

THE SOUTHERN  
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXI.—NO. 2.

---

APRIL, MDCCCLXX.

---

ARTICLE I.

MINISTERS' WIDOWS AND ORPHANS.

At the last meeting of the General Assembly, a memorial looking to some positive and permanent provision for the families of deceased ministers, was presented by the Rev. Dr. J. Leighton Wilson. If his scheme, or any kindred scheme, should be got into successful operation, as the fruit of this initial effort, he may undoubtedly regard it as the crowning work of his useful life. Because the imperative need of such a provision presses upon the Church with accumulating weight year by year; because the manifest interest excited throughout her bounds since the earliest discussion of this topic demonstrates the fact that the Church is beginning to recognise this ponderous obligation; and because no enterprise that has engaged the attention of her worthiest sons is so environed with difficulties as this.

In the discussion at Mobile, two or three things were formally expressed or constantly implied. First, that the preaching of the gospel, from Presbyterian pulpits at least, seems to involve the necessity of poverty in the preacher. That is to say, the

It seems to us that if the general character of the revision is acceptable to the Presbyteries, they will probably content themselves with signifying that, and *vice versa*; for there remains but one meeting for most of them in which to do the whole work of critically examining and stating their opinions. We hope there will be a thorough dealing with the business, even if it should require a fortnight from every Presbytery. We believe such a study of church government as this would help all our ministers and elders to understand their system better, and induce them to carry it out more fully into execution. And so we close these editorial comments with the earnest prayer that our Master and Lord may guide his servants into all truth and duty respecting this important undertaking, so that his glory and our Church's prosperity may thereby be promoted.

---

ARTICLE VI.

CHRIST AND THE STATE.

The powers that be are ordained of God. The state is a political person, moral, responsible; for to it pertain rights, duties, and obligations, which connect it directly with the government of God. It is indeed the organ through which that government is administered in its relation to man's highest earthly interests. Mankind every where, naturally and constantly, recognise in their various dialects, the personality and responsibility of nations, showing that this doctrine commends itself to the universal conscience. They speak of national virtue and national vice, national rewards and national punishments. So, too, the word of God addresses nations in their collective capacity, condemns national sins, and denounces national judgments. To say that responsibility, in its last analysis, is individual, is no just objection, but only a quibble; for though it be true, it is true of the individual, not as a disconnected unit, but *as so and so related*. Man is not an individual being complete

in himself. His existence is connected with and dependent upon others—not in one way, but in every way. His character—mental, moral, and religious—is formed by the influence of others. His very nature points to others. It is not an individual, isolated nature, but a relational, associative, civil, and political nature. A state of individualism, could such exist, would be destructive of nature. That is as much natural to which the necessities of nature drive us, as that which is born in us. Or, to state it in another form, the necessary developments of nature are nature—nature completed and perfected. Man's nature, then, is the family, society, the state, and the Church, (for the Church was natural to holy Adam, formed in the image of God, and engaged in the open worship of God on the Sabbath day.) Endowed with understanding, conscience, and will, man is, by his nature, a moral and religious being, the subject of the moral law; and constituted, also, a social, civil, and political being, he is also, as such, moral and religious; for his whole nature was made by God and for God. God made society and government as much as he made man. The duties of the second table, as well as those of the first table, he owes to God—to God first, to his fellow man next.

Again: being social, he must be moral and religious; since to deny to him moral distinctions would be to attribute to his nature elements destructive of society. Social, civil, and political relations imperatively demand the exercise of moral qualities, in order to harmony, perpetuity, and peace. Moral responsibility, having its foundations in man's nature, must also characterise every outgrowth of that nature, and so be indelibly impressed upon the family, society, and the state. Relational responsibility, family responsibility, social responsibility, national responsibility, are as much natural as individual responsibility. Relations are as much realities as individuals, and will exist as long. The Church as the Church, and not as a collection of individual believers, will continue for eternity. As a *Church*, it was given to Christ before the world began; as a *Church*, it was redeemed; and as a *Church*, it will be glorified in heaven forever.

As well deny the responsibility of man as deny the responsibility of the family, the state, and the Church; for the family, the state, and the Church are *man*—man whole and complete. On the same principle that we deny the responsibility of the nation as such, must we also deny the responsibility of the *race*, as such, under the covenant of works, and the responsibility of the *Church*, as such, under the covenant of grace. In both cases, federal being and federal responsibility preceded actual being and actual responsibility. By the one covenant, Adam and his race were constituted a federal body. By the other covenant, Christ and his Church were constituted a federal body. In neither case was there simply a collection of individuals. Adam's race was a party to the covenant made with him. Christ's Church was a party to the covenant made with him. Adam's guilt was not the guilt of the race because it was imputed to them, but it was imputed to them because it *was* theirs. Christ's righteousness is not the righteousness of the Church because it is imputed to her, but it is imputed because it *is* hers. For God's judgment is always according to truth. Under the one covenant, the responsibility of the race was not met. Under the other covenant, the responsibility of the Church was met.

They who charge indefiniteness on the term "national identity," would do well to consider if it be in their power to define *personal identity*. But the identity of a nation is, however, as real as the identity of an individual. The individuals that compose it, like the particles of matter in the human body, pass away, and are succeeded by others; but the body politic continues essentially the same. The identity of a nation is distinct from the identity of the individuals that belong to it; for whilst human beings *collectively* are essential to the existence of a nation, individually they are not; just as the particles of matter in the human body are collectively essential to its existence, but not individually. They, then, that deny personality, individuality to a nation, or call it a mere figure of speech, must, on the same principle, deny personality, individuality to a person, an individual, and call it a mere figure of speech.

Moral obligation belongs to a nation all its life. Sometimes

the obligation to punishment it has incurred, descends from generation to generation, until at length the accumulated guilt of centuries becomes concentrated in one unhappy generation, and the penalties due to the numerous offences of their forefathers are exacted with interest from the individuals then happening to exist. Thus said the Saviour to the men of his generation: "Behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: and some of them ye shall scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city: *that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the days of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the altar and the temple. Verily I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation.*"

What a proof of the personality, responsibility, guilt, and punishment of nations! It is generally the case that nations are sinning most when punished least. They are left to fill up the measure of their iniquity. And so, too, punishment overtakes them at a time when they are chargeable with fewest public crimes. Rome had ceased to be an aggressive power centuries before her downfall.

A state which does not recognise its dependence upon God, is false to the law of its own being. Subjects that have no religion are incapable of law. If the tie that binds man to God is not acknowledged, the tie that binds man to man cannot be enforced. Every state must have a religion, or it must cease to be a government of men. Hence, no commonwealth has ever existed without religious sanctions. A modern author well observes: "Whether true or false, sublime or ridiculous, man must have a religion. Every where, in all ages, in all countries, in ancient as in modern times, in civilised as well as in barbarian nations, we find him a worshipper at some altar, be it venerable, degraded, or blood-stained." To the truth of this remark every student of history will promptly subscribe. It is a common mistake to suppose that religion is restricted to the Church. Religion embraces all the ties which bind men to God. "Civil" is distinguished from "ecclesiastical," not from "religious." Religion, of necessity, belongs to every divine institution—the

the family, society, the state, as well as the Church. All these institutions are from God; all are dependent upon him, and all are designed for his glory. As religion is not only profitable, but necessary, for the life that now is, as well as for that which is to come, so religion is necessary for the being and well-being of the state, to fit it to accomplish its ends. And therefore the state is a religious institution.

The design of government is to confine men within the circle of their obligations, and to protect the sphere of their rights. Laws are rules of conduct, directing men to the end for which they are created. Therefore, though appertaining to different parts and aspects of human life, they must partake of the unity of the end itself. Hence it is impossible to separate the fundamental doctrines of jurisprudence from religion, without throwing out of consideration the more excellent part of man, and the only permanent existence of which his nature is capable. The Christian religion, by teaching man the real end of his creation, has given him a clearer view of law, which is the rule of his conduct, directing him to that end.

Suarez lays it down, that all human laws are originally derived in some way or other from the divine law; and he cites this passage of Augustine: "*Conditor legum temporalium si vir bonus est et sapiens, legem eternam consulit ut secundum ejus immutabiles regulas, quid sit pro tempore jubendum vetandumque discernat.*" Zallinger and Domat deduce natural law from the two great primary laws of the Bible: Love to God; love to thy neighbor. The former observes: "Some writers on natural jurisprudence fall into error at the very outset of the science by taking a maimed and imperfect view of the nature of man, and referring all that man ought to regard in the observance of natural laws to this temporary life only, and to its interests; and so they deem themselves more philosophical, in proportion as they separate religion from natural law." "A rule of men's outward actions is not sufficient in itself for the government of mankind. This is so, not only because the government of men's minds, which are the most excellent part of them, is necessary even for the purpose of regulating their outward acts, but also because man

must be considered with reference to the immortality of his soul, even in regard to human government." "Not only external acts, but even the internal movements of the will are subject to natural laws. This is the reason why *intention* is material to the legal effect of human actions; and hence we see the connexion between natural jurisprudence and ethics." This shows the necessity for government to recognise Christianity as the only effectual means for accomplishing its end.

But it is not only necessary that the state have a religion, but equally necessary that it have the *true* religion, which only can convert obedience into a living principle. Falsehood and error are mighty for evil, not for good. Only that which comes from God can secure God's blessing and promote man's interests. A false religion incorporated with government, must ultimately bring it to ruin; and many such will rend it in pieces. A commonwealth can no more be organised which shall recognise all religions, than one which shall recognise none. The sanctions of its laws must have a centre of unity some where. "To combine in the same government contradictory systems of faith, is as hopelessly impossible as to constitute into one state men of different races and languages. The Christian, the Pagan, the Mahometan, Jews, Infidels, Turks, Hindoos, Mormons, cannot coalesce as organic elements in one body politic. The state must take its religious type from the doctrines, the precepts, the institutions, of one or the other of these parties. That the state should treat all religions with equal indifference, is to suppose that its subjects can have a double life, flowing in double streams, which never approach nor touch—a life as citizens, and a life as men." The state is not only a religious, but a *Christian* institution. Christianity is its organic life. It sustains vital relations to the Lord Jesus Christ. It has nothing to do with an absolute God, for an absolute God has nothing to do with it. It stands related to God only through Christ, the Mediator. For the Son of God, as such, being an absolute God, can have nothing to do with it. The essential kingdom of God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, over the universe, is administered through the mediatorial kingdom of Christ. It is only as Mediator that he

can be the head of the state. *For every relation, through which rights were conferred upon, and benefits enjoyed by man, was once forfeited by sin, and subsequently restored by the Mediator, and hence is the redeemed property of Christ.* The state, with every other conservative institution built upon man's nature, went down with that nature in man's fall, wrecked and ruined. It was once lost, then saved—saved by grace. It owes its present existence to grace. In man's fallen nature, no foundation exists for any institution that was based on his unfallen nature: such as the family, the state, property, etc. The foundation was quite taken away by sin, which doomed his nature and all its interests to eternal destruction. The institutions based on his original nature are therefore derived now from his *redeemed* nature—redeemed in the sense in which this world and all things in it have been redeemed by Christ—redeemed from present, if not future destruction—redeemed, if not regenerated. All men are the redeemed property of Christ, though all men are not the redeemed family of Christ.

To save man's nature, and all the interests and institutions originally derived from it, necessity required that it be committed to Christ. Christ is the Lord of man's entire nature, and of all its original developments. The state therefore owes its present existence to him, and should acknowledge its obligations to its Preserver. If creation imposes obligations, redemption imposes still greater. For nihility, which the former terminates, is not so far from God as sin, from the consequences of which the latter delivers. *Nothing* has no moral character, and offers no opposition to the divine power; but *sin* is the *infinite opposite* of the divine character, the invader of the divine rights, the rebel against the divine majesty, the eternal antagonist of God, whose government it aims to subvert, and whose being it aims to destroy. The rescue of a nature, the willing subject of sin, from merited destruction, even though it be temporary, and in a way that makes far greater demands upon the resources of Deity than creation does—nay, requires them *all*—certainly imposes far greater obligations than creation does. And every institution derived from that nature now rescued, whether it be of



temporal duration only or eternal, is morally bound to acknowledge its Redeemer, and to a greater degree than it is bound to acknowledge its Creator. The Godhead has, and can have, nothing to do with the sinner in his *civil*, any more than in his individual relation, except through Jesus Christ. To his very existence and preservation as an individual, Christ is necessary; and the more complex his relations, of course the more need of Christ's interposition, and of the coherence in and subjection to Christ, of all institutions which proceed from the manifold nature of man, and the various circumstances in which he is placed.

Although man is redeemed and restored by a mediator, yet such is the character of sin, the infinite opposite of God, and so altered are the relations of the creature to God by sin, that though reconciled and restored, he can never be so restored, as to dispense at any time with the offices of the Restorer or Mediator, but will need them forever in heaven, as well as upon earth. Thus the Mediator not only stood between the sinner and God when reconciled, but he stands between them now, and he will stand between the saint and God forever—the bond of union and communion between God and the glorified Church forever. The mediatorial person will abide God-man forever. The mediatorial throne will be occupied forever. The mediatorial kingdom will endure forever. The mediatorial offices will be discharged forever. The Lamb will both conduct the worship of heaven, and feed the flock of God forever. The passage in Corinthians, which speaks of the Son's delivering up the kingdom to the Father, so far from militating against this doctrine, establishes it. That this "delivering up," relates to the *trusteeship* of his kingdom, and not to the kingdom itself, is evident, for it is expressly stated, that when all things shall be subdued unto him, the Son also himself shall be *subject* unto him that put all things under him. But in what sense is, or can be, the Son "subject" to the Father, except as *Mediator*? The "subjection" of the Son establishes his mediatorialship. The first cannot be without the last. For as long a time as he is "subject," for so long a time is he Mediator. So

that the *eternal subjection* of the Son (which this passage asserts) proves the *eternal duration* of the Mediator's kingdom.

Man's very *nature*, then, with all that is founded upon it, being lost by the fall, and then restored by the Mediator, and its dependence upon him for its preservation being absolute, entire, and everlasting, it follows that every institution, based upon a nature that is for every moment of its being dependent upon its Restorer, is equally dependent every moment upon that Restorer. The State is under the mediatorial care and government of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is his subject. To him it is responsible. It is a Christian institution, designed to secure first the glory of God, and next the civil good of man. It is a monstrous proposition, that any institution terminates on itself or on man. In God, not in the creature, it lives, moves, and has its being. To ignore its Maker and Preserver, is atheism. To withhold allegiance, is treason. To substitute the good of man for the glory of God as its end, is idolatry. The state owes allegiance to Christ its divine King, and is bound to respect his statutes, and observe those which relate to it. "*By me,*" says Christ, "kings reign, and princes decree justice; *by me* princes rule, and nobles, even all the kings of the earth." "The kingdom is the Lord's, and *he is the governor among the nations.*" "Be wise, now, O ye kings, be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. *Kiss the Son,* lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way."

That the reference is to kings and judges in their official character, is evident from the passage in Acts iv. 26-28: "The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord, and against his Christ. For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done."

In the same character in which kings oppose are they to serve the great Mediatorial King. Herod and Pilate, as rulers, are commanded to own the Son. Dr. Owen well observes: "Judges and rulers, as such, must kiss the Son, own his sceptre, and ad-

vance his ways. Wait upon *your King*, the Lord Christ, to know *his* mind. If you lay any stone in the whole building that advanceth itself against his sceptre, he will shake all again. Dig you never so deep, build you never so high, it shall be shaken. Say not this or that suits the interests of England, but look what suits the interests of Christ; and assure yourselves that the true interest of any nation is wrapped up therein!" Alexander also considers this Psalm as referring to nations as nations. It deserves notice, too, that the Psalm considers opposition by rulers to Christ, to be opposition to Jehovah also: "The kings of the earth set themselves against Jehovah, and against his Anointed;" shewing that there can be no medium for officials, any more than for others, between Christianity and Atheism. He that denieth the Son denieth not only the Father, but the Godhead also. Opposition to the Mediator is opposition to the absolute God; for through the kingdom of the former, the kingdom of the latter is administered. Even heathen kings did sometimes acknowledge the authority of the God of revelation. The king of Nineveh, under the preaching of Jonah, caused his people to observe a solemn fast. Nebuchadnezzar made a decree, extolling the God of Israel, and threatening destruction to those who should speak against him. Darius decreed that his subjects should fear the God of Daniel as the living God, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed. (And yet Christian ministers are found in our day who deny that to be a duty, which even heathen acknowledged and performed!) "Say ye *among the heathen* that the Lord reigneth," is the command. "The *shields* of the earth belong unto God." "The earth is the *Lord's*, and the fulness thereof; the world, and *they that dwell therein.*" "Thy Maker is thy husband; the Lord of hosts is his name, and thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel; *the God of the whole earth shall he be called.*" Christ, the Redeemer, Husband, and Head of the Church, is the God of the whole earth! "O Lord *God of Israel*, who dwellest between the cherubims, thou art the God, even thou alone, of *all the kingdoms of the earth.*" "O Lord God of our fathers, art not thou God in heaven? *and rulest not thou over all the king-*

*doms of the heathen?"* "Arise, O God, judge the earth; for thou shalt *inherit all nations.*" "God hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, *whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds.*" "And there was given the Son of man, dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, *that all people, and nations, and languages, should serve him.*" "And the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom, *under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him.*" "And I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come." "Thou shalt also suck the milk of the Gentiles, and shalt suck the breasts of kings; and thou shalt know that I the Lord am thy Saviour and thy Redeemer, the Mighty One of Jacob." "All kings shall fall down before him; all nations shall serve him; all nations shall call him blessed." "So the heathen shall fear the name of the Lord, and all the kings of the earth thy glory; when the people are gathered together, and the kingdoms to serve the Lord." "Come near, ye nations, to hear; and hearken, ye people; let the earth hear, and all that is therein; the world and all things that come forth of it." The God of revelation—Christ, the Mediatorial King—addresses the nations. "The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted." "Who would not fear thee, O King of nations?"

The moral law, in all ages of the world, has been administered by Christ. It was "*the angel of the Lord,*" as the martyr Stephen said, who appeared to Moses in the burning bush, and who spake to Moses on Mt. Sinai, and gave him "the lively oracles." An absolute God never governs transgressors by laws, nor counsels, nor threatens, but damns them at once and forever. An absolute God did not tolerate for one moment the sinners in heaven—the angels that kept not their first estate. And can an absolute God tolerate for one moment sinners on earth? Impossible! Reprieves, and laws, and counsels, and promises, and threatenings, all belong to a mediatorial government. And the addressing these to nations and governments

and rulers, proves of itself the existence of a mediatorial government over them, and the direct responsibility of nations and governments and rulers to Christ, the mediatorial King of kings and Lord of lords. And so the Apocalypse shews us the pouring out upon the NATIONS of the *wrath of the Lamb*. Civil government, then, is under the Mediator's control. "All things were created by him and FOR HIM." "The Father hath delivered all things into the hands of the Son." "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son." "The Father hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church." This universal headship being *given*, points to his mediatorial character; for his universal headship, as the Son of God, is essential, and not derived. He is not simply "Head over all things," but "Head over all things *to the Church*." The headship of nature, providence, and grace are his. Possession of universal power is necessary to the interests of the Church. Power beyond the Church is *essential* to the existence, increase, and welfare of the Church itself. For the enemies which beset her are not confined to the false disciple within her bosom, and to the worldling and the infidel without, but are found likewise in the invisible world, and comprise the entire host of fallen angels, who are ever tasking the resources of their gigantic intellects to accomplish her destruction. It is needful therefore that Christ be head over them, to overrule their machinations and assaults for his glory and the Church's good, to make their wrath to praise him, to curb their fury, and say unto them, "Thus far shall ye go, and no farther." In like manner, they who minister to the welfare of the Church are not her faithful members alone, but mighty angels also, who are *all*, without exception, ministering spirits to the heirs of salvation. It is needful therefore that Christ be head over them, to direct their agency, and derive from it a revenue of glory to his name and of blessing to his people. The headship of the nations is his, for the interests of the Church in every age have been and are inseparably interwoven with theirs. Under the mediatorial government of Christ, the respect paid to the moral law, and their bearing towards the

Church of God, determined the prosperity or the decay of the ancient nations. It is true that their measure of light was less than ours, and consequently their measure of responsibility was less; and Christ, as head of nations, bore long with them, although their religions were false religions, and he did not immediately sweep them away; for their false religions contained some principles of rectitude in common with the true religion. And so he continued to prosper them (though they knew him not), annexing success to the exercise of virtues, superficial indeed, but necessary to the being of society, until his secret designs were answered by them, in relation to his Church, which is the great end of all empires, kingdoms, and peoples, and the entire system of providential dispensations.

The office of each of them in relation to her was clearly indicated by the providence of God, and their conduct and fate were shadowed forth in that solemn declaration of his word: "The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted." This relation and this destiny have been set forth in graphic language by a modern writer: "Egypt was the nursery and school of the infant Church, where, by the discipline of centuries, a handful of wandering shepherds were to be transformed into a nation of civilised men, governed by regular laws, living in fixed habitations, possessed of all those arts and appliances that should fit them for their new career in their own land, and when this office is discharged, and she begins to regard this people as her own, and resist God's commands in regard to them, he brings them out of her with a high hand and outstretched arm. Assyria he uses as a scourge and rod to his rebellious people, though it was not in the heart of the king, nor did he think so; and when that purpose was subserved, the indignation of God laid Nineveh in the grave. Babylon was the prison-house in which the Jews were cured of their apparently incurable idolatry, and the nation of Israel was utterly dissolved. Cyrus and his dominion were made the deliverers of God's Church, and the avenger of her wrongs on Babylon. And when that empire had grown hostile to the purposes it was raised up to subserve, it was shattered to atoms by the conquering

power of Alexander. His conquests in their turn spread the Greek language and culture over all the East, and prepared the way for the diffusion of the gospel in that tongue, wherever Jews were dispersed that spoke and read the Greek language. To Rome was assigned the work of making commerce free and intercourse safe, of teaching the idea of law to a barbarian world, of binding together discordant races in one vast dominion, and affording safeconduct for the preachers of the religion of Christ through all the Roman world. And when she was no longer needed for this purpose, when her civilisation became effeminate and corrupt, and her religion superstitious, she went down before the hardy nations of Germany. Thus one by one were these great empires raised up to minister in their several ways to God's Church, and as they turned against her, and became unfit to advance her interests, were laid in the grave by a resistless hand." Thus did the Church determine the rise, decline, and fall of ancient empires. It is worthy of notice, too, that the Church imparted to them the knowledge of those fundamental truths and principles that constitute the moral life of a nation, which, imperfect and feeble as it may be, preserves its being so long as it does exist. Religion is the principal foundation and ligament of political society. And in that Church, which, upon emerging from the ark, possessed the whole world, the doctrines and institutions of pure Christian religion were found. These transmitted to succeeding generations, abused and corrupted as they were, yet held together the political framework of the nations. The religious life of the nations was continued and strengthened by contact more or less direct with the Church of God; and the increased mental activity thereby engendered was manifested in the progress of philosophy, science, and art. The learning of the Egyptians was proverbial. But it was principally due to the institutions established among them by an illustrious *Israelite*, Joseph, who held the second rank in the kingdom. By the king's appointment, he "instructed his elders or priests in wisdom," Ps. cv. 22. And in Genesis xlvii. 22, mention is made of Joseph's care of and provision for the priests, by assigning them portions, and settling their lands. That Joseph, in the colleges of priests,

and other institutions of learning founded by him in the kingdom, would be zealous in communicating to them the knowledge of the true God, and instructing them in the principles of revealed religion, we may readily infer from his tried character and eminent piety. Melancthon observes: "Egypt excelled in arts, and laws, and other learning; Joseph had planted a Church there; but after his death the kings turned aside to idols, and in the following times Egypt was full of idols and magic arts." Thus the famed Egyptian wisdom in which Moses was learned was derived in no small degree from the "lively oracles" of revelation.

In the days of Solomon, Egypt derived no little benefit from intercourse with the land of Israel. Clement of Alexandria, well versed in Egyptian rites, shows their resemblance to the Jewish: the Egyptian cantor corresponding to the Jewish singer; their sacred scribe to the Jewish; their sacrificing cup to the Jewish cup of drink-offering; their bread set forth to the Jewish shew-bread; their prayers, festivals, sacrifices, firstfruits, hymns, to those among the Jews. Serranus the philologist, in his preface to Plato, observes: "That the Egyptians retained many things from the traditions of the patriarchs, the ancient history of Moses demonstrates; and that they derived many things from the clear fountains of the Scriptures, which yet they contaminated by their own mud (or fables) is no way to be doubted." Pythagoras, founder of the school which bears his name, and who, according to Jamblichus, first gave name to philosophy, regarded with the utmost reverence by a multitude of disciples as an oracle in philosophy, ethics, and theology, whose *αὐτὸς ἔφη* was sufficient authority with them, was also indebted to the Jewish Church and Scriptures for all that was valuable in his philosophy. Hermippus, his biographer and a pagan, testifies that "Pythagoras translated many of the Jewish laws into his own philosophy," and that "he was an imitator of the Jewish opinions" touching God, the creation of the world, the soul, purification, excommunication," etc. Porphyry, who also wrote a life of Pythagoras, states that he had converse with the Hebrews. Vossius says that "out of a desire to get learning Pythagoras



was conversant with the Persian magi, and with the Assyrians, under whose government the Jews then were found. Many testimonies exist to show that this indefatigable philosopher pursued his investigations among the Jews in Phenicia, Egypt, Babylon, and Judea. Josephus, speaking of Pythagoras, says: "Not only was he well skilled in our discipline, but he also embraced many things greedily." The renowned Plato likewise drank of the sacred fountain of inspiration. Aristobulus, a Jew, affirmed this of Plato: "He followed our institutes curiously, and diligently examined the several parts thereof." Clement of Alexandria says: "Plato remarks, that 'God, as also the ancient discourse teaches, comprehends the beginning and the end, and the middle of all things.' Whence, O Plato, did you thus darkly set forth the truth? The nations of the barbarians, says he, are wiser than those. Truly, I well know your teachers, though you may wish to conceal them. *From the Hebrews you have borrowed both all your good laws, and your opinions respecting the Deity.*" Numenius, the Pythagorean philosopher, undisguisedly writes: "*What is Plato save Moses Atticizing?*" "Your philosophers," says Justin Martyr to the Greeks, "through the agency of divine providence have, unwillingly, been even themselves compelled to speak on our side the question; and now especially those who sojourned in Egypt, and who are benefited by the theosophy of Moses and his ancestors. For those of you who are acquainted with the history of Diodorus, and with the productions of other similar writers, can scarcely I think be ignorant that Orpheus, and Homer, and Solon, and Pythagoras, and Plato, and several others, having sojourned in Egypt, and having been benefited by the history of Moses, afterward set forth matters directly contrary to their former indecorous speculations concerning the gods. Thus, for instance, Orpheus, though the first teacher of polytheism among you, declared to his son Musaeus, and to other sincere hearers, the unity of the Godhead. We find him also adjuring the *Voice of the Father*; by which expression he means the *Word of God*; through whom were produced the heavens and the earth, and the whole creation, as the divine prophecies of holy men teach us. For becoming par-

tially acquainted with those prophecies in Egypt, he thence learned that the whole creation was produced by the *Word of God*." In like manner, Tertullian affirms: "Truth is more ancient than all, and if I am not deceived, the antiquity of Divine Writ has in this profited me, that I am fully persuaded it was the treasury of all following wisdom. *Which of the poets, which of the sophists, who did not drink altogether of the prophets' fountain? Thence also the philosophers quenched their thirst; so that what they had from our Scriptures, that we receive again from them.*"

Thus, under the mediatorial kingdom of Christ, not only did the nations of antiquity minister, in one way or another, to his Church, but their qualifications for this service were also derived from her. Out of her fulness did they all receive, and of her own did they give unto her. Conformity to the partial revelation they had, kept pace with their fidelity to their mission—the ministering to the Church of God. But the rejection of the truth was followed by the persecution of the Church; and this, sooner or later, insured their ruin. The light afforded now is greater than formerly; consequently the responsibility and the guilt are greater too. If the respect had to an obscured and distorted gospel must be taken into account when we estimate the former posture of nations and governments before God, much more must respect be had to a clear and perfect gospel when we estimate the present posture of nations and governments before God. And these positions are established by the moral law itself. The moral law for *holy man* included not only the law written on his heart at creation, but also all positive precepts given to him by God. The obligation to obey the latter equally with the former rests upon a moral principle. Positive laws do not create, but suppose a previous obligation to obedience. The right to punish a breach of these laws does not arise from the prohibition, but from the authority of the prohibiter. The moral law for *fallen man* still requires of him what he has lost by sin—knowledge, righteousness, and holiness—but cannot impart them; requires also the endurance of the penalty for transgression. The moral law for *redeemed man*

includes not only the law written originally on the heart at the creation, but also that further revelation of the divine will rendered necessary by the fall, and graciously given in the Scriptures. The latter is necessary to the former—means to the end. Without the Scriptures, there is, and can be, no obedience to the law written upon the heart. Revelation enables nature to accomplish its end. The moral law includes, of necessity, *all the means* that are essential to its end; and therefore includes *faith in Christ* and *obedience to Christ*. It has been said that faith in Christ, not being competent to Adam when created and so being no part of the religion of nature, is therefore not binding on any of Adam's posterity. As well argue that Adam in Eden, being unable to perform the duty of a father, and take care of children, because he had none, therefore the duty of taking care of children is not binding on any of his posterity! Adam could not relieve the miserable, for none existed; therefore his posterity are not bound to do this! But it is not true that Adam had not the *power* to nurture children, or to succor the miserable; neither is it true that he had not the *power* to believe in Christ; had it been revealed to him. He had power to believe every communication from God; and so the gospel, if revealed. He had the power to love and obey God in all things; but love and obedience presuppose faith. Therefore he had the power of believing all things. Angels knew a Redeemer before he came, by revelation, and rejoiced in it. And so Adam could have known by revelation from God his fall and recovery, and believed in his Redeemer. The principle of holiness in Adam and the believer is essentially the same, though circumstantially different. 1. Both are formed after the same likeness, *the image of God*: "God created man in his own image." "Put ye on the *new man*, which, *after God*, is created in *righteousness and true holiness*. There cannot be two specifically different images of the same original. 2. Both are a conformity to the same standard, the moral law. 3. The terms used to describe the one imply that it is of the same nature as the other. Conversion is a *return* to God. Regeneration is styled a washing, implying the restoration of the soul to lost purity. 4. Supreme love to

God is acknowledged to be the principle of man in innocence. This principle, if possessed, would lead a fallen creature to embrace the gospel. Guilty man cannot love and serve God. Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to the believer. The obligation that is on man, as man, to love God and obey his law, is therefore now the obligation to believe in Christ, in whose person the believer rendered a perfect obedience to the law as a covenant of works, and from union to whom the believer is enabled by the Holy Spirit dwelling within him to obey the law as a rule of life. Thus the obligation that perpetually binds man to obey God, binds the sinner to believe in Christ, in order to obey God. And so the Saviour said to the Jews: "I know you that ye have not the *love of God* in you. I am come in my Father's name, and ye *receive me not*;" showing that "receiving Christ" is "the love of God," otherwise the neglect of the one would be no proof of the lack of the other. It was Christ who republished the moral law on Sinai, and who uttered as the very first command those solemn words: "Thou shalt have no other gods *before me*."

Christianity is necessary to the existence and well-being of society and the state; for law supplies no power to fallen man to obey its commands. It points out duty, but furnishes no ability to perform it. Some conservative influences outside of law are necessary for this, and those influences proceed from the Spirit of Christ. The gospel, in the hands of the Spirit, is the only conservator of law, of society, and the state.

Jehovah, through his prophet Habakkuk, denounces the pride and ambition of the heathen monarchs, Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and others, and proclaims the judgments that awaited them. He shows what is destructive of national greatness, and what is requisite for national security: "Behold, his soul which is lifted up, is not upright in him; *but the just shall live by his faith*." "Justification" and "faith" are connected with *national*, as well as with *individual life*. Unrighteousness on the part of a prince or people will destroy them. Righteousness only exalteth a nation. But whence is that righteousness? It comes not from within, but from above—not from man, but from God. It is

that righteousness, as the prophet shows, which is the matter of *justification*, and which is received through *faith*, even Christ's righteousness; accompanied by the conservative influences of the Spirit, who only can generate those virtues that are essential to the permanence of society and government. "*The just shall live by his faith*," or as the pointing is, "The justified by faith shall live." Christianity is the only religion that can save a nation. Lord Bacon observes, "There never was found in any age of the world, either philosophy, or sect, or religion, or law, or discipline, which did so highly exalt the public good, as the Christian faith. Whence it is very evident, that one and the same God gave to his creatures the laws of nature, and to men the law of Christianity." (De Aug. Sci.) Great stress is laid upon the "light of nature" and "natural religion" by certain divines in our day, as well as by sceptics. But no one, either of the former or latter class, has instructed us what they mean precisely by these terms so convenient for them to use, though not to define, and what is embraced in them. How comes it to pass, that a theory of pure deism was never presented, and a platform of natural religion never constructed, without the aid of the Scriptures? And this has been done generally, not by infidels, but by believers in Christianity. They supposed that they were following the mere light of nature, when in truth they were walking in the broad daylight of Revelation. Lord Herbert, the most consistent of Deists, presented in his treatises, "*De Religione Gentilium*" and "*De Religione Laici*," his system of natural religion. But it was borrowed from the Scriptures, to which he refers as a source of information. (Tucker shrewdly observes: "I think I have found on conversing with unbelievers that they have more of the Christian in them than they know of themselves.") His system cost him much labor, he tells us, and yet he considered it suited for universal acceptance! If this be the system of universal religion, why does it not spontaneously present itself to the universal intelligence of the race? Whence the necessity of labor to prove it? That of itself refutes its pretensions! And if it cost him, a scholar, so much study to discover it, what must become of the masses who have

neither inclination, nor time, for such investigations? The fact is, that all such writers have, as was well said, "with true philosophical gratitude, bedecked their reason with garlands stolen from the tree of life and given themselves credit for the gift of God." On the part of Christian defenders of natural religion, most of their mistakes are due to the common but erroneous distinction between "natural" and "revealed" religion. The true distinction is between "natural" and "supernatural" religion: and both of these are *revealed*. By natural religion is meant the religion of man *before* the fall. By supernatural religion is meant the religion of man *after* the fall. Those doctrines which were known to Adam before he sinned, constitute the system of natural religion. Those doctrines which were known to man after he sinned, constitute the system of supernatural religion. The former were revealed to him equally with the latter. The light of nature or reason was not a sufficient guide to Adam, even in a state of innocence. It was not a perfect rule even then. For though man was free from the imperfection which results from *sin*, yet not from the imperfection which attaches to *creatureship*. Had Adam's reason been an all-sufficient guide, he would not have needed any directions as to what he was to do, but would without assistance have discharged his entire duty. But this was far from being the case. He did need special instruction; and he received it. Several truths were revealed to him. How, but by revelation, did he know of such a creation of his wife as to pronounce her flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone? that dominion was given him over all creatures? that he was to till the soil, and that herbs and fruit should be his food? that he was forbidden to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, on pain of death? that he should perform instituted worship, and observe the seventh day as a day of sacred rest? How, but by revelation, did he know God as subsisting in three persons? how did he know the Trinity? whom he *must* have known—otherwise he was an idolater and his worship could not be accepted. How did he know the immortality of the soul, and a future state of rewards and punishments, but by that covenant which was made with him, containing revealed truth

embraced in the promise of life on the one hand, and the threatening of death on the other? Here then were special revelations from God to Adam, which would not have been given if not necessary, and which could not be necessary if reason were a complete guide. And if revelation before the fall necessarily entered into natural religion, there can be of course no distinction between them. If reason at its best estate required the aid of revelation, can it dispense with it now at its worst? What has it done for its votaries who worship it as their god? Has it led them to the knowledge of any great fundamental truth in religion? Has it even convinced them of the existence of a Deity? No, indeed. The idea of a God is not "innate" in the mind. There never was a man known or heard of who had the idea of a God without being taught it. Children always need to be taught it. There are instances of persons born deaf and dumb who never had it. Travellers tell us of nations who do not have it. Even in this land, in the nineteenth century, there are not a few *now* who have no idea of a God! It is one thing to demonstrate the reasonableness of an idea after it is once made known, and quite another thing to originate it ourselves. No one would have considered the creation as an *effect*, had he never heard of a *cause*. Even a Plato acknowledged that the idea of a God can never be discovered by reason, and candidly admits that it was learned by tradition from the barbarians, meaning the Jews. Whole sects of philosophers denied the very being of a God. And some died martyrs to Atheism, as Vaninus, Jordanus, Bruno, and others. And those who admitted his existence believed him to be altogether such as themselves, subject to the same passions. The idea was even *lost* after it had been revealed; willingly, culpably lost. The apostle declares that the heathen world "*did not like to retain the knowledge of God.*" They "*suppressed the truth in unrighteousness.*" They were without excuse. Ever since the creation of the world, the being and power of God had been revealed to men. (Rom. i. 20, "from the creation of the world;" ἀπὸ not ἐκ, referring to *time*, as in eighty-four other places in Scripture, and so considered here by Beza, Erasmus, Piscator, Vatablus, Valla, Winer, Robinson,

Hammond, Whitby, Olshausen, Alford, Hodge, David Brown, and others. The apostle refers to the work of creation, not as an explanation of the origin of the idea of God, but as corroborating and illustrating the original revelation of God to man.) The heavens declared the glory of God; but they were blind, willingly blind, and did not see it. The light shineth in darkness, but the darkness comprehendeth it not. Tholuck well observes: "An impartial examination of heathenism will afford the important result, that heathenism is a *corrupted truth*, a divine utterance, heard falsely, which in its own nature comes from God." The tendency of fallen nature being downward—from God, not to God—abusing and willingly losing the revelation made to it, proves the unreasonableness of attributing it to the power of *discover* unwelcome and hated truth. Do men have, originally, a conception of that God whom they "do not like to *retain* in their knowledge," after he is made known to them? Did that nature, which from its first existence "loves darkness rather than light," yet, of itself, apprehend somehow the hated light? Nothing but the restraining hand of a gracious Providence laid upon the mind of man kept a fallen world from universal atheism, devilism, and perdition. Separated from God, all nature's instincts lead to corruption and death. What are termed the "instincts of nature" are just the promptings or the aversions which God, by the insensible methods of his providence or *common grace*, has implanted in the hearts of men. Culvernel, one of the most eminent defenders of the "light of nature," which he styles "the candle of the Lord," is yet compelled to make concessions fatal to his theory. "It is true, they do not follow the candle of the Lord, for then reason would have guided them better. But this very consideration shows the weakness of their candle-light, for if it had been brighter *it would not have been so soon put out.*" "Sin entered in first at a corporeal, then at an intellectual window, and stole away the heart, *and the windows have been broken ever since.*" "Those laws which nature had engraven 'upon the tables of their hearts,' *sin, like a moth, had eaten and defaced,* as in all other men it had done; but in them, those fugitive letters were called home again, and those



many 'blanks' were supplied and made good again, by comparing it with the other copy (of God's own writing too) which Moses received in the mount." Then, in support of his theory, he goes off in this strain: "Some will grant that the Gentiles had their candle and their torch, but it was lighted at the Jews' sun. They may have some bottles of water to quench their thirst, but they must be filled at their streams. Say some, Pythagoras lighted his candle there, and Plato lighted his candle at theirs. But what, did they borrow common notions of them? Did they borrow any copies of nature's law from them? Was this 'written law' only some Jewish manuscript which they translated into Greek?" But, if "sin, like a moth, had eaten and defaced" these common notions, whence come they now, if not from the light of an original revelation? "*I never* heard," says he, "of a nation apostatising from common notions." "You will scarce find any nation that did generally and expressly, and for long continuance, either violate or countenance the violation of any precept clearly natural." These assertions are directly in the face of Paul's declarations touching the Gentile world in his Epistle to the Romans. "All the more civilised and renowned nations gave due obedience to nature's law." This argument is on the other side. And why was this the case with them, so far as it was true of them? Because under the universal kingdom of the Mediator, the ordinary influences of the Spirit, in nature and providence, preserve in the minds of all nations some traces of the moral law originally engraved upon the heart, but obliterated by the fall, and now restored by him, for maintaining the sense of their responsibility, and for securing the coherence of society, all with reference to the divine plans for the coming of the kingdom of God. The remark of Colliber is true and just: "It is no difficult matter to make appear from the testimony of former ages, that there has actually been an ancient, immemorial tradition of the formation of the world by a beneficent, wise, and most powerful Being: which tradition alone was sufficient to diffuse the principles of religion as universally as the pretended innate idea is conceived to have done."

Revelation having entered into natural religion, and being

necessary to it, as we saw, even in a state of innocence, it follows that to oppose natural religion to revelation, is to overthrow it. And so it has always happened, that a disbelief of Christianity in particular, was followed by a disbelief of religion in general. Not to come to Christ, is to depart from the living God. Hence the votaries of natural religion are found characterised by a determined hostility or a settled contempt for all that is sacred—not merely for the gospel of Christ, but for all that relates to the belief and the service of the living God. To avoid the odium attached to the name “Atheist” which was previously given, and justly, to all unbelievers in Christianity, the name *Deist* was assumed, by this class, in the middle of the sixteenth century. Viret, in his Epistle Dedicatory of his “Christian Instruction,” states that these men, though they put on this mask, and accommodated themselves to the religion of those with whom they were obliged to live, though they professed to admit the existence of a God and the immortality of the soul, were nevertheless in the habit of *ridiculing all religion* as the dream of folly, or of reprobating it as the offspring of fraud or priestcraft. So that the system of the hypocritical Deist was invented by him simply as a pretext for being altogether irreligious and for living without God, as he was living without Christ in the world. So too, in after times, we find a Bolingbroke denying goodness and justice to God; a Hume denying God to be wise and good; a Hobbes affirming virtue as vice, creator and creature to be terms invented by men, not realities; Voltaire, D’Alembert, Mirabeau, Diderot, all declaring, “No God, no responsibility, no rewards and punishments, no world to come!” It follows, then, that to build the state, not upon Christianity, but upon “natural law” or “natural religion,” is to build it upon *Atheism*, the destruction of all law, all religion, all morality, all virtue, all happiness! It is said: “Without the Bible, enough can be known of God’s eternal power and godhead to ground the responsibility of natural religion and ethics.” Even were it true, which it is not, that without revelation “enough can be known,” the question is, IS “enough known” by fallen man? Does not the apostle shew that the heathen first abused,

then lost the knowledge of God as creator, and worshipped and served the *creature* rather than the Creator? And if idolatry were permitted by God to have *any where* its *full* influence, without the restraint of his Spirit acting in providence, without a particle of that indirect influence which belongs to the system of Christianity, where, we ask, could be found the foundations for society, for law, and for government? Is such a case possible, even? Produce it, if you can, and do not point us to nations which owe their continuance, so long as they do continue, to those conservative influences connected with that remnant of revelation they have handed down from generation to generation. But, it is said, "Pagan Rome had a legitimate government, for Christians were enjoined to render her conscientious allegiance." "Legitimate," *providentially*; for the mediatorial King, whom she knew not, used her for the accomplishment of his purposes, and the interests of his kingdom—sometimes making her "the rod of his anger," wherewith to correct his erring Church, to submit to which was to submit to him—and kept her in being until she had accomplished all her mission, and so enjoined upon his people subjection, for he was her head, and she was made by him to afford protection to them, and they were made to pray for her, especially as hindering the development of the man of sin, that most fearful enemy of the Church, which could not accomplish its purpose until the Roman government were "taken out of the way." But not "legitimate," scripturally, (*i. e.*, not conformed to the scriptural model,) else why her decline and fall? If possessed of "the righteousness which exalteth a nation," would she not have continued?

If by the "law of nature" be meant the sum of those moral rules discoverable by reason, then, as one man's reason reaches further than another's, what is obligation to one is not obligation to another. The law is by no means fixed and uniform—therefore, imperfect; nay, the wisest philosophers have frequently contradicted each other, and have sometimes been wrong on both sides,—another proof that the law of nature is imperfect. Again, to give this law effect, obedience must be secured by proper rewards and punishments, which, if not dis-

tributed sufficiently in this life, must be expected in another. But how many philosophers even were persuaded of a future state? And what of the multitude? So that the uncertainty of the sanction proves again the law of nature to be imperfect.

What state ever owed its existence and preservation solely to the truths supposed to be contained in natural religion, and not to the influences of those truths which are derived from revelation? The state owes its life to the gospel. The very earth owes its continuance to the gospel. The new grant of the earth to Noah was founded on the covenant of grace. Every nation—the whole world—has had the gospel. The institutions still in force among heathen nations prove it. So that they are not under “natural law” solely, and never were. And it deserves to be considered, how much the doctrines of revelation, though distorted among them, have to do, in maintaining their social organisation and government. Belief in a God and in a future state of rewards and punishments, is not enough. For the heathen universally acknowledge *guilt*, and have recourse to *sacrifices* to propitiate their offended deities. Hence the doctrine of the atonement is their only hope of safety. Were it not for this, their future prospect would be one of punishment solely. But *fear alone* will not lead men to the practice of those virtues that are essential to social order, nor restrain them from indulgence in those vices that are destructive of it. Fear alone leads to despair, and despair generates lawlessness and crime. And this is *death* to society. Thus, the doctrine of the atonement underlies heathen society and government. And whence is that doctrine derived? Nature knows nothing of it. It is found in that system of revealed truth which has been in the possession of the race since the fall of man,—in that gospel which descended from Adam to Noah, and from Noah, the second father of the human family, to the various nations of the earth.

Thus are both the indebtedness and the responsibility of the whole world to the gospel evinced. And if that gospel does not wield its legitimate influence over the consciences and the hearts of men, not only as church members, but also as citizens, then.

are they threatened with the most terrible calamity that can possibly befall them—the withdrawal of God's Spirit, and consequent blindness of mind and hardness of heart. Better, far better, that the genial influences of the atmosphere should be suspended; better, far better, that the heavens above us should be brass, and the earth beneath us be iron, than that the soul-quickenings, life-giving influences of the Spirit of God should be taken away! And what can be expected of a country whose government does not acknowledge the headship of Christ, but that it be cursed with desecrated Sabbaths, abandoned sanctuaries, abounding ungodliness, and desolating judgments? The stream cannot rise higher than its source. "If the state is to be rescued from the darkest dangers that threaten it, we must preach Christ. Christ, not merely as the supreme revelation of God; Christ, not merely as the sacrifice for human sin; Christ, not merely as the Head of the Church; but Christ, as the Ruler of all men, the Regenerator of nations, the Saviour of society."

And what can be expected of a government whose constitution, like that of the American government, contains not even *the name* of God? In the year 1793, that eminent man, faithful witness to the truth, and pure patriot, Dr. John M. Mason, addressed the following words of warning to his countrymen: "That very constitution which the singular goodness of God enabled us to establish, does not so much as recognise *his being!* Yes, my brethren, it is a lamentable truth—a truth, at the mention of which shame should crimson our faces—that, like Jeshurun of old, we have 'waxed fat and kicked.' 'Of the Rock that begat us, we have been unmindful; we have forgotten his works, and the wonders that he hath showed us.' From the Constitution of the United States, it is impossible to ascertain *what* God we worship, or whether we own a God *at all*. This neglect has excited in many of its best friends more alarm than all other difficulties. It is a very insufficient apology to plead, that the devotion which political institutions offer to the Supreme Being is, in most cases, a matter of mere form. For the hypocrisy of one man, or set of men, is surely no excuse for the infi-

delity of another. Should the citizens of America be as irreligious as her constitution, we will have reason to tremble, lest the Governor of the universe, who will not be treated with indignity by a people, any more than by individuals, overturn, from its foundation, the fabric we have been rearing, and crush us to atoms in the wreck." So spake, in years long gone by, that faithful, fearless man of God. The omission deplored was a fearful one; and it should not be matter of surprise, if a holy God, who proclaims his jealousy of his own glory, should let fall a blow that would shatter a disloyal and rebellious government. Neutrality in religion is as impossible for a state as for a man. The individuals which comprise it are the subjects of opposing kingdoms—Christ's and Satan's. Each class contends for the authority of its own master. The only question is, which master will the state obey? Which influence shall predominate in her constitution and laws? It is no reply to this to say, that legislators may be moral men, though not Christians. For it is Christianity which has supplied those influences which hold in check the tendencies of their unrenewed natures, and even adorn their characters with artificial virtues, and illumine them with a kind of *dry light*. Death is one thing, and decay is another. A dead body, nor a dead soul, betrays its true condition when it is *embalmed*. Again, the state must either be Christian or anti-Christian and anti-church. The recognition of Christ's headship by the state is essential to its recognition of Christ's headship of the Church. Without the former, there can be no true sense of national responsibility; hence no restraint; but disregard of the rights of the latter, lawlessness, and persecution, will mark the character of the state. If it does not recognise Christ's headship, it will very practically recognise the devil's. And then the enmity of the serpent will discover itself, more or less, through the state, against the Church—the sphere of the latter invaded by the former, its rights infringed, its independence destroyed, its constitution perverted to hostile ends, its very being assailed. It is only by Church and state recognising each its allegiance to one common head, Christ, that each can be confined within its own appro-

priate sphere, and kept from encroaching upon that of the other.

The doctrine we advocate does by no means confound or unite two distinct institutions—the Church and the state. There is no inconsistency in affirming that two institutions are under one divine head, when each is kept to its own sphere, without interference or collision between them. The planets which belong to our solar system revolve all around one common centre, the sun, and yet their orbits are distinct. In like manner, the family, the Church, and the state, are all subject to Christ, the head of all power; and yet these institutions are kept each within its own peculiar orbit; to transcend which, and encroach upon that of another, would be to rebel against the authority of their common head. Christ wears “many crowns” upon his august brow.

The renowned Gillespie, in his controversy with Hussey, who held, that as magistrates were under Christ, they might exercise rule over the Church, went to an erroneous extreme, and *denied* that magistrates were under Christ as Mediator. But Hussey's own premises were sufficient to furnish a just conclusion—the very opposite to that he reached. For if magistrates are under Christ, then they are bound to respect the law of Christ; and that law insures the spiritual independence of his Church.

It is objected, that, as civil government is derived from nature, not from grace, therefore it cannot be subject to Christ as Mediator. With equal reason might it be urged that, as the marriage relation, the parental relation, and the relation between master and servant, are not founded in grace, therefore the parties to these relations cannot be subject to Christ as Mediator. But all original relations we have seen were dissolved by the fall, and afterwards restored by Christ the Mediator; and so all lawful relations are his redeemed property, and are bound to recognise their Lord and Redeemer. Hence Christians are bound to marry *only in the Lord*; fathers to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; servants to be faithful to their masters, *as unto Christ*; masters to remember their responsibility *to their Master in heaven*. The theory of fallen man's right to society and government, on the ground

that these are founded in nature, not in grace, is, like the theory of his natural right to liberty, the offspring of infidelity. Well did Wickliffe say: "Dominion belongs to grace." Nature itself was saved by grace.

It is objected that the state cannot know the Trinity or Christ, because the state is founded in nature, which knows nothing of the Trinity or of Christ. But if the true knowledge of the true God be essential to duty and to happiness, both for the individual and the state, then it is evident that the doctrine of the Trinity is a doctrine of natural religion, and, as such, must be recognised by the state. And, though the doctrine of a Mediator belongs to supernatural religion, yet if it be a fact that he does sustain relation to the state, then that relation must be acknowledged by her. As Bishop Butler observes: "How the relation is made known, whether by reason or revelation, makes no alteration in the case; because the duty arises out of the relation itself, not out of the manner in which we are informed of it." This just position it has been attempted to set aside by the following sophistical reasoning: "The state, being determined in its constitution exclusively by the light of natural religion, cannot, as a state, know whether Jesus is king. The relation of Jesus to the state is not 'a true relation'—not even to us possessed of revelation. Why? Because that revelation nowhere requires states, as such, to ground their rightful powers on the mediatorial authority of Jesus." This objector does not see that this reasoning, 1. Represents the Jewish theocracy as contradicting the principles of natural religion. If the state, as the state, cannot know whether Jesus is king, then the Hebrew state, as a state, could not know Jesus as its king. 2. Holds good against *the family* as well as against the state. 3. Holds good against *man as man*. For man cannot recognise the Bible, as man, but only as a sinner, upon his principle. The light of nature must be his exclusive teacher as man. All the utterances of the Bible, apart from the plan of salvation, he is at liberty, nay, *bound* to ignore and reject. On this ground many are advocates of the all-sufficiency of the light of nature, contending that this falsifies the claims of all pretended revela-



tions. Thus the light of nature is made to deny revelation altogether. 4. Begs the question; assumes that revelation does not teach the supremacy of Jesus. 5. Is inconsistent with itself. For, if the relation of Jesus to the state "is not a true relation," then the state cannot listen to a revelation that declared it to be "a true relation," and that taught the supremacy of Jesus. If the state, as such, *cannot* know Jesus, then for a revelation to assert that it *can*, is just to prove itself to be an imposture. This shallow reasoner elsewhere overthrows his own position, and falls into grievous errors besides. "If it be said that, as Christ is head over all things to the Church, his supreme headship should be acknowledged by 'all powers that be,' we answer, that, by all means, it ought to be done where it can be truly and honestly done; and we doubt not that the day is coming when 'all the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ,' and 'all kings shall fall down before him, and all nations shall serve him.' But how is it now? No man calleth Jesus Lord, but by the Holy Ghost, says Paul." Now, 1. This writer admits the first three texts quoted to be proof-texts of our doctrine. 2. Shows that the state, during the millennium, will know Jesus, and so, according to him, must contradict the principles of natural religion, and recognise that to be a true relation which "is not a true relation." 3. He makes the obligation to duty turn upon the *sincerity* of the ruler. Rulers are bound to represent the *obligations* of their people, not their erroneous beliefs. Error has no rights. "The rights" of a disloyal, anti-Bible, anti-Christian conscience, are the rights of a rebel and a robber. 4. He is inconsistent with himself. It ought not to be done in any *case*, if, as he teaches, the state represents only man's natural relations to a Creator. If his principles be true, the state is bound to testify *exclusively* to what originates in nature, and is bound to ignore every thing that springs from grace. The same principle would condemn the subjection of the angelic world to Christ, and pronounce irrational and unjust the decree of the Father, "Let all the angels of God worship him"! 5. According to him, obligation does not exist where the Holy Ghost is

not given! No man *can* say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost; therefore no man *should* say it who has not the Holy Ghost! Does a sinful inability exempt from an essential obligation? Must men be released from duty, in order not to be guilty of hypocrisy? And is hypocrisy unavoidable, when the gracious offer of the Spirit is made us, the acceptance of which will prevent it? Another objection is, that, if Church and state both profess the true religion, the two are confounded. As well say that, if both acknowledge the same God, they are confounded equally as if they acknowledged the same Christ. Does the common recognition of the same head, Christ, destroy all distinction between them, as to nature, duties, powers, sanctions, and ends? The state professes the true religion, not as the Church, but as the state; and this she owes (1) to her sovereign, Christ; (2) to herself, her well-being demanding it; (3) to her subjects, their duty, and happiness as subjects requiring it. If the magistrate, as such, is not to recognise Christ's supremacy, then neither *Christ's day*, the Christian Sabbath. If the state, founded on nature, not on grace, is therefore not to acknowledge Christ and redemption, then also is it bound *not* to acknowledge the redemption Sabbath, the Lord's day, but only NATURE'S Sabbath, the last day of the week. So that the Church is bound to keep *one* Sabbath, and the state *another*! It is objected again, that our argument requires that all associations of men, such as banking companies, railroad companies, sewing-machine companies, etc., are bound to acknowledge Christ in their meetings. And are we not bidden to acknowledge *him* in *all* our ways? Is not the providence of God in his hands? and is not every dollar that goes into our pockets, put there by him? And if we desire not merely wealth, which may prove a curse, but the blessing that maketh rich, are we not to render unto him the honor that is his due? Is there any thing incongruous, unbecoming, ridiculous, for an association, any more than for individuals, to be "not slothful in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord?" Are we not to do whatever we do to the glory of God? Is it so, that THE NAME which is above every name, which confers dignity and honor and blessing upon all that is associated with it, would

be out of place, would be regarded as an intrusion or an interference with business, if introduced into *any* company of men? If so, then, "O my soul, come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honor, be not thou united." But it deserves to be noticed, that the objector admits the responsibility of the state, of society, and of all associations of men to God, if not to Christ. And of necessity; for otherwise we would have an irresponsible body having responsible members. Prayer being the universal acknowledgment of dependence, the objector must admit that every association should acknowledge by prayer its dependence upon God. And as the body as such cannot know Christ, and the individuals belonging to it cannot know God, except in Christ, then it follows that the body prays to *one* God, and the individuals pray to *another*!

Another objection is that this doctrine leads to persecution. On the contrary, it interferes not at all with a man's individual relations to God. Macaulay regards civil disabilities as persecution. This is a mistake. It is simply *self-defence*. It is the government protecting itself from influences which threaten its existence—withholding arms from those who are enemies to its Divine Head, and who would endanger its life. Loyalty to Christ is the sole guarantee of its continued being and well-being, and not the favor and support of those who deny their Lord and Master. "It is better to trust in the Lord, than to put confidence in princes." The favor of Christ must not be exchanged for the favor of ungodly men. Christ must be allowed his proper place in all the governments of men. The *disabilities of the Great King* are not to be preferred to the "disabilities" of his rebellious subjects. Protection is one thing, and persecution another. The Papist—that deadly serpent, cherished now to such an extent in the bosom of American States—the Infidel, the Unitarian, the Jew, and the Moralist, are not to be disturbed in their persons and property, but they are not to *give character* to government. They are the parasites of Christianity: they may feed at her table, but they are not to rule in her house. Infidelity left to itself would subvert all government. A nation of infidels could not exist. Well did Burke

remark, "Infidels are outlaws of the constitution, not of this country, but of the human race." And the Jews are not allowed by God to be a nation. The very reason why they ceased to be a nation, was their unbelief in and rejection of *Christ*, their divine head. They were unfaithful to their theocracy, or more definitely, their *Christocracy*, and hence their national bands were dissolved by Christ, and they are scattered through the world. And those who would give them a place in government would undo what God himself has done, and restore those to government whom God has deprived of government for this very reason: rebellion against CHRIST, the head of government! It is the duty of every people to acknowledge the headship of the Lord Jesus Christ. The time will certainly come, when "the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ." They will still continue the kingdoms of this world, and at the same time be the "kingdoms of our Lord Jesus Christ." Their moral character will be changed. Their government will be theocratic. "And the Lord shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one." The Hebrew theocracy shadowed forth the ultimate character of all the kingdoms of earth. The true relation of the state to Christ was set forth therein. There was no confounding of Church and state then, as so many suppose. The Church was not the nation, nor the nation the Church. Each had its distinct rulers, courts, laws, subjects, penalties, and duration. Moses and his successors were the rulers in the state. Aaron and his successors were the rulers in the Church. The Church had her courts of the synagogue and ecclesiastical sanhedrim; the state those of the gate and the civil sanhedrim. The ceremonial laws were those of the Church; the judicial those of the state. Civil and ecclesiastical privileges were not necessarily extended to the same persons. Proselytes might be members of the Church, without participating in the privileges of the state; whilst, on the other hand, scandalous offenders against the ceremonial and the moral law, permitted to enjoy civil rights, were nevertheless debarred the fellowship of the Church. The distinction was marked, too, in respect of penalties. Those

of the Church were purely ecclesiastical, as casting out of the synagogue; those of the state extended to fine and to death. The distinction, too, in respect to duration was equally marked. The Jewish state ended when it became a Roman province; the Jewish Church subsisted and retained its ecclesiastical character down to the destruction of the temple and the dispersion of the people among all nations. The normal character of a republic was exhibited in it. Just as the principles of the Jewish religion were those of the Christian religion, only not so clearly revealed; just as the ecclesiastical principles of the theocracy were, when subsequently divested of their Jewish covering, the same as those on which the New Testament Church was founded; just so were the *governmental* principles those which are destined one day to characterise every government on earth. The theocracy was a mirror which reflected the universal Church and the universal state. The elements of the gospel were in it; the elements of the Christian Church were in it; the elements of a pure, permanent, universal republic were in it. Every government will one day be a Christocracy, and this was represented in the Hebrew theocracy.

“My kingdom is not of this world,” was as true under the theocracy, when Christ was the recognised head of both the Church and the state, as it is true now. Different forms of government did not affect the theocracy then, neither will they necessarily do it in time to come, should different forms exist. Christ may occupy the same throne in the state without the least interference one with the other, or collision between the two. A theocracy does not *necessarily* involve miracles. The Church is *a* theocracy from its very nature, and none the less because Christ’s rule over her now is not signalised by miracles. Under the Old Testament, miracles were frequent; so were they at the beginning of the New; because the spiritual sense of the Church was weaker then than now. Miracles were necessary as aids to her weak vision. They were the Church’s *spectacles* or *magnifying glasses* through which she saw clearly the hand of God in her history, his power and majesty. But *now*, her eyesight being strengthened, she needs spectacles no more—she does

not, in this matter, see through a glass darkly. The increase of spiritual sense puts the Church now in the same relation to the providence of God, in which miracles placed the Church formerly, *i. e.*, enabled her to see Christ in providence.

Such then is the glorious destiny which awaits our now convulsed and distracted earth: "the Lord shall be king over all the earth." It was for the establishment of this universal theocracy our Lord taught us to pray in the words: "THY KINGDOM COME!"

Now what are we doing to bring about this blessed consummation? Christianity should be distinctly recognised in the constitution as the religion of the people, and all their legislation be pervaded by its spirit. For the adoption of Christian sentiments, principles, and practices, by the great bulk of a people even, is not sufficient to constitute the nation, the kingdom, a kingdom of Christ. Something more is necessary. A nation, as a nation, expresses its religious character, and makes its profession of Christianity *through its constitution and its laws*. When through these it distinctly recognises Christ's authority, and observes those statutes of his which relate to it, and subordinates its interests to the advancement of his glory, then and not till then is it entitled to the distinction of a *Christian nation*. And the time will come (for God has promised) when not one only, but all kingdoms will become the "kingdoms of our Lord." Let Christians realise the responsibility which is on them to do all they can to effect most desirable consummation. Not the present, but the future, condition of the nations of the earth is their normal condition. Not until the kingdoms of this world shall have become the kingdoms of the Lord, will those kingdoms have fulfilled the end of their existence, and given to Christ the glory which is his due. And not till then are Christians at liberty to be contented with the religious status of their nation, but are bound in the mean time to use all their influence in every legitimate way, as citizens, to cast the governments under which they live more and more into the mould of Christianity—to secure through the constitution and laws of their country the clear recognition of Christ's headship and authority,

the faithful observance of his precepts which pertain to them, and the freedom from national sins, which sooner or later bring ruin upon any people. "Them that honor me, I will honor," says Christ, "and they that despise me, shall be lightly esteemed."

To say that such an end *cannot* be accomplished now; that society is not prepared for this; that public sentiment is not yet sufficiently christianized;—to dismiss such matters as "theoretical," "not practical," "not important;"—is only to say that the present condition of things cannot continue, and that Christ must carry on his work of overturning, overturning, overturning, until all things be brought into subjection to him, and he reign King of nations, as well as King of saints. But before it is decided that such an end cannot be accomplished now, Christians should solemnly, as in the presence of God, interrogate themselves, whether they have used *all* the influence which their divine Master has given them in society in endeavoring to bring about this glorious result? For what purpose did Christ give them influence? For their own glory, or for his? And are they defrauding the Master of his due? One of the most august spectacles ever beheld on this earth, equal in moral grandeur to that solemn scene when the nation of Israel, assembled before Sinai, entered into covenant with God, was presented more than two hundred years ago, when the kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland, by both Houses of Parliament, by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and by the Assembly of Divines in England, and then by the people generally, entered into a "solemn league and covenant" with God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, "for the reformation and defence of religion." The immortal document thus began:

"We, noblemen, barons, knights, gentlemen, citizens, burgesses, ministers of the gospel, and commons of all sorts, in the kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland, by the providence of God, living under one king, and being of one reformed religion, having before our eyes the glory of God, and the advancement of the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, for the preservation of ourselves and our religion from

utter ruin and destruction, according to the commendable practice of these kingdoms in former times, and the example of God's people in other nations; after mature deliberation resolved and determined to enter into a mutual and solemn league and covenant, wherein we all subscribe, and each one of us for himself, with our hands lifted up to the Most High, do swear"—(here follow the objects of the covenant: the preservation of the reformed religion; the preservation of the king's rights; the rights and privileges of the parliament; and the liberties of the kingdoms). And in these ever-memorable words of solemn, manly dignity, does this matchless state-paper conclude: "And because these kingdoms are guilty of many sins and provocations against God and his Son Jesus Christ, as is too manifest by our present distresses and dangers, the fruits thereof, we profess and declare, before God and the world, our unfeigned desire to be humbled for our own sins and for the sins of these kingdoms: especially, that we have not as we ought valued the inestimable benefit of the gospel; that we have not labored for the purity and power thereof; and that we have not endeavored to receive Christ in our hearts, nor to walk worthy of him in our lives; which are the causes of other sins and transgressions so much abounding amongst us; and our true and unfeigned purpose, desire, and endeavor for ourselves and all others under our power and charge, both in public and in private, in all duties we owe to God and man, to amend our lives, and each one to go before another in the example of a real reformation; that the Lord may turn away his wrath and heavy indignation, and establish these churches and kingdoms in truth and peace. And this covenant we make in the presence of Almighty God, the Searcher of all hearts, with a true intention to perform the same, as we shall answer at that great day when the secrets of all hearts shall be disclosed; most humbly beseeching the Lord to strengthen us by his Holy Spirit for this end, and to bless our desires and proceedings with such success as may be deliverance and safety to his people, and encouragement to other Christian churches groaning under, or in danger of, the yoke of anti-christian tyranny, to join in the same or like association and covenant, to



the glory of God, the enlargement of the kingdom of Jesus Christ, and the peace and tranquility of Christian kingdoms and commonwealths."

Oh that the Lord Jesus would bless this land, and dispose it by his grace to join itself to him in a perpetual covenant that shall never be forgotten!

"Come forth out of thy royal chambers, O Prince of all the kings of the earth! Put on the invisible robes of thy imperial majesty. Take up that unlimited sceptre which thy Almighty Father hath bequeathed thee; for now the voice of thy bride calls thee, and all creatures sigh to be renewed!"

"Come then, and added to thy many crowns,  
Receive yet one, the crown of all the earth,  
Thou who alone art worthy! It was thine  
By ancient covenant, ere nature's birth;  
And thou hast made it thine by purchase since,  
And overpaid its value with thy blood.  
Our song employs all nations; and all cry,  
'Worthy the Lamb, for he was slain for us!'  
The dwellers in the vales and on the rocks  
Shout to each other, and the mountain-top  
From distant mountains catch the flying joy,  
Till, nation after nation taught the strain,  
Earth rolls the rapturous hosanna round!"