

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1860.

James Eckard of Phila
see index p. 158
No. IV.

ART. I.—*The Logical Relations of Religion and Natural Science.*

PHYSICAL science, at the present day, investigates phenomena simply as they are in themselves. This, if not positively atheistic, must be of dangerous tendency. Whatever deliberately omits God from the universe, is closely allied to that which denies him.

We cannot thoroughly investigate nature without asking for the origin and source of all things. Science undertakes to solve questions which compel either the acknowledgment of God, or the assertion of open atheism, or else a resort to that concealed atheism which quietly sets God aside without directly denying his existence. When, for example, a philosopher says that certain causes produced the present state of our earth, he is bound to answer the question, Did those causes arise from the will of an infinitely wise Creator? For, if the creating agency of Jehovah is admitted, we thus bring into scientific research an element which cannot be adequately comprehended except by an intellect equal to that of Deity. All physical theories must be exceedingly controlled and limited by the admission of such an element. That which to us seems impro-

ART. V.—*Napoleon III. and the Papacy.*

AMONG the remarkable events with which the agency of Napoleon III. is to be connected in the history of our age, we may record the termination of the temporal power of the Papacy. The event has not yet become a formal fact; but its probability is now so universally recognized, both in Protestant and Catholic Christendom, that we feel free to make this record of our views respecting it, as one of the events of the time. It is true that newspaper reports cannot be fully relied upon, till they are more variously confirmed than some which we shall here reason upon as true; but unless there is unaccountable error in the late rumours, we have Catholic testimony in favour of our assumption; having just now noticed the report that Cardinal Wiseman lately retired from a mortifying interview with the Pope, saying to his friend, "It is full time to bow to the hand of Providence, by which the downfall of the temporal power is visibly decreed."

It is now some fifteen hundred years since the Bishop of Rome began to claim supreme spiritual authority in the church, and to receive peculiar deference and veneration from a large number of his brethren. This gradual ascendancy of the Roman diocesan over the prelates of other localities was partly, and perhaps mainly, the natural result of circumstances. Rome was an opulent, refined, and influential metropolis; a centre of learning, of commerce, and of almost unbounded political power. The position of the Church of Rome was commanding. The bishop there had superior means of knowledge on most matters of general interest to the church. His large revenue, sumptuous living, personal refinement and dignity, and his pomp of official display, challenged the reverence of the populace, and secured a marked respect for his presence and opinions in the councils of the church.

It was natural that under such circumstances the successive bishops of Rome should become ambitious of power; and should study the means of obtaining it; and the ignorance and rudeness of the people, and the want of learning and culture

among the inferior clergy, enabled the Roman prelates to use their power with great advantage to the church. Such a leading influence from Rome was easily established, and finally led to the erection of a supreme constitutional power and jurisdiction.

Thus arose, in due time, the Papacy, fully confirmed in ecclesiastical supremacy. And now this supremacy must be secured against the interference of the civil government. The seat of its power must not be ruled by a worldly sovereign. It must have revenues free from the control of secular authority. It seemed unavoidable, that the Pope should have a territory subject only to himself. In those times, when the church was not clearly distinguishable from the state, the ecclesiastical authority was liable to serious annoyance from the secular powers. The spiritual power must be independent of the civil. If the church be subject to a government administered on worldly principles, how can she administer her own affairs according to her spiritual nature and design? This necessity was inseparable from the times; from the character of the people, and that of the governments. The church must everywhere have sole and supreme jurisdiction, under Christ, of her spiritual affairs. She must understand and adopt for herself, the doctrine and the discipline given her from heaven, judge the qualification of her ministers and members, and choose the means of guarding her communion. Her decisions must be final with her members, and not be liable to be annulled or reversed by the temporal power. Not to insist on this, would be to deny the authority of her Head in herself. This is the great point contended for by the Free Church of Scotland; and the great prerogative so securely enjoyed by the church, and so happily placed beyond all controversy, in these United States of America.

The way to prevent the spiritual and temporal power from frequent and violent conflict was not then known. The jurisdictions of the two were not distinctly separated. The church had no resource but to assert her superiority to the state. This she claimed the right to do, by virtue of the supreme importance of the spiritual interests of men. Her standard writers held that "the church exercises the same sway over the state

that the soul does over the body; that it is the right and duty of the spiritual authority to curb the secular whenever the latter becomes prejudicial to religion." (See Bellarmine de Rom. Pontifice V. VI.) It was never the received doctrine of the church that the Pope had the power of regular civil legislation over princes; though Ranke asserts that Sextus V. cherished that opinion, and was displeased when any abandoned it. But it was the evident and justifiable aim of the church writers of the middle ages, to present the best speculative vindication possible at the time, of her right and her duty to secure herself in the free administration of her spiritual affairs.

But granting the entire propriety of the medieval endeavours of the church for temporal power, so far as to protect her own rights, we can still justify her only by her temporary exigency; and now that the exigency is past, the provision should be relinquished. Now, the only necessity for that sort of defence, is created by the Catholic church herself; by her pertinacious and perverse alliance with corruption, and her opposition to the true progress of the human race. When nations and governments have knowledge of Christianity, and respect for its claims, they will protect the church in her spiritual rights and duties. She safely trusts her defence to them. All the enlightened nations who have any experience of freedom; understand the relation of the church to the state; and in this country, as in others, it has been demonstrated that the church need not bear the sword to secure the effectual use of the keys. The fall of the temporal power is thus inevitable, and the facts we have mentioned are the historical conditions of its termination.

This event does not come from local and temporary causes merely. It follows a long and general preparation in the social progress of the world under the impulse of the Christian truth and life. Of this, the prominent human agency employed by Providence in the movement, is a remarkable illustration.

The part of Napoleon III. in these proceedings is prominent and significant. It is incidental to the influence he seems destined to exert in European affairs. We do not know enough of his religious history to pronounce upon his religious faith; but we think it very doubtful whether he entertains any con-

scientious preference for the Catholic church. We recollect no acts of his in favour of Catholicism, nor any practices of himself or his household, which signify more than a prudential and political deference for the faith of the great body of his subjects, whose religious sentiments he could not wisely offend. As for his military defence of the Pope, he foresaw good reason, in the important contingencies of Europe, for choosing rather to supply that defence himself, than to let Austria supply it; and while this supposition sufficiently explains the fact, it is not unworthy of the man. He receives a compliment for his deed—the title of “the true son of the church,” which only shows the Pope can be grateful for past favours in the hope of favours to come. That Napoleon, therefore, in proposing to humble Austria, should not scruple to endanger the Pope, is not at all surprising. He is not open to the charge of inconsistency or treachery; for all see by this time, even those who saw not before, that the French arms in Rome did not represent Napoleon’s conscience as a Catholic, but his policy as sovereign of France, and manager of Europe. We know not that he has ever professed a personal, conscientious interest in any of the religious matters he has been politically concerned with; whether in promoting spiritual reform in the Catholic church, or in weakening her in favour of Protestantism. But by his timely and effective intervention in Italian affairs, he became a prominent, providential agent in the present depression of Rome; and in every word of his to the Pontiff, he has shown that the important and disastrous result to the Papacy agreed with his expectation and design. Having enlarged Sardinia, till her exaltation attracted Romagna, and roused that part of the Papal dominions to revolt, he virtually required the Pope to forbear resistance; and the impotent shadow of falling power was able only to protest. The history of the final temporal depression of the Papal chair cannot be written without placing Napoleon III. foremost among the conscious agents of Divine Providence in the event.

This prominent agency of the French Emperor in these proceedings is very significant. In his mental habit there appears a settled consciousness of being an agent of the overruling power, and of all the political leaders known to history, there

was never one more alive to the providential significance of passing events than he. The world is fully prepared to give him credit for remarkable sagacity; credit which he has earned by his uniform success in one of the boldest series of human undertakings. Whatever his pretensions or his experience in evangelical religion, (and of this we know nothing,) he is evidently willing enough to regard himself, and to be regarded, as an instrument or agent of Providence in accomplishing the destiny of France; and in this conceit resembles his illustrious predecessor. With this impression of himself, and with his extraordinary sagacity in human affairs, with his acknowledged ascendancy in Europe, and even with all the selfish ambition which his bitterest revilers allege against him, his leading part in the passing events of Italy is richly suggestive.

All things were, in his view, so prepared for a great political change in northern Italy, which might work the interest of France, that he promptly resolves to encourage the movement, and set himself forward as its guide. While coveting glory from that field, he saw that the way to that glory lay through a contest in behalf of human freedom. He had cherished before a presentiment of some such opportunity; and had fortunately provided, by having kept an army for years in Rome, on pretence of protecting the Pope, that nothing should be done in that quarter by Austria, Sardinia, or Rome, without his intervention. When he set out upon his expedition, it was with the motto, as it were, upon his banners, "The Freedom of Italy from the Alps to the Adriatic;" and knowing, of course, that to displace the Austrian despotism must destroy the Papal, he betrays no misgiving nor hesitation, but moves steadily on through Solferino to Villafranca, with the destiny of the Papacy in his hand, yet with a courtesy, prudent and well-sustained, towards an office held sacred by so many of the rulers and people with whom he had to do. That amusing proposal of an Italian confederacy of Austria, Sardinia, and Naples, under the presidency of Rome, naturally with the tacit understanding that the Emperor of France would continue dictatorial adviser, now appears more like a witty evasion, for the time, of the real design of the mover, than like an earnest suggestion for the permanent settlement of Italy. He evidently

looked for a long and sweeping progress of the change he had inaugurated—the coveted restoration to France of Savoy and Nice, and remoter results, not definitely foreseen, yet naturally probable, when questions can be raised about them which have been predetermined by management. And it is to be presumed that he as fully expected to annihilate the temporal power of the Papacy, as to overthrow the Austrian dominion in Italy. In a word, he saw those large populations, ripe for partial emancipation, and looking wishfully towards the constitutional kingdom of Sardinia, whose king looked wishfully towards France. There was a rising spirit of freedom. It was seen to be not a blind and transient impulse, but a movement of the rational instinct; and the circumstances were now such, that humanity there might be expected to take an advanced position, from which it would not recede. So sure was this sagacious observer of human affairs that the set time for the freedom of Italy had come. When he enjoined upon the Pope to institute substantial and reasonable reforms, it could not have been with the expectation that the requisition would be heeded; for the reforms must extend to matters on which his Holiness had announced his unfavourable determination, and which the whole spirit and tenor of the Papal government would repel. That government must, therefore, fall. “He that now letteth will let until he be taken out of the way.” The man whose hand was upon the springs of that great movement had “principles which would not allow of armed intervention” to prevent the States of the Church from withdrawing from the temporal jurisdiction of Rome. And it was even among the earliest of his suggestions, that his Holiness contract his jurisdiction to the limits of the metropolis. As the cause of Italian liberty was now so plainly receiving the patronage of Providence, it was time for those who would secure the favour of Providence to pay a prudent respect to the demands of civil and religious liberty. Such was Napoleon’s judgment of the times. With this conviction he allows the sword he has drawn for Italy to fall on the secular arm of the Papacy; and such a conviction in such a man, is a welcome sign of providential preparation for a permanent advance of Italy in the line of human progress.

The position and character of Napoleon gives this movement at Rome another point of significance. When he strikes for liberty as one of the ways to secure the ascendancy of France in Europe, he strikes virtually for Protestantism. Now, a conscientious and devoted Protestant might honestly allow his zeal to mislead his judgment, and promptly and blindly hazard other great interests, without reasonable assurance of success to his favourite cause. Considering himself merely as the representative of Protestantism, he might act from special and local views which do not comprehend the general current of human affairs. But Napoleon, with no Protestant predilections, and with no design of promoting any religion, except as means to an end, undertakes an expedition at vast expense and political risk, to release millions of people from the social constraints incident to the domination of the Papacy. Without hesitation, and with sure execution, he lifts his sword against a tyranny thoroughly baptized into Romanism, and allows the blow to fall on the Papal throne itself, whose feeble incumbent he holds like an infant in his own arms. He gives this bold and forcible expression of his clear conviction that Protestant liberty is about to awake, and that France can make her interest out of the occasion; that there is no glory to be gained in maintaining the temporal power of the Pope; that the sun of Papal Rome is going down, and the noonday of Protestantism is near. This sagacious leader among the sovereigns of Europe, the glory-seeker of the world, a despot on his own throne, with no Protestant bonds upon him, like those which bind the British crown—incapable, as his enemies insist, of disinterested zeal for truth and right, and sure of grateful adoration from the Catholic world, for service he might render to the church of Rome—sees nothing to hope from propping up the tottering Papal power, and will not stake the prestige of his own name and the renown of France, in a campaign for Romanism and the Pope. He feels no political motive to do the Romish interest a service when he might. His hope is in a blow for liberty; such liberty as Romanism tends to destroy. This also shows how little, in his own view, he has to fear or to hope from Romanism in his own empire. He reads on the leaf of Providence now turned, the decree that the Roman Babylon is to fall; that it has no

longer a name nor a place among the agencies of advancing civilization; and that the spirit of Protestantism, under whatever form, as opposed to Popery, must take its place. This is a sign. The eye of Protestant hope may rest upon it. It is the rainbow of promise, set in the receding cloud of European despotism by the God of Protestant liberty; a sign that the flood of arbitrary power shall never destroy the nations again.

The principle by which we are estimating the passing events at Rome, would not allow a remainder of civil jurisdiction to the Pope, even within the walls of the metropolis itself. If the church no longer needs the sword in her own hands, to fulfil her destiny, then why should she cleave to a municipal authority in Rome? Why should the head of the Catholic church in Rome any more require a civil jurisdiction there, than a Protestant Episcopal Bishop in New York, or the Trustees of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in Philadelphia? If Catholicism now wants special laws for her protection, let her ask for them, as other institutions do, through the free and enlightened legislation of the state; and let her do in Rome as she must do in this country—convince the community that her influence is a great public benefit, that she is not living unto herself, but for the good of the state and of the world—and she will then command all that her real usefulness requires. The intelligence and free conscience of the civilized world are now a guaranty for the security of the church in her sacred immunities, far better than the sceptre of civil authority can be in her own hands; and as the only necessity for that power which ever existed has now passed away, it is not meet that she should leave the word of God, to serve in the secular field.

And must it not come to this? The people of Rome, as well as those of the Romagna, must naturally desire to be governed like the prosperous and progressive people around them. Especially will they repel the degradation of being left behind in a triumphant migration of their countrymen from Egypt towards a land of promise. Will they be content as an isolate, forsaken community, whose neighbours have left them for better associations? Will they respect and love a government detested and cast off by the mass of its former subjects, without dignity or influence, and cut off from healthy and improving intercourse

with the rest of the world? And why should so populous and renowned a city, with a situation central for social advantages, with facilities for commerce, with a history the most memorable, next to Jerusalem, of all the cities of the world, and with a name as venerable in the circles of literature and jurisprudence, as in the Christian church, be doomed, in an age of light and of surrounding advancement, to that ignominious bondage?

God has accomplished a great work in the world by the Catholic church. Despite of her manifold corruptions she was the depositary of precious truth. The doctrines of the Trinity, of God in Christ crucified, of salvation through his blood, of the Holy Ghost, of the forgiveness of sin, of the resurrection of the body, and of the life everlasting, are the light of the world. And these doctrines that church always professed. By the power of the truth thus maintained, thousands within the pale of the Romish communion were beyond doubt brought to the knowledge of God; and the light of the gospel was preserved from utter extinction. But her work is accomplished. Her form a pillar of salt between Sodom and Zoar. The Spirit of God goes out of her into other forms; while she, with her fanatical conceit of infallibility, forges chains of bondage, and yokes of galling captivity for her people out of the very truth which should make them free. Her vices, as an institution, are concentrated and immovable. She can never again be a form and an embodiment of Christianity for the world. She has nothing more to do in her present shape, but to linger with her lessening train, till her followers have walked by her flickering taper to the grave, and their children have become disciples in another Christian school.

What then should Romanism do? And what should this generation expect?

Popery, as such, should give up the ghost. We would not consign it to death as a punishment for having existed. Grant all that may be claimed for it as useful in its time. But its work is done, and done long ago. The Pope has done no good in any country for the last hundred years. And we cannot conceive a condition of things as likely to arise out of the present state of the church and the world, in which a Christian man, with the title of supreme and universal head of the church,

and residing in Rome or anywhere else, can do any real service even to the Catholic branch of the church. The Catholic communion may continue, and may be *the church*, even in her view of the matter. She may continue to claim apostolic grace in her sacrament of ordination, to the full satisfaction of the bishops and all others concerned; but the dogma of the primacy of St. Peter would fall, of course, with the Pope; and it is that late-born and unmitigated falsehood which has broken down the constitution of that church and consumed her life. And as the patrimony of St. Peter is the temporal power, and that is falling for ever, the holder of the patrimony may as well disappear; for what is the heir without the inheritance. The only necessity for his continuance lies in the fact that he exists, and there is no constitutional provision to abolish him. If once he were removed, and Catholic people were no longer plied with the devices of priestcraft, to keep alive in them a factitious reverence for his unseen person, there would be found, even in the present nature of Catholicism, no want or tendency that would reproduce him. It is impossible that the spirit of Catholic piety, if left to its natural course, should produce in an American Catholic the need of a Roman Pope, whom he never sees, and whom he never hears of, except as his Holiness is forced on his notice by the priest who uses the name and pretended dignity for his personal ends. The Catholicism of France makes virtually nothing of the Pope. The Gallican church denies, in form, his power over civil rulers, his infallibility, and the superiority of his decisions over those of councils. And this leaves nothing for the Pope that renders his office or authority of any practical value for the people. We would say then, in the plain, simple language of Presbyterianism, let the Pope, in view of the whole state of things, consider whether his usefulness in that capacity be not at an end; and, if so, let him take his dismissal, and let his session, the college of cardinals, be dissolved. A body of men with talents and address to attain to such places, can, with the right spirit, be very useful in other offices, but in that they can do nothing. We do not speak thus because we think the voluntary resignation of the Pope or the dissolution of any portion of the hierarchy probable, or even possible, but we take this method of expressing what we think

of the present condition of the Papacy, and of the value of the office in determining the religious future of the world.

We incline to anticipate successive modifications of the Catholic system, by the continued and accelerated progress of change which has been inaugurated in the United States. The silent but growing disuse of dogmas and of practices which have become distasteful and unprofitable to the altered mental conditions has already gone much farther among the Catholics of the United States, and even among those of foreign birth, than is generally known. Some twenty years ago, we heard, in the leading Catholic congregation of one of our largest Atlantic cities, a discourse from a priest which took us quite by surprise. It was an exhortation concerning the duty of confession, and complained of great and growing neglect of this ordinance of the church, and remonstrated—"Why should the church have to mourn that one of her most binding ordinances should be so generally neglected by her members who are engaged in the business of the world, or have risen to the higher ranks of intelligence and culture?" And from statements as to the number of members in the charge, and the number who attended the confessional, it appeared that scarcely one in a hundred pretended to comply with the requisition of the church, by the habitual abuse of the confessional; that those who did confess, were mostly of the lowest class, or in extremity. This is the inevitable course of usages which do not agree with the advancing ideas of propriety, and which cannot adapt themselves to some rational sentiment of utility, even while fulfilling an acknowledged scriptural requirement. So it has already been with the Catholic church in this country, and so it will continue to be. The changes will naturally be the more rapid within the church as the usages become the more conformed to the religious sentiment prevailing in the age, and as the antagonism between Catholic and Protestant becomes less bitter and violent, while the transition of individuals and of communities from Romanism, will also be more free and frequent. Circumstances will also hasten the work. While the spirit of the two great divisions of christendom towards each other is conformed more and more to the gospel, the greater religious susceptibility of

Protestants will be communicated to the Catholics by the tendency to equilibrium, so long as Protestants continue in what we know to be their freer and higher communion of the Spirit.

The instinct of the awakened religious sentiment of Protestantism, leads to an immovable assurance of our improved condition in comparison with Romanism. That assurance may be freely and thankfully expressed without vaunting, and without vain, self-complacent and irritating taunts, or supercilious and repulsive exultation. And the true spirit of the Reformation will keep Protestants more and more on their guard in this respect, even in the height of triumph. And this assurance of which we speak has so many and such patent confirmations in the course of Providence and the progress of grace in the world, that the meek and grateful utterance of it, in all direct and indirect expressions compatible with the lowly mind of piety, must be a commendation of our cause to all earnest and candid seekers after truth. We are under temptation, indeed, from the bearings of all the social changes of the world in favour of the Protestant interest; but our imperfections are enough to employ the most diligent circumspection, to keep us alive to the admonitions of the Spirit, through Providence and Scripture, and to preclude all self-reliant and boastful indulgence.

But the progress of the world is like a demonstration in our favour. The changes are all in one direction. The progressive civilization of the world brings forward the Christian nations which have the most easy and free communion with the spirit of Protestantism, and throws back those most shut out from that spirit, and confined to that of the Romish church. Wherever the two systems are brought into direct conflict among people enjoying freedom of conscience and opinion, the gain is in favour of Protestantism. In mixed communities, where the two classes of people have free scope for mutual influence, the tendency is uniformly in the line of Protestant progress. Thus, in countries wholly Catholic the people are left by the church in ignorance; plainly showing that it is no part of the policy of that church, when left wholly to herself, to promote the universal diffusion of knowledge. This appears undeniable from the history of Catholic influence where it has not been disturbed, as in Mexico, Spain, Central and Southern Italy, and the South

of Ireland. But in this country, the Catholics are not behind in their zeal for education. They enter freely and at great expenditure of funds and labour into competition with the Protestant system of universal education; and though, for the most part, they take this course as the only condition of successful rivalry with the prevailing Protestantism, the effect is to change the entire Catholic policy in relation to mental culture, and by consequence, to modify, in important respects, the details of discipline and worship. The difference between the methods for public edification in the Catholic assemblies of this country and those of thoroughly Catholic countries, strikes all travellers who witness it. This invariable conformity shows that the tendency of the two bodies under mutual influence is in the Protestant line, and not in the Catholic. Thus also the withholding of the Scriptures from the laity, which is an undeniable and prominent feature of Romanism, in theory and practice, gradually disappears in this country, as in other countries increasingly Protestant, and the Scriptures, in the same form as used in public teaching, are distributed among the people. And the people are instructed in public on the presumption that the Bible is possessed and read in their families. We have ourselves heard in Catholic assemblies, whole discourses framed throughout on this presumption, and in this respect not differing at all from those of a Protestant pulpit. The cases we witnessed were those indeed of the most cultivated congregations of an enlightened city; and though not probably a sample for the whole Catholic population, prove nevertheless the tendency to conformity; which is our point. And what we have said of education, and of the popular use of the Bible, is equally true of other matters, which we should mention if time would permit.

It would therefore not be contrary to the course of Providence in analogous cases, if silent and half unconscious, and legally unauthorized modifications of Romanism should go on, and be immensely accelerated as the time draws nigh for all antichrists to be destroyed; and if, in process of time, the dissolving petrification of the ante-reformation Catholicism, in trying to recover some dim sense of her identity, should find that she was not. Thus England awoke, upon a time, to the

consciousness that she was not under arbitrary rule, but had a constitutional government, while her constitution was never written, but only grew, as a power, in the hearts of rulers and people. Thus old things pass away, in the most ordinary course of Providence and grace; not by a stream of formal repeals and abolitions, but by a constant shedding of the obsolete, and the silent descent of outgrown usages into desuetude.

As for the Papacy, it is outliving its time. Its spirit and power are gone. What is it? We speak not of the Catholic church as a whole, but of the Papacy, with its appendages, as an office of that church. What moral or religious influence has it with the people, for instance, of this country? What questions of any real moment, in doctrine or practice, has its infallibility to decide? Suppose the Catholic churches of the United States were severed from Rome, as the American Episcopal church is separated from its mother-church of England, having all merely legal matters adjusted to its separate state, and what would it lose? Of what moral or religious benefit would the Catholic Christians of this country be bereft?

With the fall of the temporal power of the Pope, will cease also, in a great measure, the acknowledgment of his spiritual influence. The early and continual endeavours of the Papacy after temporal powers, betrayed the conviction that, without the dignity of secular dominion, the universal headship of the church could be little more than a vain show. How much more must that conviction reveal itself in these times, when the people have become more enlightened, and capable of asking and weighing the reasons of things? And now that the secular dominion is coming to naught, it becomes more than a mere query for the curious, what the spiritual powers of the Papacy will hereafter in practice amount to. The revolting states of the church, as they pass under a government tinged with Protestant liberty, will have more spiritual sympathy with progressive christendom than with Rome; and if Rome herself should join the progress, she would soon dissolve in the elements of freedom, like the morning mist in the light of advancing day. While the people are forsaking the Pope, and adopting another government of their own preference, they

take with them the great body of the clergy. The priests and bishops are as decided Catholics as ever, and may give their new government great trouble before they can learn to adjust themselves to their new conditions; but they must serve the people in their office. Their new king is an excommunicate, and their allegiance to him is a contempt of the spiritual power of the Pope, with which all pretences of submission in other things will be incompatible. The populous and influential state of the church which has already revolted, will feel little more regard for the spiritual power than it felt for the temporal. The Northern States of Italy, whose efforts for freedom were opposed by all his influence, can only hold him as a defeated enemy. The spiritual ministrations of an office which has been associated by the people with so odious a resistance to their welfare, must be of small account.

Indeed, the power and dignity of the Papacy are now so low, that no future changes in its government will be of any public concern. They can be nothing to the world, nothing to Europe; nothing in church, nor in state. The unhappy pontiff feels this, as he shows in his plaintive epistle to the sufferers in Syria. And a letter is now mentioned, but not yet come to hand, in which he is said to give up all as lost, and to declare his purpose to meet death in Rome rather than flee. He seems to expect no restoration; and it does not seem possible that any future changes of the world should replace him. The time has been when the Pope received the profoundest homage of princes; when he could compel them to wait at his gate, and to hold his stirrup, and could exact of them whatever might increase his power, and gratify his ambition. But he has now no powerful friend for his time of need. Sicily is lost to his interest, and other revolutions in Naples seem near. The only two powers of Europe confessedly Catholic, can do nothing for him. Austria, in her poverty, turmoil, and infirmity, can render him no aid. Spain, once the richest and greatest of the kingdoms of Europe, now lies in weakness and humiliation, needs help herself, and seems on the point of selling a portion of her independence for some mess of pottage from Napoleon. There is no help for his Holiness, and it does not yet appear how the affairs of Italy can be permanently

settled on any terms which will allow him to remain in Rome.

So complete is the prostration of that once mighty office. And it falls not by a tempest of foreign force, but by its own natural decay. Its root has died in the soil of humanity. It belonged to the childhood of the church, and is now put away as a childish thing. It belonged to a forming period of the Christian nations; and now as fast as the nations attain to manly intelligence and freedom, they cast off the Papacy. There never was on earth a temporary institution, not even the feudalism of Europe, or the divinely appointed system of Moses, that was more manifestly preliminary and provisional, intended to prepare the way for something better; none that has more evidently had its day, and become more thoroughly obsolete, than the institution of the Papacy. The fall is a sign of the steady and sure progress of the kingdom of Christ. So must also everything decline which belongs only to her training through the successive stages of her growth; everything which does not belong to her perfection as the body of Christ, and is not an organ and ornament of her glorious manhood.

The changes now in progress in the populations of Europe and Asia, to say nothing of other parts of the world, are more suggestive than any which the history of those countries has recorded before. Great events are taking place, and greater still are approaching. The Turkish empire seems virtually at an end; waiting only for the political system of Europe to digest and secrete the material. It has been already compelled, in its weakness, to tolerate Christian missionaries, until thousands of its Mohammedans have had their attention invited to the Holy Scriptures. We refer not to the Catholic Christians of Syria, who are now suffering so dreadfully from the barbarities of the Druses, but to those in Turkey, reached by the labours of Protestant missionaries. Millions in Italy are now accessible to Protestant influence, who never have been before. Even the Catholic portion of the church is leaving the Papacy behind, in many quarters, and pressing forward to that which is before. The kingdoms of the world are becoming the kingdom of Christ. They are everywhere preparing to protect his people in their privileges and their duties as Christians. They

thus become one kingdom, with Christ for its acknowledged head. All are learning to recognize and illustrate the universal brotherhood, and are expecting to see the human race return to the fellowship and union of a single family. Thus the kingdom of God will come, and his will be done on earth, as it is in heaven.

ART. VI.—*The recent Theory of the Eldership examined.*

THE ruling elder according to this theory is the *presbyter* of Scripture and of the Christian church in the early period of its history. It is the one fundamental order of which the preacher is a class—a functionary—who, by virtue of an additional gift, performs different duties, “but is by no means of a different order.” There is, therefore, but one order of rulers in the church—deacons being only assistants or helps.

According to Dr. Breckinridge and Dr. Thornwell this theory involves all that is essentially distinctive of Presbyterian government.* The issues are therefore of vital import. The theory is dogmatically “affirmed” to be sustained by arguments “clear, conclusive, and irresistible.” (*Review*, p. 7.) “The Scriptures and our Standards both EXPRESSLY teach that the ruling elder is strictly and properly a presbyter, and therefore entitled to participate in all the acts—(*of necessity he would be*)—in which any presbyter, *as such*, can bear a part.” (*Ib.* p. 57.) “The presbyter, as a title of office, means a ruler, and *nothing more than a ruler.*” (*Ib.* p. 58.) This “is clear from the passage which proves *beyond the possibility of a doubt*, that presbyters and ministers of the word are not synonymous terms. That passage is 1 Tim. v. 17.” (*Ib.* p. 61.) “From the account given of the meaning of this word it follows, that it is not

* See *The Christian Pastor* and *Appendix*, by Dr. Breckinridge, Baltimore, 1845, and *The Elder Question*, by Dr. Thornwell, in the *Southern Presbyterian Review*, June, 1848.