

reasoning from the existence of monarchy in the one for the existence of royal headship or magisterial pre-eminence in the other. Civil and sacred interests were combined in Israel. The nation was the Church, and the Church was the nation. Both were of Divine institution, and were founded in grace. God was the author of law for the civil polity, as well as for ecclesiastical affairs. No change could be made upon the constitution except by his authority. No repeal could be made by man of the laws which were recorded in the statute book, for they were divine. No representatives of the people could be chosen to meet in Parliamentary council for legislative purposes; if any difficulty arose, or event occurred, which required special consideration, enquiry was to be made at the oracle of God, the ephod, and the Urim and Thummim had been appointed for this end, and God also declared his mind by the prophets. Now the kingdoms of the world are not founded in grace, but in nature. God is not the author of the constitutions that may be adopted nor of the laws that may be in force. No political code is contained in the New Testament scriptures. The ecclesiastical and the secular have not been combined. Those who hold office in the one, do not thereby become office-bearers in the other. In fact the Jewish nation was a type of the Christian Church, and not a type of what nations would be under the New Testament economy. To reason, then, that because there was a kingdom in Israel, the kings of modern nations should be head of the Church, is a piece of most palpable sophistry, and assumes that two institutions, between which there exists a very great difference, are parallel.

Neither has it been ordained of the Lord that his ministering servants should be paid out of the national treasury. Such a conclusion must, we think, follow immediately from the fact that he has not authorised a state and church connexion, for if his kingdom of grace and the kingdoms of the world are distinct in their constitutions, laws, office-bearers, and effects, why should the one devote of its revenue to the support and extension of the other? It is in vain to refer to the Mosaic dispensation in proof that there should be a state-paid clergy, for it was the Divine law which prescribed the mode in which the priests under that system were to be supported, and we never read that the tithes were collected by regal enactment or compulsory measures. No commandment can be produced from the New Testament for the state to endow ministers of religion. "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the