

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 4. — APRIL, 1888.

I. THE LOLLARDS.

IN the Middle Ages there were developed two opposite views of the sphere and mission of the church. One was that of Hildebrand and his school, who began with the claim that the church should be independent of the secular power, and ended with the demand that all civil rulers should recognize the successor of St. Peter as their suzerain. The natural outcome of this theory was that the administration of civil governments should be largely in the hands of ecclesiastics, that the hierarchy should be enriched at the expense of the state, and that the whole body of the clergy should be practically divorced from their spiritual functions.

The other view found advocates in William of Ockham and Marsilius of Padua, who held that the sphere of the church was purely spiritual. Not only was the state independent of the church, but the pope, with all ecclesiastics, was of right, in all secular concerns, subject to the civil ruler.

Of this latter view John Wyclif became the champion in England. It was as a member of the Parliament of 1366, which repudiated the papal claim for tribute that King John had engaged to pay, that we first hear of Wyclif's opposition to the pretensions of Rome. From that time forth he was busy refuting her claims, and, by the use of all the means in his power, helping on the efforts, then making under the lead of John of Gaunt, to exclude the dignitaries of the church from secular offices and confine them to their legitimate work.

our common foe. We can carefully abstain from entering territory already occupied.

III. *Help one another.* This can be done in many ways; and we shall find that he who watereth others shall himself also be watered. It is said that the late Dr. Johns, the beloved Episcopal minister of Baltimore, never passed the church of another denomination without lifting up a prayer for a blessing upon it. Did this spirit prevail, men would say, "Behold how these christians love one another"; and it would go far towards the evangelization of our race, in accordance with our Saviour's prayer, "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: *that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.*"

J. A. QUARLES.

V. THE PRESBYTERIAN ORIGIN OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE.

THE wisest and best men in every age have felt the indispensable necessity of religion to the stability of society. Hear the testimony of that distinguished jurist, statesman and philosopher, Sir James Macintosh, in his *Letter on the Study of Law*: "I am now to treat of religion, and of the claims which it has upon the acknowledgment and support of him who sustains the character of an advocate in our courts of justice. The opinions of men have experienced a thousand changes; kingdoms that have been most powerful have been removed; the form of the earth itself has undergone various alterations; but amid these grand and ruinous concussions, religion has remained unshaken; and a principle so consentaneous to the first formation of our nature must remain, until by some power, of which at present we have no conception, the laws of that nature are universally dissolved. Powers thus singular must have their foundation in truth; for men may rest in truth, but they can never rest in error. What is thus true must also be just; and, of course, to acknowledge its influence must be the spontaneous and natural effusion of a love of truth; and the love of truth either is really, or is affected to be the character of

those who have dedicated themselves to the study of our laws. Thus naturally, even upon the first glance, do the characters of the lawyer and the supporter of religion meet. The conclusion must be, that he who affects to doubt of the fundamental truths of religion, much more he who dares to deride them, is dissolving by fraud and violence a tie which all good men have agreed to hold in respect, and the violation of which must render the violator unworthy the esteem and support of his fellow-creatures."

The opinion of Washington in regard to the necessity of religion to sustain the morals of a nation, cannot be brought too often to the notice of the people of the United States. In his "Farewell Address" he says: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable. *In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens.* The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connexions with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in the courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, *reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.*"

The utter inefficiency of all mere human instrumentalities to protect and elevate the race has been repeatedly demonstrated. And the reason is obvious. Man has a physical, intellectual and moral constitution, and all these schemes ensure defeat by running counter to some of the laws of that constitution. Besides, that constitution has been deranged by sin, and none of these instruments have the power of restoring it. They all spring from that nature of his, and they cannot rise higher than their source. If, then, there be a system calculated to remedy this evil, that must be the highest order of patriotism which employs it. The gospel is

that system. It is adapted to every want of man's varied nature, and meets the demands of his intellect, his conscience, his affections and his energies. It makes him a new creature in Christ Jesus, and places him under the tutelage of the blessed Spirit. Having rescued him from the fall, it places him in harmonious relation to every law of his nature. It teaches him that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, he is to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world. It makes him provident for time by making him provident for eternity. It renders him obedient to the law of the land by making him first a law unto himself. It induces him to relax his grasp upon the pelf of this world by placing within his reach the durable riches of another. It opens around him a sphere of christian usefulness to others. It inspires him with new desires, and constrains him with motives never felt before "to live, not unto himself, but to him who died for him and rose again." Henceforth, he is a blessing to the community and the world.

To what achievement similar to this can infidelity point? What has it done to ameliorate society and make a miserable world happy? Where are its institutions, its happy, prosperous social and political establishments? Is it not a mockery to ask the question? Let France, reserved in the righteous providence of God as the unhappy subject of the experiment, proclaim once for all that the reign of infidelity is the reign of terror and the reign of death! Infidelity, left to itself, would subvert all government. A nation of infidels could not exist. Well did Edmund Burke remark: "Infidels are outlaws of the constitution, not of this country, but of the human race." And Dr. Arnold justly observes: "To speak of religious liberty when we mean the liberty to be irreligious, or of freedom of conscience when our conscience is our convenience, is no other than a mockery and a profanation."

The gospel being the richest boon God has given to the race, and essential to its welfare for this world and the next, its widest diffusion is the dictate of the purest patriotism. It devolves an obligation upon every man, every citizen, every christian, to disseminate it as the only guardian of man's rights and interests for time and eternity. It is not only the cause of God, but also the cause of man, the cause of philanthropy, of patriotism, of society,

of civilization, of government, the cause of country, the cause of the world.

It is to the christianity of the Old and the New Testaments that mankind, in all ages, has owed whatever measure of liberty they enjoyed. The civil government of the ancient Hebrews was the government of a free people, not only the first, but the only free government of antiquity. The Mosaic constitution was pervaded with popular sympathies and the spirit of liberty. The best wisdom of modern times in the difficult science of legislation was anticipated by Moses. The moderns are not the real discoverers; they have but applied the truths and principles established by the first, the wisest, the ablest of legislators. In an age of barbarism and tyranny, Moses solved the problem how a people could be self-governed and yet well governed; how men could be kept in order and still be free, and how the liberty of the individual could be reconciled with the welfare of the community.

Municipal assemblies managed the public business of the cities, assemblies of the tribes administered the general affairs of the tribes, and the assemblies of the commonwealth those of all Israel. Though united by general interests and formed into a confederacy, yet each tribe was a sovereign state, and gave far less power to the confederate government than these United States ever gave to the general government.

Now, the head of the Hebrew nation was Christ. It was "*the Angel of the Lord,*" as the martyr Stephen declared to the Jews, who appeared to Moses in the burning bush, and who spake to Moses on Sinai and gave him the "lively oracles." The government was a theocracy. Messiah was king. 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, revenues, penalties and duration. The church had her courts of the synagogue and ecclesiastical sanhedrim; the state, those of the gate and the civil sanhedrim. Pre-existent ecclesiastical laws and the ceremonial laws were those of the church; the judicial, those

of the state. 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 to characterize every government on earth. "The Lord shall be king over all the earth; in that day there shall be one Lord." "The kingdoms of the earth shall become the kingdoms of the Lord." They will still continue the kingdoms of this world, and at the same time be "the kingdoms of the Lord." Their moral character will be changed. 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. This does not confound or unite two distinct institutions, the church and state. There is no inconsistency in affirming that two institutions are under one Divine Head, when each is kept to its sphere, without interference or collision between them. The planets which belong to our solar system revolve around one common centre, the sun, and yet their orbits are distinct. In like manner church and state are both 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 each other, would be to rebel against the authority of their common head. Christ wears "many crowns" upon his august brow. Christ and Cæsar may occupy the same throne in the state without the least interference.

Christ came not to institute a new church, but to open a new sphere for his ancient church, and start it upon its new career, the restrictions of the ancient theocracy being done away with, and all nations, instead of one nation, designed to enjoy the honors and blessings that shall be conferred by their mediatorial King. The government of the Hebrew church, and also of the Hebrew state, was by assemblies, *Presbyteries*, for such were the synagogues and

the sanhedrim, composed of presbyters or elders. Such, too, is the government of the New Testament church, a government of assemblies, of *Presbyteries*, not of presbyters. Archbishop Whately concedes that "wherever a Jewish synagogue existed that was brought to embrace the gospel, the apostles there did not so much form a christian church as make an existing congregation christian by introducing the christian sacraments and worship, leaving the machinery of government unchanged, the rulers of synagogues, the elders and other officers, being already provided in the existing institutions."

The Presbyterian Church is older than the Reformation, older than the apostles, older than the New Testament. The Presbyterianism of the Old Testament church did not originate with the Jewish dispensation, but ante-dated it, and had its rise in the earliest age, the patriarchal, the government of the church in that day being by presbyters or elders. The patriarchal system exists in families among all nations. It is founded on the natural relation between parents and children. Among those races retaining a primitive simplicity in their mode of life, this organization of society is still found. As the father governs his own household, so the head of the family, *i. e.*, of the elder branch, governs the younger, and the head of the whole tribe governs both. As the natural heads of houses, families, and tribes were the hereditary magistrates, the name *old men, elders*, was the common appellation for the rulers of the people. The same usage of the term occurs in application to domestic arrangements. Eliezer of Damascus, Abraham's steward, is called (Gen. xxiv. 2), not "his eldest servant of his house," as our translation has it, but "his servant, *the elder* (*i. e.*, ruler) of his house." So in Gen. l. 7, we read of "all the servants of Pharaoh, the *elders* of his house," as well as "all the *elders* of the land of Egypt." These *elders* and the *senators* of Psa. cv. 22, are identical in Hebrew.

The Scriptures exhibit the Presbyterate as existing in the very earliest ages, and continuing to the very latest; whilst Prelacy is conceded by its most learned divines and scholars to have no foundation whatever in the Word of God. Their able organ, *The Rock*, (London) faithfully reflects their views in recent issues,

(November 11th, 1887, and December 2d, 1887): "The fact is, that diocesan episcopacy, as we know it, is of comparatively modern growth; and so far from standing on Bible authority as a divine institution, it is just as much, or as little, divine as the office of Lord Mayor of London. No man now contends that the *επισκοπος* of Scripture was of a different order from the elder, or that modern diocesan episcopacy can stand now as it has so long stood, like a pyramid upon its apex, on the minute points of support afforded by one or two misunderstood passages. Bishops, of course, there were in Scripture times, but their modern analogue must, if anywhere, be found in the rectors of large towns, such as Brighton or Bradford. Every scholar has long given up, as a mere piece of patristic ignorance, the pretense that apostles were the prototypes of bishops. Diocesan episcopacy stands solely on the law of the land, and the attempt, so often made in these days, to base it upon the high ground of scriptural authority, as divinely ordered, and therefore of permanent and essential obligation, will only rebound with destructive force upon itself." "The question is, Was there anything whatever in the first age of the church which answered to our idea of a bishop? The unanimous reply given to this question by the most learned scholars of our day is, that there was not. The bishop, as we find him now, is the creation of post-apostolic times. The presbyter-bishops were the only primitive bishops, and it is only in later ages that the diocesan bishops have quite swallowed up and reduced to subjection the order of presbyters, which certainly has whatever advantage lies in priority. The Dean of Canterbury, lately speaking on this point, adverted to the hackneyed quotation of Ignatius, 'Do nothing without the bishop;' and said it simply meant, 'Do nothing without the incumbent,' and was addressed to the whole church, advising them always to consult their pastor."

On the other hand, the Presbyterian Church, based upon the Scriptures, the Rock of Ages, claims, not simply an apostolic succession, but a far more ancient one, even the patriarchal succession. Through all the dispensations, whatever else be changed, it remains unchanged, ever the same venerable historic church, like its Divine Author, the same yesterday, to day, and for ever! The

one grand olive tree, which the Lord God hath planted, making wild olive trees, grafted in, fruitful, in proportion as they partake of its root and fatness, bearing its fruit in all ages, in all the ages of time, and in all the ages of eternity! In comparison with it, how ridiculous are the pretensions of episcopacy! It becomes not the mushroom of a night to vaunt itself in presence of the majestic cedar of Lebanon!

The Presbyterian Church is governed by assemblies, and the liberty of assemblies is essential to the preservation of the gospel. John Knox well said: "Take from us the freedom of assemblies, and you take from us the evangel!" It is a great mistake to suppose that a particular form of church government is a matter of little consequence. Christ has not only instituted the government but its form. The relation between a form of church government and its doctrine and worship is direct, close and intimate. It is the shell which guards the kernel. It is the body which covers and preserves the soul. Every student of ecclesiastical history is forced to see this. Why is it that certain forms of government, and certain systems of doctrine, and certain modes of worship are found uniformly associated together? Why are Presbyterianism and Calvinism in such close sympathy and union? Many of the churches of New England were once Presbyterian as to church government, and Calvinistic as to doctrine. When Presbyterianism was supplanted by Congregationalism, how did it happen that the Calvinism was not retained, but in like manner was supplanted by Socinianism? This same result uniformly obtains, sooner or later. But how can it be explained, if a particular form of government be a matter of indifference, and have, as many suppose, no influence upon the doctrines and worship of a church? In Scotland, during the time that assemblies were suppressed and Presbyteries neglected, ministers became negligent, immorality and heresy prevailed and popery increased. In Germany, where infidel tenets were substituted for the pure Word of God, this lamentable condition is traceable to the deficient constitution of the German churches, and their entire want of control over the opinions of their own ministers. These instances show there is not a more unfounded notion than that a particular form of church government is a matter of indifference.

If the doctrines of the gospel need for their protection the polity of the gospel, without which their purity and integrity cannot be maintained, nor the freedom of the church secured, still less could it be expected that those doctrines, such as the doctrine of confederation, the doctrine of representation, not enshrined in their congenial Presbyterian polity, should, disembodied, be able to engender and conserve the freedom of society and the state.

The famous infidel, Lord Bolingbroke, was one day sitting in his house, reading Calvin's *Institutes*, when he received a morning visit from Dr. Church, an Episcopal minister. "I have been studying Calvin's *Institutes*," said he; "what do you think of those matters, Doctor?" "O my Lord, we don't think about such antiquated stuff; we preach the plain doctrines of virtue and morality, and have long laid aside those abstruse points of grace." "Look you, Doctor," said Lord Bolingbroke, "you know I don't believe the Bible to be a divine revelation, but they who do can never defend it on any principle but that doctrine. To say truth, I have at times been almost persuaded to believe it upon this view of things; and there is one argument which has gone far with me in behalf of its authenticity; which is, that the belief in it exists upon earth even when committed to the care of such as you, who pretend to believe it and yet deny the only principle upon which it is defensible." The connexion between ecclesiastical and civil polity and ecclesiastical and civil liberty is direct and striking. The historian, Ranke, (as reported by the late Dr. Henry Boynton Smith,) affirmed: "We may consider Calvin as the founder of the Free States of North America. It was his doctrine which shaped the men who left home and country, in order to preserve their religious freedom in the wilds of America." The historian, Bancroft, well says: "Calvinism is gradual republicanism," and "*He that will not honor the memory and respect the influence of Calvin knows but little of the origin of American liberty.*" "Episcopacy and monarchy are feared as natural allies." It was the declaration of Dr. Chandler, a distinguished Episcopal divine, that "Episcopacy can never thrive in a republican government, nor republican principles in an Episcopal church." The admitting of the laity to some share in its government is pronounced by Bishop

Seabury to be "incongruous to every idea of Episcopal government." It is a fact so obvious as to be admitted by those who have no sympathy with our form of polity, that Presbyterianism in the church is the mother of republicanism in the state. Queen Elizabeth, that imperious sovereign, hated Presbytery because she deemed it inconsistent with monarchy. King James, educated a Calvinist and a Presbyterian, when leaving Scotland to ascend the vacant throne of Elizabeth, assured his countrymen of his love for their church, and of his determination to support it. He had, however, hardly crossed the Tweed before he began to manifest his aversion from a form of church discipline which he regarded as essentially republican. The submissive demeanor of the English bishops, and their high doctrine as to the power of kings, confirmed a conversion which had already taken place. The Scottish presbyters were accustomed to urge him to repent of his sins. The English bishops, on their knees, assured him he spoke by the immediate assistance of God! It is not wonderful, therefore, that James adopted the cause of the latter and made it his own. A favorite saying of his was, that "Presbytery agreed with monarchy as well as God with the devil." It was the struggle of the Scotch for the liberty of their church which was the means of preserving the liberties of England. Charles I. had succeeded in governing England for twelve years without a parliament. When the Scotch formed their national convention for resisting the tyranny of the king, Charles found it necessary then to summon a parliament. One object that he kept before him was the extermination of Calvinism from the English Church on political grounds.

The natural tendency of our faith is to develop the principles of political liberty. Charles I. was no mean logician when he declared that "there was not a wiser man seen since Solomon than he who said, 'No bishop, no king!'" The temporal follows the spiritual, and whom Christ makes free, he is free indeed.

The British constitution bears more distinct marks of the genius and high principle of three Presbyterian ministers, Knox, Henderson and Carstairs, than of any three lawyers England ever produced.

Carlyle, speaking of Presbyterianism in Scotland, and referring

to the noble outburst in St. Giles's church, in Edinburgh, followed by the sublime scene in Greyfriars churchyard, where men signed the old League and Covenant with their blood, (acts and scenes which, in their remote consequences, took off the heads of Wentworth, Laud, and King Charles, and secured liberty for mankind,) says: "The tumult in the High Church in Edinburgh spread into a universal battle,—a struggle over all these realms; and there came out, after fifty years' struggling, what we call the glorious Revolution, a *habeas corpus* act, free parliaments, and much else." And of this same attempt to enslave Scotland Macaulay writes, "To this step our country owes its freedom;" and Hallam says, "In its ultimate results it preserved the liberties and overthrew the monarchy of England."

"The Solemn League and Covenant
Cost Scotland blood, cost Scotland tears;
But it sealed Freedom's sacred cause!
If thou art a slave, indulge thy sneers."—*Robert Burns.*

Mr. Carlyle says, with truth: "It was among the noblest human heroisms, this Puritanism of ours. That the sense of difference between right and wrong had filled all time and all space for man, and bodied itself forth into a heaven and hell for him: this constitutes the grand feature of those Puritan, old-christian ages; this is the element which stamps them as heroic, and has rendered their works great, manlike, fruitful to all generations. It is by far the memorablest achievement of our species; without that element in some form or other nothing of heroic had ever been among us."

In a similar strain Mr. Froude, the historian, observes: "Calvinism has borne ever an inflexible front to illusion and mendacity, and has preferred rather to be ground to powder like flint than to bend before violence, or to melt under enervating temptation. These men were possessed of all the qualities which give nobility and grandeur to human nature, men whose life was as upright as their intellect was commanding, and their public aims untainted with selfishness; unalterably just where duty required them to be stern, but with the tenderness of woman in their hearts, frank, true, cheerful, humorous, as unlike sour fanatics as it is possible to imagine any one, and able in some way to sound

the key-note to which every brave and faithful heart in Europe instinctively vibrated. . . . Calvinism is not a system of opinions merely, but an attempt to make the will of God as revealed in the Bible an authoritative guide for social as well as personal direction. The Calvinists have been called intolerant. Intolerance of an enemy who is trying to kill you seems to me a pardonable state of mind. It is no easy matter to tolerate lies, clearly convicted of being lies, in any circumstances; specially, it is not easy to tolerate lies that strut about in the name of religion; but there is no reason to suppose that the Calvinists, at the beginning, would have thought of meddling with the church if they had been themselves let alone. They would have formed communities apart. Like the Israelites whom they wished to resemble, they would have withdrawn into the wilderness—the Pilgrim Fathers actually did so—to worship the God of their fathers, and would have left argument and example to work their proper effect. They were crushed down, but they rose again. They were splintered and torn, but no power could bend or melt them. They abhorred, as no body of men ever more abhorred, all conscious mendacity, all impurity, all moral wrong of every kind, so far as they could recognize it. They attracted to their ranks almost every man in Western Europe that ‘hated a lie.’ Whatever exists at this moment, in England and Scotland, of conscientious fear of doing evil, is the remnant of the convictions which were branded by the Calvinists into the people’s hearts. The discipline which it once aspired to maintain has fallen slack. Desire for ease and self-indulgence drag forever, in quiet times, at the heel of noble aspirations, while the shadow struggles to remain and preserve its outline, when the substance is passing away. This was not the religion of the fathers; this was not the Calvinism which overthrew spiritual wickedness, and hurled kings from their thrones, and purged England and Scotland, for a time at least, of lies and charlatanry. Calvinism was the spirit which rises in revolt against untruth; the spirit which has appeared and re-appeared, and in due time will appear again, unless God be a delusion and man be as the beasts that perish. For it is but the inflashing upon the conscience of the nature and origin of the laws by which mankind

are governed, laws which exist whether we acknowledge them or whether we deny them, and will have their way, to our weal or woe, according to the attitude in which we please to place ourselves toward them; inherent, like the laws of gravity, in the nature of things, not made by us, not to be altered by us, but to be discerned and obeyed by us, at our everlasting peril."

Let these weighty words of an impartial thinker and historian be well pondered by us in these days of laxity and demoralization. Society must needs suffer in its highest interest when Calvinism, Puritanism, declines. This is a fact established by all history. Bishop Burnet records the fact that the managers in the parliament which overturned Presbytery and restored Episcopacy were, during the time of its sitting, "*almost perpetually drunk.*" When the Puritans were subdued the corruption of England rivalled Rome. Parliament endowed the illegitimate children of King Charles and nearly a score of mistresses, who were honored at court and pampered on the public treasury. The Church of England stands now precisely where she stood at the death of Elizabeth. Hear the testimony of one of her own prelates, Bishop Short: "The kingdom has, for the last two hundred years, been making rapid strides in every species of improvement, and a corresponding alteration in the laws on every subject has taken place; *during this period nothing has been remedied in the church.*" Its condition has been thus described by a writer during that period: "I could name whoremongers, confessing their lechery and yet enjoying their livings, and also having their mouths open and not stopped nor forbidden to preach. I know also some that have said mass divers years since it was prohibited, and upon their examination confessed the same, yet are in quiet possession of their ecclesiastical promotions. I know double-beneficed men that do nothing but eat, drink, sleep, play at dice-tables, and read service in the church, but teach nothing at all."

So, too, in our land are found similar "successors of the apostles," whose energies are devoted to undermining the small remains of Protestantism in their communion, and supplanting these by one Romish element after another. The first step from Puritanism is the first step to Romanism. The learned Sismondi declares the

truth: "Geneva has been the champion of double liberty, civil and religious; of English liberty, wise and powerful at the same time; progressive, and yet conservative."

The infidel Hume, with all his hatred of the Puritan character, was yet compelled to pay them the following glorious tribute: "So absolute was the authority of the crown that the precious spark of liberty had been kindled, and was preserved by the Puritans alone, and it was to this sect the English owe the whole freedom of their constitution." The whole freedom of the English constitution due to the Puritans! And the freedom of the American constitution due to the Puritans! (using the term in its popular acceptance.) This, of itself, were sufficient to invest the name *Puritan* with imperishable honor and glory, by the testimony of their worst enemies! Let those who enjoy, or ever enjoyed, the blessings of civil and religious liberty beware how they defame the character of those heroic men who, at such costly sacrifice of treasure and blood, spread the table at which they are gratuitously fed! To bear false witness against any one is disgraceful. But to bear false witness against a benefactor—to slander the saviours of Liberty, the fathers of the state, the patriots of society—is a crime which justly brings upon the wretch the curse of a world! And who are the men that are thus reviled and calumniated? Milton, Owen, Howe, Edwards, Charnock, Bates, Baxter, Hampden, Sidney, and a host of other worthies, among the most illustrious names that adorn the annals of literature, and the brightest stars that illumine the political firmament! What a splendid galaxy of genius and worth! Names, endowments, achievements, sacrifices, devotion to principle, that have made the name *Puritan* "a title of intellectual and moral nobility"! Not a ray the less, no paling the brightness of their glory, when the dogs of earth bay the stars of heaven!

They have been charged with intolerance; but it was the treatise of an illustrious Puritan, John Owen, Vice-Chancellor of Oxford University, which imbued the civilized world of that age with the principles of toleration that now obtain. The credit is by many given to the writings of John Locke, the philosopher; but it is forgotten (if ever known) that John Locke was a student under John Owen, and imbibed his master's principles and embalmed

them in his essays.¹ It is true that certain offenses were then deemed cognizable by the civil law which are not so considered now. Witches were hung in New England. So were they in Old England. The great and good Sir Matthew Hale did this. No purer name adorns the annals of jurisprudence. It was owing to the doctrine which then universally prevailed, the relation of the magistrate to the first table of the decalogue: a doctrine, be it understood, which has never yet been settled, which in our day has been revived, and which is undergoing a keen discussion now, both in Europe and in this country. That the Puritans were the *victims* of intolerance no student of history will venture to deny. Their enemies "had no patience with them," as the jail, the sword, the axe and the fagot will testify in thousands of instances. The following inscription was put upon the coffin of one who perished in prison: "This is the corpse of Roger Rippon, servant of Christ, and Her Majesty's faithful subject, who is the last of seventeen which that great enemy of God, the Archbishop of Canterbury, with his high commissioners, have murdered in Newgate within these five years, manifestly for the testimony of Jesus Christ." Take one specimen of the tender mercies of Archbishop Laud. Dr. Alexander Leighton, a Scotch divine and father of Archbishop Leighton, published a book in defence of Presbyterianism and against Prelacy. He was brought into the Star Chamber and sentenced to be pilloried, whipped, his ears cut off, his nose slit, to be branded in the face with a hot iron, fined ten thousand pounds, and then to lie in the Fleet prison for life! When this sentence was pronounced, Laud pulled off his cap and gave God thanks for it! Laud records in his private diary, with great gusto, how literally the sentence was executed, and adds: "On that day seven nights his sores upon his back, ears, nose and face being not yet cured, he was whipped again at the pillory in Cheapside and had the remainder of his sentence executed upon him, by cutting off the other ear, slitting the other side of his nose, and branding the

¹ The teachings of the Confession of Faith on liberty of conscience were well known throughout the kingdom long before Jeremy Taylor's essay appeared. And of what value were the *theoretical* sentiments of a man whose *practice* was in notorious and painful contrast with his oily sentimentalism?

other cheek." He was then carried back to prison, where he continued in close confinement ten years, until released by the Long Parliament.

"The noble army of martyrs praise thee!" But to that noble army episcopacy contributes none, save the victims of its satanic cruelty. Episcopacy has no martyrs. How could it have any? To point to Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer is to betray ignorance of their writings and principles, which plainly shew that, though nominally in her, they were not of her, and that it was their anti-Episcopal principles which brought them to the stake. Bishop Hooper states that, in the year 1550 (previous to the revisal of the articles), Archbishop Cranmer was sincerely bent on advancing the purity of doctrine, agreeing in all things with the Helvetic churches, which were strictly Calvinistic. Cranmer not only maintained a close correspondence with the Genevan reformer, and consulted him on every important step of the English Reformation, but communicated to him his plan of a common confession for all the Reformed churches, of which Calvin expressed his high approbation.¹ Knox, whose sentiments were thoroughly Calvinistic, was one of the persons employed in reviewing the articles. The Puritans, who were decidedly of the same sentiments, never expressed the smallest scruple about the doctrinal articles, and the English dissenters continued to subscribe them until 1779.

The Puritan ministers, pursued by Laud and his followers, harassed, persecuted, hunted by these hell-hounds from one diocese to another, turned their thoughts to the wilds of America. "The Puritans," says Hume, "shipped themselves off to America, and laid there the foundations of a government which possessed all the liberty, both civil and religious, of which they found themselves bereaved in their native country. But their enemies, unwilling that they should anywhere enjoy ease and contentment, and dreading, perhaps, the consequences of so disaffected a colony, prevailed on the king to issue a proclamation debarring these devotees access even into these inhospitable deserts." Let this testimony of an enemy, and an infidel, forever settle the question as to the true motives which brought the Puritans to these shores.

¹ See Burnet's History, and Strype's Cranmer.

Nor did they escape persecution even here, in some of the colonies. The first Presbyterian minister who preached in the city of New York, Francis Makemie, was, for no other crime than preaching the gospel and administering baptism to a child, seized and thrust into prison in New York; nor was he suffered to depart till there had been extorted from him a sum equal to all the fees and expenses of his prosecution, amounting to between two and three hundred dollars.

The Hon. Archibald D. Murphy, in his oration at the University of North Carolina, in 1827, said: "Religious intolerance drove from England a great number of Presbyterians, Quakers and others, who sought refuge in the Virginia colony. They there soon met with the same persecution which had driven them from their native country. They were compelled to leave the colony; and Providence directing their course through the wilderness, they settled near Pasquotank and Perquimans, and formed the germ of the Carolina colony. A civil government was established purely representative, a circumstance to which may be attributed, in a great degree, the republican feelings and opinions which soon characterized the colony, and which led to the plan of civil polity under which we now live. When the Lords Proprietors discovered that the colony was likely to become numerous and powerful, they endeavored to restrain the civil and religious liberty they had promised to emigrants. They established a new form of government, declaring their object to be to make the government of the colony agree as nearly as possible with the monarchy of which it was a part, and to avoid erecting a numerous democracy. The plan failed. The prosperity of the colony declined, public morals relaxed, the laws lost their energy, a general spirit of discontent grew up and ripened into rebellion, the governors became corrupt and the people idle and vicious. The plan was then abolished. Two factions then arose: one that wished to establish a high-toned prerogative government; the other consisted of high churchmen, who gained the ascendancy, and by their violence brought the government into contempt. Their object was to deprive all dissenters of the right of suffrage, to curtail their civil rights, and render their situation so oppressive as to compel them to leave the

colony. A party of French Huguenots had emigrated to the colony, to enjoy that liberty of conscience and of worship which was denied to them in their native country. These people, entitled by their sufferings no less than by their Protestantism to the friendship and hospitality of the colonists, were treated with a cruelty that disgraced the high-church party. Being aliens, they were incapable of holding lands until they were naturalized; and this party, having the ascendancy in the Assembly, not only refused to naturalize them, but declared their marriages by ministers not ordained by Episcopal bishops illegal, and their children illegitimate! The progress of this violent, persecuting spirit was checked by the wise and conciliating measures adopted by Governor Archdale, a Quaker."

The London Nonconformist says: "It is long since we found that the most intolerant of all churchmen are the so-called broad-churchmen, whose sentimental charity is beautiful, but who hate with a viciousness that exceeds the most vicious of all the ordinary theological sects."

The spirit of prelacy is one and the same in all ages. It is not dead, but sleepeth. Let it have power, and it will proceed to the same monstrous extremes now as then. Well said Rutherford: "*Prelacy is the nest and the egg to hatch and bring forth popery,*" that gigantic satanic conspiracy against the theocracy of the Lord Jesus Christ and the liberties of the world. Pope Innocent III. acted in keeping with the system when he excommunicated the barons who wrested *magna charta* from King John.

It has been asserted that the famous Maryland Act of Toleration of 1649 was the act of Romanists. This is a mistake. Recent investigation has shown that two-thirds of the legislature which passed that act were Protestants.

It is a true remark, verified by all history, which a Belgian statesman, De Lavaleye, makes in his admirable pamphlet, "Protestantism and Catholicism in their bearing upon the liberty and prosperity of nations": "The Roman religion has not fitted the French to live in freedom, to tolerate each other, and to govern themselves. The true home of the Catholic clergy is Rome, as they themselves announce. They will therefore sacrifice their

country, if need be, to the welfare or to the dominion of the pope, the infallible head of their religion and the representative of God upon earth."

The Abbe Michaud utters the following weighty words: "The Romanism of the present day, so far from being a religion, is only an aggressive and contentious political system, and, in view of the gigantic organization which the Jesuits and Rome are everywhere developing, a religious war is inevitable and even near at hand. For it is to be observed that the Jesuits and Romanists aim not only at universal religious supremacy, but also at supremacy in civil and political matters. 'The temporal,' say they, 'must be subordinate to the spiritual, the state to the church.'"

Ponder well the horrible oath which binds the vassals of Rome: "I, A. B., now in the presence of Almighty God, the blessed Virgin Mary, the blessed Michael the archangel, the blessed St. John Baptist, the holy apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and the saints and sacred host of heaven, and to you, my ghostly father, do declare from my heart, without mental reservation, that his holiness the pope is Christ's vicar-general, and is the true and only head of the Catholic or universal church throughout the earth; and that by the virtue of the keys of binding and loosing, given to his holiness by my Saviour Jesus Christ, he hath power to depose heretical kings, princes, states, commonwealths, and governments, all being illegal without his sacred confirmation, and that they may be safely destroyed; therefore, to the utmost of my power, I shall and will defend this doctrine and his holiness' rights and customs against all usurpers of the heretical authority whatsoever, especially against the now pretended authority and Church of England, and all adherents, in regard that they and she be usurpal and heretical, opposing the sacred mother church of Rome. I do renounce and disown any allegiance as due to any heretical king, prince, or state named Protestant, or obedience to any of their inferior magistrates or officers. I do further declare the doctrines of the Church of England, of the Calvinists, Huguenots, and of others of the name of Protestants, to be damnable, and they themselves are damned and to be damned that will not forsake the same. I do further declare, that I will help, assist and advise all

or any of his holiness' agents, in any place wherever I shall be, in England, Scotland, and in Ireland, or in any other territory or kingdom I shall come to, and do my utmost to extirpate the heretical Protestants' doctrine, and to destroy all their pretended powers, regal or otherwise. I do further promise and declare that, notwithstanding I am dispensed to assume any religion heretical for the propagating of the mother church's interest, to keep secret and private all her agents' counsels from time to time as they intrust me, and not to divulge, directly or indirectly, by word, writing or circumstance whatsoever, but to execute all that shall be proposed, given in charge, or discovered unto me by you, my ghostly father, or by any of this sacred convent. All which I, A. B., do swear by the blessed Trinity, and blessed sacrament which I now am to receive, to perform and on my part to keep inviolably: and do call all the heavenly and glorious host of heaven to witness these my real intentions to keep this my oath. In testimony hereof I take this most holy and blessed sacrament of the Eucharist, and witness the same further with my hand and seal in the face of this holy convent, this — day of —, A. D. —."

Consistently with the above, Cardinal Manning, in behalf of the pope, makes the following claim: "I claim to be the supreme judge and director of the consciences of men, of the peasant who tills the fields, the prince that sits on the throne, of the household that lives in the shade of privacy, *and the legislature that makes laws for kingdoms. I am the sole last supreme judge of what is right.*"

A writer in *The Advent Review* groups a number of striking facts, showing the tactics of the papacy for regaining supremacy. He says: "Wise for her own interests, the Church of Rome has taken into her own hands the education of youth. In some countries partially, in others entirely, she is training young Europe in the principles of the Syllabus. In France she has a staff of not less than 70,000 persons, male and female, engaged in the work of teaching youth. What are these 70,000 doing but binding down France in the chains of the Syllabus? In Italy and Spain the schools are worked mostly by priests and monks. In Belgium, christian brothers teach the boys, and nuns the girls. In South-

ern Germany, the teachers in the schools are mostly clerical ; it is the same in Austria. Here are millions and millions being reared in the Syllabus, being taught as the truth of God that all merely civil laws and civil rulers, so far as they are not in consonance with popish canon law, are moral nullities, and that the pope is the one God-appointed and divine governor of the earth.

“The generation now being so trained, will soon have the affairs of Europe in their hands. They will be the cabinet ministers of monarchs ; the legislators of kingdoms ; the editors of newspapers ; teachers in colleges and schools ; generals in the army ; and, especially, they will form the rank and file of the soldiery which will fight our future campaigns. It was the schools opened in Germany by the Jesuits that furnished the soldiers for the Thirty Years’ War. The same tactics are being repeated ; and a new generation, trained in the schools, will soon be seen legislating, writing, preaching, and fighting for the suppression of ‘Naturalism,’ that is, civil liberty, and the subjection of the world to the divine vicegerency of the pope.”

If any should conclude that danger from this source does not threaten America, let them ponder the following facts: A Romish priest in this country said to the Rev. Dr. E. G. Brooks, and by him communicated to *The Christian Statesman* of October 30, 1875: “You Americans are committed by your principles to tolerate us ; but we are bound by our principles not to tolerate you, and under the protection of your toleration we are certainly traveling to the time when we will upset toleration, and have everything our own way.” *The Shepherd of the Valley*, a Romish paper, made the following declaration (November 22, 1851, and August 6, 1853): “If the Catholics ever gain, which they surely will do, an immense numerical superiority, religious freedom in this country is at an end. So say our enemies, and so we believe.” The editor of *The Western Watchman* (St. Louis), “Father” Phelan, says: “Protestantism ! We would draw and quarter it ! We would impale it, and hang it up for crows’ nests ! We would tear it with pincers, and fire it with hot irons ! We would fill it with molten lead, and sink it in hell-fire a hundred fathoms deep !”

Tantæ-ne iræ animis celestibus ?

This is just the logical terminus of their principles. And their boast is, that *they never change*. When we consider their perfect organization, and that the vote of the entire body is always an unit, and that in several States they hold the balance of power, and are courted by all parties, and large sums of money are annually paid to them out of state treasuries, as to an established religion, we see just cause of apprehension. Unprincipled politicians refuse to commit themselves in favor of any reform (such, for instance, as the Bible in our public schools) which, in the most indirect way, implies an opposition to Romish claims. No patriot can countenance, directly or indirectly, a system which is the deadliest enemy to the highest earthly interests of man!

Such was Washington's opinion of popery. The Address to the people of Great Britain, from the delegates appointed by the General Congress, held at Philadelphia in 1774, to represent the grievances of the American colonies, contains the following remarkable paragraph representing their opinion of the dangerous principles of the Church of Rome. The number of delegates was fifty-two, and included the names of Washington, Lee, Chase, Livingston, etc. After complaining of being deprived of trial by jury, of their ports being blockaded, their charters being destroyed, and of an act being passed to protect and indemnify such as might be guilty even of murder in endeavoring to carry their oppressive edicts into execution, the Address goes on to state: "And by another act, the Dominion of Canada is to be so extended, modelled, and governed, as that by being disunited from us and detached from our interests by civil as well as by religious prejudices, that by their members daily travelling with Catholic emigrants from Europe, and by their devotion to an administration so friendly to their religion, they might become formidable to us, and, on occasion, be fit instruments in the hands of power to reduce the ancient free Protestant colonies to the same state of slavery as themselves. . . . They are now the subjects of an arbitrary government, deprived of trial by jury, and where imprisoned cannot claim the *habeas corpus* act, that great bulwark and palladium of English liberty; nor can we suppress our astonishment that a British parliament should ever consent to establish in that country

a religion that has deluged your island in blood, and dispensed impiety, bigotry, persecution, murder and rebellion through every part of the world!"—*The Political Censor or Monthly Review*, Philadelphia, 1796.

Could the Father of his Country have been present again in Philadelphia, September, 1887, at the Centennial of the American Constitution, would he have "suppressed his astonishment" at witnessing the chief of a community of traitors selected to preside over the religious exercises of that august occasion? What emotions of grief and indignation would have overwhelmed him, on beholding the foremost place, with an audacity characteristic of his seditious sect, claimed by and assigned to the representative of "*a religion that has deluged in blood*" many lands, and "*dispensed impiety, bigotry, persecution, murder, and rebellion through every part of the world*"!! This persecutor of church and state, which has shed the blood of fifty millions of martyrs! If this astounding insult offered to the memory of Washington and his fellow-patriots, the illustrious founders of our republic, fail to arouse the American people and cause them to rebuke and thwart the usurpations of a foreign despot, then are they fitted to be his abject slaves! Retributive history will stamp upon the centennial commemoration of the American constitution, as an ineffaceable blot, the name, *Cardinal Gibbons*.

If the proposed "law ordering the expulsion of dangerous aliens" be enacted, as it should be, consistency, justice, public safety require that it should sweep out of America the entire body of the Romish clergy.¹

We have said, that to the writings of John Owen the civilized world is largely indebted for the dissemination of the principles of toleration. But this was in no sense a discovery of his, for even in the writings of the earliest Reformers, notably Zwingle, the principle may be found stated and vindicated with all the clear-

¹ The immortal Milton, "the champion and martyr of English liberty," as well as "the glory of English literature," the bold defender of the freedom of the press, the rights of conscience and the rights of man, gave it as his deliberate opinion, that a christian commonwealth, in consequence of the pope's pretensions to political power and the idolatrous nature of his religious rites, ought not to tolerate his dangerous sect.

ness and force with which Owen has announced it. The Presbyterian Church of Scotland and the Presbyterian Church of Holland were the first, among the churches of the Reformation, to avow and defend the doctrine. Owen was deeply imbued with the spirit of Presbyterianism, and was a diligent student and great admirer of the writings of the learned Rutherford, and declared that he "could readily join with Presbytery as it was exercised in Scotland." The Puritans and Pilgrims, who settled New England, had been nursed in the bosom and had drunk of the spirit of Presbyterian Holland and Geneva before they reached the Rock of Plymouth, and from the first their institutions partook of the Presbyterian form.

The Scottish Bands and Covenants—those imperishable depositories of the principles of ecclesiastical and civil liberty, conservators of the rights of church and state—were both religious and political, ecclesiastical and national, and as such were subscribed by persons of all ranks and qualities, by ministers of the gospel, nobles, barons, gentlemen, burgesses and commons of all sorts. These Bands and Covenants educated the Scotch and Irish settlers of this country in the principles of liberty, and prepared them for the work to which Providence called them, the achievement of American Independence.¹

It was from these Scottish Bands and Covenants, as embraced in Rushworth's Collections, we find that Mr. Jefferson drew largely both sentiments and phrases, as he himself admits. The Hon. Gulian C. Verplanck, of New York, in an address delivered over forty years ago, traced the origin of the Declaration of Independence to the National Covenants of Scotland. And Chief-Justice Tilghman stated that the framers of the American constitution were greatly indebted to the standards of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland. The Hon. William C. Preston said: "It is a most remarkable and singular coincidence, that the constitution of the Presbyterian Church should bear such a close and striking resemblance to the political constitution of our country." The two may be supposed to be formed after the same model. And so, too, we find that a large proportion of the veterans of the Revolution

¹ Mr. Carlyle well observes: "The meaning of the Scotch Covenants was, that God's divine law of the Bible should be put in practice in these nations."

were ministers, officers and members of the Presbyterian Church. James Hall, of North Carolina, assembled his congregation, raised among them a company of cavalry, and took both the command and the chaplaincy. Samuel Houston used his rifle with deadly effect at the battle of Guildford Courthouse. David Caldwell was so conspicuous for his zeal and feared for his influence, that Cornwallis offered a reward of two hundred pounds for his head. These are a few out of many instances of the devotion of the Presbyterian ministry to the cause of their country. Gen. Morgan, who commanded at the Cowpens, was a Presbyterian elder. Gen. Pickens was a Presbyterian elder. Col. Campbell, Col. Williams, Col. Cleaveland, Col. Shelby, Col. Sevier, heroes of King's Mountain, were all Presbyterian elders, and the body of their troops were drawn from Presbyterian settlements. Col. Bratton and Maj. Dickinson were both elders of the Presbyterian church. Maj. Samuel Morrow, who was with Col. Sumpter in four engagements, was for about fifty years a Presbyterian elder. Bishop White states, that during the Revolution "the doors of the far greater number of Episcopal churches were closed for several years." Jacob Douche, an Episcopal minister, was appointed chaplain to Congress in 1776 and officiated for awhile, but he turned traitor to the cause, and wrote a long letter to Gen. Washington urging him to do the same. One Peters, an Episcopal minister, of Connecticut, in the beginning of the Revolution sided with the enemies of his country, and fled from the indignation of his neighbors to England, where this traitor employed his time in preparing and publishing a miserable fabrication, slandering his countrymen and his own ancestors, which he called "The Blue Laws of Connecticut," which some persons confidently believe actually had a place in the statutes of that colony!!

Dr. Inglis, the Tory rector of Trinity church, New York, only did the Presbyterian body simple justice when he wrote in October, 1776: "I do not know one Presbyterian minister, nor have I been able, after strict inquiry, to hear of any who did not, by preaching and every effort in their power, promote all the measures of the Colonial Congress, however extravagant." The Hon. Mr. Read, a distinguished Episcopalian, candidly acknowledges that

“patriotic clergymen of the Established Church were the exceptions, whilst a Presbyterian loyalist was a thing unheard of,” and adds: “The debt of gratitude which independent America owes to the dissenting clergy and laity can never be paid.”

It becomes us to remember ever that an illustrious Presbyterian ancestry, here in this section, applied the principles of their republican church to found their republican state; that in the ancient town of Charlotte, long years ago, a heroic band of Presbyterians planted in that soil the seed of that mighty oak whose wide-spreading branches extend from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and under whose protection all denominations enjoy perfect security, none daring to molest or to make them afraid!

The time-honored Mecklenburg Convention of May 20, 1775, was the offspring of Presbyterianism! One of the historians of North Carolina justly observes: “The principles, the creed of Puritanism, under whose influence human society has so happily been developed, are the principles of civil and religious liberty that struck deep in the soil of Carolina, and sent their vigorous shoots into the valley of the Mississippi.” Of the members of that immortal Convention one was a Presbyterian minister, nine were Presbyterian elders, one of whom, Abraham Alexander, was the chairman, and all were in some way connected with the seven congregations that embraced the whole county of Mecklenburg. They were a band of heroes, who first of all, in the defence of the liberties of their country, “pledged to each other their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor!” They have rendered historic and invested with renown the names of Alexander, Brevard, Davidson, Caldwell, Graham, McDowell, Polk, Avery, Phifer, Reese and Balch.

History justifies the declaration of Mr. Bancroft: “The first voice publicly raised in America to dissolve all connection with Great Britain came, not from the Puritans of New England, nor the Dutch of New York, nor the planters of Virginia, but from the *Scotch-Irish Presbyterians of North Carolina.*”

It was the speech of Dr. John Witherspoon, a Presbyterian minister, president of Princeton College, which decided a wavering Congress to subscribe the Declaration of Independence. When

Congress hesitated to pass the Rubicon, Dr. Witherspoon arose and said: "There is a tide in the affairs of men, a nick of time; we perceive it now before us. To hesitate is to consent to our slavery. That noble instrument upon your table, which insures immortality to its author, should be subscribed to this very morning by every pen in the house. He that will not respond to its accents, and strain every nerve to carry into effect its provisions, is unworthy the name of *freeman*. For my own part, of property I have some, of reputation more. That reputation is staked, that property is pledged, on the issue of this contest. And although these gray hairs must soon descend into the sepulchre, I would infinitely rather they should descend thither by the hands of the public executioner than desert at this crisis the sacred cause of my country!" Such was the appeal which decided that Congress, and ushered into existence the American republic.

And yet there are those who would rob Presbyterianism of its right to its own offspring, and who claim to share the honor and glory of its achievement. Despite the teachings of philosophy, that the civil must follow the spiritual and partake of its genius and form, despite the plain, indisputable facts of history, despite the admissions of the candid and honorable of other denominations, and even of infidels, these luminaries of our day have discovered that the credit is due to no one denomination or class or section or State, but to *the spirit of the age*, to which infidels as well as christians contributed!

This is one of those convenient generalities in which ignorance finds a fancied refuge. What caused *the spirit of the age*, or did it originate uncaused? Thomas Paine himself asserts that "independence was a doctrine scarce and rare, even towards the conclusion of the year 1775." According to Thomas Paine, then, *the spirit of the age* was averse to independence till the close of 1775. And yet Mecklenburg had declared her independence months before! Paine's *Common Sense* was not issued until January, 1776, and was itself the offspring of a suggestion of Dr. Benjamin Rush, who was brought up under the Rev. Samuel Finley, afterwards president of Princeton College. So that what was really valuable in Paine's *Common Sense* was due to *the*

Presbyterian spirit of the age, to which Mecklenburg was the first to contribute seven months before! ¹

No claim has been, nor could be, put forth by the Methodist denomination to a share in originating American Independence. The followers of Mr. Wesley were influenced by him and were obedient to his dictation. Hear his announcement: "All the Methodists there were firm for the government." Dr. Bangs, a Methodist, says of Mr. Wesley's preachers: "They all returned to their native land, except Asbury." And *he*, it was reported, hid among the Tories of Delaware! Will any follower of Mr. Wesley dispute his words? If, then, according to the assertion of one of them, "it was not Presbyterianism, but *the spirit of the age*, that effected independence," how did it happen that *the spirit of the age* did not reach the disciples of Wesley? A more damaging plea could not have been put forth! Wesley's preachers fled the

¹ It has been proved that Paine wrote in defence of American liberty *before* he became an infidel. His "*Common Sense*" and "*Crisis*" constantly appeal to Scripture to sustain their positions. Thus:

"As the exalting one man so greatly above the rest cannot be justified on the equal rights of nature, so neither can it be defended on the authority of Scripture, for the will of the Almighty, as declared by Gideon and the prophet Samuel, expressly disapproves of government by kings."—*Common Sense*.

"We claim brotherhood with every European *christian*, and triumph in the generosity of the sentiment."—*Ibid*.

"As individuals we profess ourselves *christians*."—*Crisis*.

"I look on the various denominations among us to be like children of the same family, differing only in what is called their christian names."—*Common Sense*.

Not until some years later did he avow infidel sentiments. And no word or act of his can be cited in favor of American liberty, or anything else that was good, after he renounced christianity and published his detestable books against the Bible. In 1796 he published a vile effusion, vilifying Washington thus: "As to you, sir, treacherous in private friendship (for so you have been to me, and that in the day of danger), and a hypocrite in public life, the world will be puzzled to decide whether you are an *apostate* or an *impostor*; whether you have abandoned good principles, or whether you ever had any." Addicted to beastly habits, his career ended in poverty, shame and misery. The following epitaph was written for his tombstone while he was yet living:

"Here lies Tom Paine, who ably wrote in
Liberty's defence,
But in his 'Age of Reason' lost his
'Common Sense.'"

country in such haste that *the spirit of the age* could not overtake them!

To Roger Williams and his Baptist associates, it is claimed, belongs, preëminently, the glory of having first on this continent asserted and vindicated the most unlimited principles of civil and religious liberty. Mr. Bancroft says of him: "He was the first person in modern Christendom to assert, in its plenitude, the doctrine of liberty of conscience, the equality of opinions before the law." He has been extolled again and again as a martyr of liberty, his banishment from the colony of Massachusetts (1636 or 1637) being attributed to his devotion to a sacred principle which all good men everywhere now venerate. It is not a pleasant office to spoil a beautiful romance, but the claims of truth require it. And that all this is nothing but a romance, a recent investigation of all the original documents by a distinguished divine of Boston, Dr. Dexter, conclusively shows.

In the first place, Roger Williams's views of the magistrate's power over the bodies and outward state of men only, were not peculiar to him, but were held by men who preceded him and who were every way superior to him, and who held these views without being disturbed; nor was he banished on account of them. But his offenses were these: 1, Proclaiming continually the invalidity of the charter of the colony; that the king's patent was void; that the colonists had no just titles to their lands; that it was a sin to hold them. 2, Proclaiming the unlawfulness of the oath, as being needless to christians and a profanation of the name of God on the part of the unregenerate. He went up and down the colony preaching these seditious doctrines, unsettling the minds of some, and thus doing what he could to undermine the government and subvert the foundations of society. He was repeatedly remonstrated with, but all to no purpose, for although he recanted and professed to be penitent and promised amendment, he broke his promises. He was at length brought to trial for these two crimes, and this it was which procured his sentence of banishment. Respecting his trial, he says: "I acknowledge the particulars were rightly summed up."

In the second place, as to his toleration, "being too tolerant

for the times, etc.," nothing could be further from the fact. He was one of the most intolerant of men. He endeavored to draw off his church from communion with all others, and then refused to commune with his own church because it would not break off communing with all others in the Bay, and refused to commune with his wife because she still attended the meetings at his church. He also taught that it was a sin for women to appear in public, and especially to be present at church, without being veiled. We find that Dr. Cotton Mather, in his *Magnalia*, describes Roger Williams "as a man that had a wind-mill in his head," and speaks of his "quixotism," and represents him as "a preacher that had less light than fire in him."

In the third place, all this occurred whilst Roger Williams was a Congregationalist. More than a year elapsed after his banishment before he joined the Baptists. So that, if any glory belongs to this so-called "martyr of liberty" because of his banishment, this glory of their pet hero Baptists cannot share!

Dr. Mather describes also the disturbances wrought by the Quakers, who declared "the Bible to be the word of the devil," and wrote and published pamphlets "against all earthly powers, parliaments, laws, charters, magistrates and princes," "denying any government to be God's ordinance, but that of those who witness to their light within, and calling every other government, consisting of rulers, judges, justices, lawyers and constables, a tree that must be cut down, for the light alone to rule." "I appeal," says he, "to all the reasonable part of mankind, whether the infant colonies of New England had not cause to guard themselves against these dangerous villains." But yet he does not favor the magistrate's proceeding against them.

This historical investigation, with this survey of the denominations, is made for the purpose of illustrating the principle that civil organizations are moulded by ecclesiastical; that scriptural doctrines can be preserved only by a scriptural polity, which is essential to the freedom of the church; and that the freedom of the church only can secure the freedom of the state. If, then, we claim for Presbyterianism that it is the bulwark of civil and religious liberty, the guardian of man's dearest rights and interests

in the church and state, this is not done in the spirit of vain-glorious boasting over others, but simply because these specified conditions are found in it. The effect follows from the cause. And let it be observed, that what we claim has been freely conceded by those who do not belong to us; yea, the confession has been extorted even from infidels, the bitter foes of christianity. Presbyterianism, embodying the institutions of the gospel more faithfully and fully than any other system, is found profitable for the life that now is, as well as for that which is to come. She spreads her table of privilege and blessing, and invites all freely to partake. But however welcome the guests, none are allowed to insult the host by claiming the entertainment as their own. Although good service was done by some distinguished soldiers and officers not of our communion, yet the movement was Presbyterian as to its origin, inception and successful result. General Washington knew whereof he affirmed, when, in one of the darkest hours of the Revolution, he declared that, if compelled to abandon every other position, he was assured that he could make a final and successful stand among the *Scotch-Irish* of Augusta county, Virginia.

If to the people of Mecklenburg county, N. C., providence assigned the foremost position in the ranks of patriots over a century ago, let them never cease to cherish and to hallow the memory of that illustrious hero who prepared them for it at so great toil and pains, and diligently for years and years sowed the seed that produced the glorious harvest. No ordinary work was given him to do, and no ordinary training and discipline fitted him for it. Deeply imbibing the spirit of the Scottish Covenants, contending earnestly for the "descending obligations" of those Covenants upon all whose ancestors were parties to the same; insisting upon making the adoption of the Solemn League and Covenant a term of communion for church members in the colonies as well as in the mother country; testifying continually to the headship of Christ over the state, and the responsibility of all kings and rulers to him, a failure of whose allegiance to him would forfeit the allegiance of the people to them; proclaiming everywhere these grand old doctrines with a fidelity and a courage and a zeal and a constancy that ought to have secured sympathy and commanded admiration:

instead of this, he experienced the usual fate of those who are in advance of the age. He was opposed, resisted, denounced as an extremist, an ultra reformer, calumniated as an agitator, and even censured by the General Synod of the Presbyterian Church! It was not until he came to North Carolina that he found a congenial element which he could mould and train successfully in devotion to principles, bearing fruit in splendid achievements, the glory of the ages.

To the immortal Craighead, a Presbyterian minister of Ireland, who settled in Mecklenburg in 1766, "the only minister between the Yadkin and the Catawba," who found in North Carolina, what Pennsylvania and Virginia denied him, sympathy with the patriotic views he had been publicly proclaiming since 1741; to this apostle of liberty the people of Mecklenburg are indebted for that training which placed them in the forefront of American patriots and heroes. It was at this fountain that Dr. Ephraim Brevard and his honored associates drew their inspirations of liberty. So diligent and successful was the training of this devoted minister and patriot, so far in advance even of the Presbyterians of every other colony had he carried the people of this and the adjacent counties, that on the very day (May 20, 1775) on which the General Synod of the Presbyterian Church, convened in Philadelphia, issued a pastoral letter to all its churches, counselling them whilst defending their rights by force of arms to stand fast in their allegiance to the British throne, on that day the streets of Charlotte were resounding with the shouts of freemen, *greeting the first Declaration of American Independence!*

A retributive providence, slow but sure, is now vindicating the memory of Christ's faithful witness and his country's greatest benefactor. The names of his detractors have passed into oblivion or have encountered the odium they fastened upon his, but the clouds of prejudice and passion which dimmed his fair fame have all been swept away, and with a glorious lustre, that shall brighten and brighten with the centuries to come, shines forth the honored, thrice-honored, name of ALEXANDER CRAIGHEAD!

Let the people of this and the adjacent counties, as well as his numerous descendants, let the Presbyterian host in these United

States, guard well, as a sacred trust, the elevated principles of this illustrious covenant, the most enlightened, consistent and devoted patriot of the age, justly entitled to the preëminent distinction: "THE *Father of his Country!*" Let them cleave to that ancient faith which is consecrated by the blood of a thousand martyrs! Let them not sacrifice one tittle of their glorious inheritance! Let them stand fast to the altars that are hallowed by the blood of their fathers! Let them stand fast to the sanctuaries that enshrine their honored dust! Let them stand fast to those pure and noble truths of doctrine and of order bequeathed by a heroic ancestry, in which they lived and for which they died! Let them stand fast in all the liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free!

A. W. MILLER.

Charlotte, N. C.

VI. THE PERILS OF EXCESSIVE INDIVIDUALISM.

Republican institutions emphasize the intrinsic dignity of man; representative government illustrates vividly his privileges, independent of all accidents of birth or circumstance; popular suffrage exercises the free and equal rights of all most practically. Such emphasis, illustration, and exercise of personal right, offer opportunity of exaggeration; it cannot be but that in the very nature of these things there must lie the latent possibility of a tendency toward such aggrandizement of personal importance as may, under some circumstances, grow to a dangerous because excessive individualism, a self-assertion aggressive and impatient of restraint.

This inherent tendency has had in the last several decades of our history certain influences eminently favorable to the development of the dangerous results referred to, among which may be mentioned: the unusual enlargement of suffrage; an enlargement in the extent and suddenness of it unprecedented, even the removal of every barrier and limit, the immediate and comprehensive destruction of every restraint and safeguard hitherto thrown around