's eloquent lips to the filthy outcasts of the Congo, and labored through Oberlin's self-denying toils among the peasants of the Alps. When we meet any earnest, holy-minded, consecrated man or woman, we should glorify Christ in them. Not unto them be the glory, but unto Him who loves them, and liveth in them!

Every truly good thing in any Christian is the result of the indwelling of the precious Saviour. Those are the most effective Christians who have most completely crucified the self-life, and attained to the Christ-life in the soul. How stubbornly and violently that old self-life often asserts its existence? How tenaciously it clings to us even when we hoped it was put to death! Sometimes it seems to start up out of its grave with such tremendous vitality, that we are forced to cry out, "Oh, wretched man that I am; who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" Paul never claimed an entire immunity from sin. If Jesus lived in Paul, so did Paul in a frail, temptable "flesh," and in a sin-poisoned world. The valiant Apostle was still in the arena of a fierce and bitter conflict. The battle between self and the Saviour, often broke out afresh. "So fight I not as one that beateh the air; but I beat down and bruise my body with sturdy blows." This nervous confession of the great Apostle, gives good proof that he never claimed a complete conquest over the old self-life. He was kept in a state of constant dependence upon his Saviour. Every victory he gained over sin, was not by his own resolutions or in his own strength, but simply and entirely by faith in his indwelling Redeemer. This is the lesson for us. We only conquer self through Christ. The more that self is permitted to live within us, the more weak and wretched and useless we are. But the more that Jesus lives in us, the more of purity and peace and spiritual power do we enjoy. The test-question is, Does self rule us, or does Christ? Is it wicked "I" that reigns within me, or the Lord Jesus? The screaming Spirit seems to come to the door of every heart and ask, "Who dwells here?" Happy that believer who can truly answer "Not I, but Christ liveth in me."

The Power of Little Things.

Few realize the power of little things. But in the small oftentimes lies the germ of the immense, of good or evil. A Dutch Burglar was plodding along one of the dykes which keep out the ocean from his beloved Holland, at ten o'clock one evening, and noticed that a little water was trickling through it near the top. Without giving further thought to the subject, he passed on to his home and his bed, but in the morning the dyke was swept away, a vast tract of country was covered with water, millions of property were destroyed, and hundreds of lives lost. Out of the little leakage came the mighty flood. Stop the leakage and you hold in check the flood. It is so in business, in church affairs, in denominational interests. Watch the little of dishonesty, of indifference, of laxity, and finally and faithfully check them.

"A nest built among the craggy rocks of the Alps," says D'Aubigne, "may, perhaps, contain a brood of innocuous eaglets; but as soon as their wings grow, they will soar into the air and with their piercing eyes discover their prey, and seize it from afar. The safer course, then, is for some strong hand to kill them in their nest when young. There are many eaglets which seem very attractive and charming in their young beauty, but developed into full maturity they are manifested as birds of prey. Strange the eaglets of evil thoughts; for, when first hatched conceived a thing that forth sin, and sin when it is hatched bringeth forth death." Strange the eaglets of bitter contentious words, too. The beginnings of strife are like the letting forth of many waters. Thorough and manly discussions of principles, and comparison of views may always be good, but "bitter words stir up strife." Happy he who wisely cares for the little things, to tenderly cherish or, promptly destroy.—*Journal and Messenger.*

The British Ministry does not seem to be regaining any of its lost popularity. As we anticipated, John Bright is not likely to save it.

Wealth and worldly possessions are often a hurt and sore pull-back to Christian professors: like some soldiers, who when they once meet with a rich booty at the sacking of some town, are spoiled for fighting over after.—*Gurnall.*

The Rev. John Davidson, late of Langholm, and formerly of Lochend and New-abbey, who only three years ago was appointed to Chalmers' Presbyterian church, Adelaide, was a few months since appointed one of the first professors in the University of South Australia.

Caesarism and Ultramontaniam.

A paper bearing this title was lately sent to the members of an association called "Association of the Catholic Religion" by the President of the Association, Archbishop Manning. The meeting was at the Archbishop's house, Westminster. The paper is of great length, but the following are the leading points:—

"In one sense, the conflict of the Church, and the world is always the same. The unity of the world is one, and the truth is one; nevertheless, the forms of that unity are endless and always changing. In one point, the warfare of the world against the Church is always the same. It always uses the same weapons, but the motives and aims of those that use them vary. The weapons have been, are, and always will be the civil power. For the first three centuries, the Jews and the heretical sects excited the suspicions, fears, and hatred of the Roman Empire against the Church. In the Middle Ages, the ambition or despotism of Christian Princes wielded the civil power against the Church. Now, for the last 300 years, and especially in this century, it is a world departing from Christianity which uses the civil power for the oppression of the Church. In one word, the antagonist of the Church has always been Caesarism, or the supremacy of the civil over the spiritual.

The presence of the Catholic Church among the civil Powers of the world had changed the whole political order of mankind. It has established upon earth a legislature, a tribunal, and an executive independent of all human authority. It has withdrawn from the reach of human laws the whole domain of faith and of conscience. These depend on God alone, and are subjected by Him to His own authority, vested in His Church, which is guided by Himself. This is the solution of the problem, which the world cannot solve. Obedience to the Church is liberty; and it is liberty because the Church cannot err, or mislead either men or nations. If the Church were not infallible, obedience to it might be the worst of bondage. This is Ultramontaniam or the liberty of the soul divinely guaranteed by an infallible Church; the proper check and restraint of the Caesarism, as Caesarism is the proper antagonist of the sovereignty of God.

We see the difference between the Pagan Caesarism and that I will call Christian Caesarism. 1. The first regards the State as its own creation, the second as the creation of God. 2. The first—i.e., Pontiff and King over the body and soul absolute and exclusive; the second is subject to all that belongs to the soul, to the Divine law, and to the Church of Jesus Christ. 3. The first makes religion an instrument or department of the State; the second makes it the limitation of civil power as subject to God and His law, of which the Church is the guardian and the interpreter. 4. The first regards all power, civil and religious, as derived from the people; the second regards civil power as formally from God, and the spiritual power as exclusively from God, and therefore dependent on God alone. This is Ultramontaniam, the essence of which is that the Church, being a divine institution, and by Divine assistance infallible, is within its own sphere, independent of all civil powers; and as the guardian and interpreter of the Divine law, is the proper judge of men and of nations in all things touching that law in faith or morals.

Inasmuch as at this moment the term 'Ultramontaniam' is cited as a nickname to kindle persecution against the Church by false accusations and misleading the public opinion of this country, I will draw out a proof that Ultramontaniam and Catholicism are identical, as are also Catholicism and perfect Christianity. Christianity, or the faith and law of Jesus Christ, has, as I have said, introduced two principles of divine authority into human society; the one of the absolute separation of the two powers, spiritual and civil, the other the supremacy of the spiritual over the civil in all matters within its competence or divine jurisdiction. I do not know how any man, without renouncing his Christian name, or the coherence of his reason, can deny either of these principles. I can indeed understand that, admitting both, he may dispute as to the range or reach of that jurisdiction. He may contend that it is wider or narrower, that it does or does not extend to this particular matter. But on this, also, I will speak hereafter. For the present it is enough to say that these two principles are held by all Christians, except Erastians, who deny the spiritual office of the Church, if not also its existence.

The Civil Sovereignty is coeval with man. Society is not of man's making. The relations of authority, submission, and equality lie in the human family, and from it are extended to commonwealths, kingdoms, empires. The Civil Sovereignty resides materially in society at large; formally in the person or persons to whom society may commit its interests. Hence, sovereignty is given by God to society; mediately, through society, to the person who wields it. Both materially and formally, mediately and immediately, Sovereignty is from God, and within its competence is supreme and sacred. Civil allegiance to the sovereign is, therefore, a part of Christianity, and treason is not a crime against a lawful authority and also a sin against God, who has ordained that authority. Ultramontaniam teaches that within the sphere of its competence the civil power is to be obeyed, not only for wealth but for conscience sake. It is a part of the Christian religion to obey the powers that are. As to the independence of the Spiritual Power we need waste no words. The existence of the Church and the primacy of its head in these 1800 years are proof enough. Further, no Christian of sound mind will deny that these two distinct and separate powers have distinct and separate spheres, and that within these spheres respectively they hold their power from God. Where the limits of these spheres are to be traced it is easy enough to decide in all matters purely spiritual.

The conflict arises over the mixed questions. And yet here there ought to be no real difficulty. Nobody can decide what questions are pure or what questions are mixed except a judge who can define the

limits of the two elements respectively, and the scope of the respective jurisdictions. In any question not within the competence of the two powers either there must be some judge to decide what does and what does not fall within their respective spheres, or they are delivered over to perpetual doubt and to perpetual conflict. But who can define what is or is not within the jurisdiction of the Church in faith and morals, except a judge who knows what the sphere of faith and morals contains and how far it extends? And rarely it is not enough that such a judge should guess, or opine, or pronounce upon doubtful evidence, or with an uncertain knowledge. Such a sentence would be, not an end of contention, but a beginning and renewal of strife.

It is clear that the civil power cannot define how far the circumference of faith and morals extend. If it could, it would be invested with one of the endowments of the Church. It must know the whole deposit of explicit and implicit faith; or, in other words, it must be the guardian of Christian Revelation. Now, no Christian, nor any man of sound mind, claims this for the civil power; and if not, then either there is no judge to end strife, or that judge must be the Church, to which alone the revelation of Christianity in faith and morals was divinely entrusted. And if this be so still, unless the Church be divinely certain of the limits of its commission and of its message, no doubt or controversy between the two Powers can ever be brought to an end.

But if the Church be certain with a divine certainty as to the limits of its jurisdiction, its voice in such matters is final. But an authority that can alone define the limits of its own office is absolute because it depends on none, and infallible because it knows with a divine certainty the faith which it has received in charge. If, then, the civil power is not competent to decide the limits of the spiritual power, and if the spiritual power define with a divine certainty its own limits, it is evidently supreme. Or, in other words, the spiritual power knows with divine certainty the limits of its own jurisdiction; and it knows, therefore, the limits and the competence of the civil power. It is, thereby, in matters of religion and conscience supreme. I do not see how this can be denied without denying Christianity. And if this be so, this is the doctrine of the Bull 'Unum Sanctum,' and of the *Syllabus*, and of the Vatican Council. It is, in fact, Ultramontaniam, for this term means 'no less nor more.' The Church, therefore, is separate and supreme.

Let us, then, ascertain somewhat further what is the meaning of supreme. Any power which is independent and can alone fix the limit of its own jurisdiction, and can thereby fix the limits of all other jurisdictions, is *ipso facto*, supreme. But the Church of Jesus Christ, within the sphere of revelation, of faith and morals, is all this, or is nothing, or worse than nothing, an imposture and an usurpation—that is, it is Christ or Antichrist. If it be Antichrist, every Caesar from Nero to this day is justified. If it be Christ, it is the Supreme Power among men; that is to say (1), it holds its commission and authority from God; (2), it holds in custody the faith and the law of Jesus Christ; (3), it is the sole interpreter of that faith and the sole expositor of that law; it has within the sphere of that commission a power to legislate with authority, to bind the consciences of all men born again in the baptism of Jesus Christ; it alone can fix the limits of the faith and law entrusted to it, and therefore the sphere of its own jurisdiction; it alone can decide in questions where its power is in contact with the civil power—that is, in mixed questions; for it alone can determine how far its own Divine office, or its own Divine trust, enter into and are implicated in such questions; and it is precisely that element in any mixed question of disputed jurisdiction, which belongs to a higher order and to a higher tribunal.

For instance, a Catholic Professor of Theology in a State University, salaried by the State, refuse the denunciations of the Vatican Council. The Bishop excommunicates him, the State supports and pays him in spite of the excommunication of the Church as a Professor of Catholic Theology. Here is a mixed question made up of stipend and orthodoxy. Surely orthodoxy is a higher element than stipend; faith is of a higher order than thalers; and to judge of orthodoxy and faith belongs not to the Civil and Spiritual Tribunal, which is (in that sphere) superior, absolute, and final? The same is true of every mixed question of benefice, or collation to benefice, or privation of benefice,—in a word, of every question of contract between the Church with the State, so far as faith and morals enter; and it belongs to the Church to determine whether they enter or no, and how far they enter and are implicated in the conflict.

Now, let it be clearly understood that in these assertions I am vindicating to the Church her ancient rights. I am not denying to the State its power to violate every Divine right upon earth. It may abuse its power at the expense of its will—Imperial, Royal, Bureaucratic, Democratic. I deny only its right. *Ad potestatem quæ sita potest.* It may re-act and enforce the *Lex Regia* against the Church. But its power is violence and its acts are tyranny. I have affirmed, then, that the Caesarism of the Pagan world, which was the enemy of God and the destroyer of all the legions of man, was by one Divine act reduced to its lawful sphere. The separation of the spiritual power from the civil and the supremacy of the spiritual over the civil order of the Christian world has redeemed Europe from the degradation of tyrants, and mankind from an inhuman slavery. Caesarism, whether in one person, or in a Senate, or in a populace, always has been, is, always must be, tyranny in the civil and persecution in the spiritual order.

After referring to the Falk laws in Prussia, and condemning them, he proceeds to say—

"If the Falk legislation had been such as a Catholic could by any subterfuge obey, even though its injury to the Church were never so great, then the nations of Europe might have been misled into condemning the Catholics of Germany as contumacious and refractory. But at this time, not a

nation in Europe commends the Falk laws. A handful of strangely-assorted persons about a year ago went on a pilgrimage to offer their incense to Prince von Bismarck on his natal days. They were peers and gentlemen, Frey, Hübner, and Labadie, and the preachers of 'our glorious Revolution' and of civil and religious liberty; and now we are informed that the delegates of cities and towns in England are to meet next month under the presidency of Earl Russell to express sympathy with Prince von Bismarck in his persecution of Catholics, and in his violation of religious liberties, which for half a century has been the special political cry of the noble Earl.

The Archbishop concludes in these terms—

Under Caesarism all kinds of freedom alike are violated. The natural antagonist of Caesarism is the Christian Church, with all its liberties of doctrine and discipline, of faith and jurisdiction; and the vindication of the liberties of the Church in their highest and most sacred form is Ultramontaniam. Therefore the world hates it. Therefore it now rails against it in all its tones and with all its tongues. 'Divus Cesar' and 'Victorinus Christi' are two persons, and two powers, and two systems between which there can be not only no peace but no truce. They have contended for 1800 years. In Germany they are locked once more in conflict. The issue is certain. The same who have always conquered before will conquer again. Where now are the Emperors of Rome, Germany, and France? But Peter is still in his See, and Peter now is Pius IX.

Authorship and Journalism

If a poet, or an aspiring author, must labor for the daily subsistence of a family, it is as well for his art that he should follow some other calling than journalism; for I can testify that after the day's work is over,—when the brain is exhausted and vague, and the lungs pant for air, and body and soul cry out for recreation,—the intellect has done enough, and there is neither strength nor passion left for imaginative composition. I have known a writer who deliberately left the editorial profession, for which he was adapted both by taste and vocation, and took up a pursuit which bore no relation to letters; hoping that authorship would profuse him thenceforth the treasures of variety, that upon occasion of loss or trouble it might be his solace and recompense, and that, with a less jaded brain, what writing he could accomplish would be of a more enduring kind. It is so true, however, that one nail drives out another! As an editor, this person was unable to do anything beyond his newspaper-work; as a business-man, with not the soundest health, and with his heart, of course, not fully in his occupation, he found himself unable at ease in his means, nor able to gain sturdier hours for literature than vigorous journalist authors slich from recreation and sleep. Fortunate in every way is the aesthetic writer who has sufficient income to support him altogether, or, at least, when added to the stipend earned by first-class work, to enable him to follow art without harassment. For want of such a resource, poets with their delicate temperaments, may struggle alone from year to year, composing at intervals, which other men devote to social enjoyment, rarely doing their best; possibly with masterpieces still in their brains till the creative period is ended; misjudged by those whom they most respect, and vexed with thoughts of what they could perform, if sacred common duties were not to incumbent upon them.—*Edinburgh Couriers*, 27th, in "A Representative Poet," *Sermon* for February.

Protestantism in Franco.

A correspondent of the *Daily News* in Paris supplies some particulars of the proceedings of the Synod of the Reformed Churches held in the Rue Roquepine lately. He says:—The Theological Parliament lately sitting here presented some points of analogy to the political one presided over by M. Buffet. It was pretty nearly equally divided into a liberal and an orthodox section, with a centre of undecided spirits who, called upon to vote, were generally found on the side of dogmatic authority. While considerable unanimity was on the side of what M. Guizot, Chabaud-Latour, and Metral designate as the Opposition, the divisions and elders of the Right triumphed in division lists. Hence the determination of M. Chabaud-Latour, Coquerel, Collet, Ecault, Dile, and the delegates of forty-two consistories supporting them, to abstain from taking part in the deliberations of the Assembly. This resolve had the effect of emptying the Left benches, and reducing the debates to a narrow range of topics and votes. The chief points which had to be established the church of materialism, positivism, and the liberal doctrine brought against the liberal party were:—1. That the Republic in France was not a Christian Republic, and that the party of the Centre Left were guilty of a crime against the principles of the Committee, and to assign the seats and leave the Right to take the leadership of the House. 2. That M. Longueval, and General de Temple, should forth to the members of the party of the Right of equal order. M. Coquerel, Chabaud-Latour, and Metral, the Conservative dogmatists of Versailles, then fell behind the secular arm. It is not possible to en-throne, in the interest of orthodoxy, a Mac-Maclon, or a Duret, in the example of the Saint-Espirit, where the Synod holds its sittings. The nearest approach to an expedient of this kind is the appeal to the Council of State, drawn up by six lay orthodox pastors and elders. That body, by its recommendation, is composed for the most part of Roman Catholics in no or less libeled, or Voltairians who, to lead a quiet life, submit to the intervention of the priest, at births, marriages, and deaths. M. Guizot, Metral (now a Fusionist deputy and formerly a partisan of the *Comp d'Etat*), and General Chabaud-Latour placed last August before the Council of State a declaration of the synodal profession of faith, voted a short time previously, with a demand for its authorization, or rather for its imposition on those congregations, coming within the

reach of the law of Germinal. A demand was also made for the Council of State to recognize the constant power of the Synod, which in things doctrinal sets up the kind of sovereignty claimed by the Assembly in things political. Council demands and protests signed by 47 members of the opposition, and a large number of pastors, elders, and laymen were also sent in. They were all embodied by that friend of M. de Falloux, the very Catholic M. Andral, in a report addressed to M. Balbie. But M. Balbie was more liberal than the orthodox Protestants. While admitting the constant power of the Synod, he avoided on technical grounds promulgating the Confession of Faith, which he sent back for reconsideration. In divers audiences granted by him to the heads of the orthodox party, he strove to point out the impropriety of their appeal to the Council of State, which, he said, was hardly competent to help them out of purely philosophical and theological difficulties. M. Balbie's sage advice has not, however, been followed. Before quitting the Synod, the majority, whilst affirming their spiritual independence, made another attempt to conciliate. To this end a letter was addressed to the president, Pastor Brestie. It acknowledged the utility of a Synod as a consultative body, and as a means towards the establishment of a closer bond of union between the Churches, by affording their pastors and elders an opportunity of propounding questions of general interest. But the letter utterly denied the right of a synod to impose any dogma or confession of faith. A dry, discourteous answer was returned by sixty members, who refused to yield on any single point. This was followed by a vote of thanks to the Synodal Committee of Permanence for its successful efforts in bringing M. Balbie and the Council of State to admit the authority of the Synod in doctrinal matters. The succeeding sittings were devoted to the discussion of disciplinary and other articles of belief which were to be embodied in last year's Confession of Faith. An idea may be obtained of the high pretensions of M. Guizot and his friends from the following amendments, which have been carried by the unyielding sixty. "The Synod alone is competent to give judgment in cases of dispute arising between Consistories and Presbytery Councils, or between these bodies and pastors. It is invested with sovereign authority to decide in ecclesiastical questions." Growing out of this article its [another empowering it (the Synod) to regulate the election of Provincial and General Assemblies, and of a Permanence Committee, which in periods of recess will keep watch over the interests of orthodoxy. Most of this supplementary legislation is intended to tie the hands of future Synods, and to secure the ascendancy of MM. Guizot, Metral, and Chabaud-Latour. These illustrious and venerable eclogerians find they have through their active participation in the Fusionist intrigue, become unpopular among even the orthodox congregations and, accordingly, they adopt the Parliamentary strategy of the Duc de Broglie in placing the Synod above the power from which it sprang. Their mouthpiece, M. Laurans, as reporter of the Committee for Revising the Confessions of Faith, has dwelt on the necessity of placing the electoral organization of the Reformed Churches in harmony with the doctrinal belief. According to the law of Germinal all Protestants are electors. But this application of universal suffrage in matters of Church government at the Rue Roquepine is declared to be a fertile source of disorder and error. Henceforth the names will be erased from the congregational lists of all those who do not bring up their children in the Protestant religion, such as it is defined by the Synod. It is furthermore ordained that "no Protestant will be eligible to sit in a Presbytery Council, Consistory, or General Assembly, unless he sign an adhesion to the revised Confession of Faith."

Presbytery of Hamilton.

At a meeting of this Presbytery, held in the Central Presbyterian Church, on the 15th inst., the Basis of Union was discussed. The following motion and amendments were submitted:—Moved by Rev. Mr. McColl, seconded by Rev. Mr. Forteous, "That the Basis of Union, as renitted by the General Assembly, be approved of. Moved in amendment by Rev. Mr. Laug, seconded by Mr. John Brown, "1. That Union among the Presbyterian Churches of the Dominion is desirable, if it can be accomplished on terms satisfactory to all parties concerned, with due regard to the principle held in common by the Churches, and to harmony of action; and that the Presbytery cherishes the hope that this will be effected in due time. 2. That the Basis sent down by the General Assembly is not satisfactory, and is disapproved of by this Presbytery. In further amendment, it was moved by Rev. B. H. Fletcher, seconded by Rev. D. D. McLeod, "That while desirous of Union between the negotiating Churches, we recommend as soon as possible to be resolved that having regard to all the interests concerned, such a modification of the proposed Basis be sought by the Assembly as would secure a larger amount of unanimity in the prospect of Union." After a full discussion on the vote was taken, when Mr. Forteous' amendment was carried against Mr. Laug's by six to two. Then Mr. Fletcher's amendment was put against the motion when 14 voted for the motion and 7 for the amendment. The year and days were called for when 14 voted yes and 7 voted nay. Mr. McColl's motion, approving of the Basis of Union, was therefore carried by the above majority. The resolutions appended to the Basis were read *in extenso*, and approved of by a majority.

How we anticipate an engagement with an important personage, we prepare ourselves. We are soon to meet God. "Prepare to meet thy God."

At a meeting of the Kirk Session of St. Andrew's Church, Galt, held on the 4th inst., the Basis of Union was rejected by a majority of four to two. The congregation vote on it on Sabbath first.

The Session and congregation of the Canada Presbyterian Church, Picton, have unanimously and cordially adopted the Basis of Union.