

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER IV.

~~1847.~~
MARCH, 1848.

ARTICLE I.

LECTURES ON FOREIGN CHURCHES, *delivered in Edinburgh and Glasgow, May, 1845, in connection with the objects of the Free Church of Scotland.* FIRST SERIES. *Edinburgh, 1845.*

LECTURES ON FOREIGN CHURCHES. SECOND SERIES. *Edinburgh, 1846.*

The first series of these lectures is by the Rev. Drs. Candlish, Wilson, and McFarlane; and the Rev. Messrs. Thomas McCrie, Robert W. Stewart, Wm. K. Tweedie, and J. G. Lorimer.

The subjects are as follows:

I. The Mutual Relations of the Churches of Christ.

II. The Independent Eastern Churches.

III. The Ancient History of the Waldensian Church.

IV. The present condition and future prospects of the Waldensian Church.

V. The Religious History of Holland and Belgium since the Reformation.

VI. Past and Present State of Evangelical Religion in Switzerland, and especially Geneva.

VII. The Past and Present State of Evangelical Religion in France.

The *Second Series*, contains seven lectures by Messrs. Wilson, Forbes, Fairbairn, Bryce, Tweedie, Hetherington, and Buchanan. Their subjects are:

VOL. I.—No. 4.

1

schema, "to the satisfying of *the flesh*," that is, of the *proud and self-righteous human heart*.

How evident, also, it is that whenever preached to people living under such a system, the Gospel is destined to inevitable and even cruel opposition. We reason *a priori*, that such an apostate and anti-Christian system will rouse itself against the pure truth: and facts justify the reasoning. Witness the present hatred and malice of the Greek clergy against Dr. King, of Athens: and witness, too, the late persecutions against the evangelical Armenians by their Patriarch. But this is a tale not to be entered upon at the conclusion of our article, and so we lay down the pen.

ARTICLE II.

PRESBYTERIANISM—THE REVOLUTION—THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, AND THE CONSTITUTION.

1. *The Superiority of the Calvinistic Faith and the Presbyterian Government. A Discourse*, by Rev. D. K. JUNKIN, A. M. *Easton*, 1844.
2. *Eccelesiastical Republicanism, or the Republicanism, Liberty and Catholicity of Presbytery, in Contrast with Prelacy and Popery.* By Rev. THOMAS SMYTH, D. D. *Boston*, 1843.
3. *Life and Correspondence of President Reed.* By his Grandson, WM. B. REED. *Philadelphia*, 1847. 8vo. 2 vols.
4. *The Baccalaureate Address in Miami University, August, 1842, by Rev. GEORGE JUNKIN, D. D. President, on the Bearings of True Religion upon Republican Government.*

VOL. I.—No. 4.

5

5. *Relative Influence of Presbytery and Prelacy, on Civil and Ecclesiastical Liberty; a Sermon. By Rev. T. V. MOORE, of Carlisle, Penn. Preached by Appointment before the Synod of Philadelphia. Oct. 16th, 1844.*

In a previous article we endeavored to trace the religious element which constituted the germinating and motive principle of the American Revolution, and the basis of its free and tolerant institutions.

Thomas Payne indeed claimed, "that he was not only an efficacious agent in effecting the independence of the colonies; the very prop and stay of the house, but that the Revolution, of which he was in a great measure the parent, led to the discovery of the principles of government."* "He considered himself as a second Columbus, and that as we owe the discovery of the land to the genius of the one, so we are indebted for the principles of government to the researches of the other." We believe, however, with the Hon. Daniel Webster,† that the American Revolution could not have lived a single day under any well founded imputation of possessing a tendency adverse to the Christian religion. Even Jefferson and Franklin, therefore, felt it to be unavoidably necessary, in order to give spirit to the enterprise, and moral heroism to the people, to bring into operation the religious principle. This was the electric power which made men stand erect upon the basis of liberty.

And we believe further, that all the essential principles which lie at the basis of the Government of the United States—the principles of republicanism in contrast with democracy, on the one hand, and an aristocratic sovereignty, on the other—were found in the Jewish Church;‡—were fully developed in the Christian Church;—are clearly and prominently presented in the system of doctrine and government adopted by the Presbyterian Church;—were

* See Life by Cheatham, p. 48, and Rights of Man, Part 2. Mr. Cheatham, however, speaks of him as follows: "As a political writer, celebrated as he has been by the illiterate, for originality, he was original in nothing but *intention*. In the United States, or rather in the colonies, and during the war for Independence, he was a very subordinate retailer of the works of great men in England."

† Bunker Hill Oration, 1825, p. 30.

‡ See Ecclesiastical Republicanism, p. 31, &c. and Professor Wines' Lectures.

maintained and acted upon the Waldenses, (who have always been thorough Presbyterians,) during all their history;—were brought to life, and revived in the reformation of the sixteenth century;—and are illustrated in the modern history of the Presbyterian Church in Europe, in England, and in this country.

The spirit of our Revolution is embodied in the Declaration of Independence, and in the Constitutions of the several States, and of the United States. Our inquiry, therefore, leads us to trace the influences which, in their measure, led to the spirit, form, and character of these productions.

There are two prominent Declarations of Independence—that of Mecklenburgh, issued May 19th, 1775—and the national Declaration, adopted in July, 1776. Between these there has been exhibited a similarity of sentiment, and of phraseology, which *necessarily* leads to the conclusion either that Mr. Jefferson, in writing the latter, was indebted to the former, or that both papers may be traced to a common source, accessible to the authors of both. Such a source is found to exist in the ecclesiastical covenants of Scotland, between which and the Declarations we pointed out a remarkable analogy, not only in their general form and character, but also in their style and language.

The favorable manner in which our argument has been reviewed by many of all denominations—Episcopalian, Methodist, Roman Catholic, as well as Presbyterian—has far exceeded our most sanguine expectations. Still, however, there appears to many to be an utter incompatibility between ecclesiastical and civil Declarations, and the attempt to trace the latter to the former, must, as it appears to such persons, be altogether visionary. In the minds of such individuals—where they are not blinded by sectarian prejudice—these ecclesiastical covenants are associated exclusively with religious matters and persons, and the political Declarations exclusively with political struggles and political leaders.

The truth, however, is, that the religious covenants and bands, to which we have referred, were *political* as well as *religious*—national as well as ecclesiastical; while the latter were as certainly originated and carried forward by the religious principle, and, in good part by the religious men, of the age of American Independence.

The covenants of Scotland were "subscribed by persons of all ranks and qualities, by ordinance of council"—"subscribed" (for their title is thus doubly explicit) by the nobles, barons, gentlemen, burgesses, ministers and commoners." This is the title of the National Covenant of 1638. The "General Band" of 1568 was "subscribed by his Majesty and divers of the estates, and afterwards by persons of all ranks and degrees by an act of council." The General Confession of 1580, bears exactly the same title and declaration. The solemn league and covenant of 1643, and subsequent dates, begins thus: "We noblemen, barons, knights, gentlemen, citizens, burgesses, ministers of the Gospel, commoners of all sorts in the kingdom of Scotland, England, and Ireland"—and has explicit reference to "the true liberty, safety and peace of the kingdom, where every one's private condition is included." Once more, "The solemn acknowledgment of public sins and breaches of the covenant, and a solemn engagement to all the duties contained therein, namely, those which in a more special way relate to the dangers of these times," a paper of considerable length, and eminent ability, adopted in Scotland in 1648, commences in the very same style, and in the name of the very same parties, "within this kingdom," and was "unanimously and heartily approved by the Committee of Estates in Edinburgh, Oct. 14, 1648." Now, in this paper, large reference is made to the fact that "neither have the privileges of the parliaments and liberties of the subject been duly tendered. But, some amongst ourselves have laboured to put into the hands of our king, an arbitrary and unlimited power destructive to both. And many of us have been accessory of late to those means and ways, whereby the freedom and privileges of parliaments have been encroached upon, and the subjects oppressed in their consciences, persons and estates: Neither hath it been our care to avoid these things which might harden the king in his evil ways. But, upon the contrary, he hath not only been permitted, but many of us have been instrumental to make him exercise his power in many things tending to the prejudice of religion and of the covenant, and of the peace and safety of these kingdoms; which is so far from preserving his Majesties' person and authority, that it cannot but provoke the Lord against him, unto the hazard of both.

Nay, under a pretence of relieving and doing for the king, whilst he refuses to do what was necessary for the house of God, some have ranversed and violated most of all the Articles of the Covenant."

The civil and political bearing of these covenants, therefore, and their notoriety, as national and most important acts, is plain and evident, while the influence which they must naturally have had upon public men in this country is equally obvious.

It was against the *double* despotism of the king and royalist party, these acts were framed—a tyranny, the effect of which was "the utter annihilation of all liberty, civil and religious." The civil bearing of these covenants, and the fact that they became *the law of the land*, so far and so long as their *political* adherents were in power, is the true source of that plausible but most unrighteous charge of intolerance, so often made against Presbyterians. Speaking of the Act of Parliament, and of the Committee of Estates in Scotland, in 1644, Mr. Hetherington remarks: "But this, it will be observed, was the act of the civil, not the ecclesiastical authorities in Scotland; and it proceeded mainly upon the principle, that the bond thus enforced was not only a *religious* covenant, but also a *civil* league. It was unfortunate that civil and religious matters should have been so blended, because whatever civil measures were adopted or civil penalties were inflicted, were sure to be unfairly charged against the *religious* element, instead of the *civil*, to which it owed its origin. But even this unpropitious circumstance was forced upon the Covenanters; partly by the fact that the proceedings of the king were equally hostile to civil and to religious liberty, and partly by their unavoidable union, with the English parliament, in which the struggle was even more directly for civil than for religious liberty."

Of the solemn League and Covenant, which was a summary of the preceding and a model for the subsequent covenants, Mr. Hetherington justly says: "It is difficult to conceive how any calm, unprejudiced, thoughtful and religious man can peruse the preceding very solemn document, without feeling upon his mind an over-awing sense of its sublimity and sacredness. The most important of man's interests, for time and for eternity, are included within its ample scope, and made the subjects of a solemn league with each

other, and a sacred covenant with God. Religion, liberty, and peace, are the great elements of human welfare, to the preservation of which it bound the empire; and as those by whom it was framed, knew well that there can be no safety for these in a land where the mind of the community is dark with ignorance, warped by superstition, misled by error, and degraded by tyranny, civil and ecclesiastical, they pledged themselves to seek the extirpation of these pernicious evils. Yet, it was the evils themselves, and not the persons of those in whom those evils prevailed, that they sought to extirpate. Nor was there any inconsistency in declaring that they sought to promote the honour and happiness of the king, while thus uniting in a covenant against the double tyranny which he sought to exercise. For no intelligent person will deny that it is immeasurably more honorable for a monarch to be the king of freemen, than a tyrant over slaves; and that whatsoever promotes the true mental, moral, and religious greatness of a kingdom, promotes also its civil welfare, and elevates the true dignity of its sovereign. This, the mind of Charles was not comprehensive enough to learn, nor wise enough to know, especially as he was misled by the prelatie faction, who, while seeking their own aggrandizement, led him to believe they were zealous only for his glory,—a glory, the very essence of which was the utter annihilation of all liberty, civil and religious. And as this desperate and fatal prelatie policy was well known to the patriotic framers of the solemn league and covenant, they attached no direct blame to the king himself, but sought to rescue him from the evil influence of those by whose pernicious counsels he was misled."

This solemn league and covenant, be it remembered, was first suggested* "when the English Parliament had fallen into great distress by the progress of the royal arms: and they gladly sent to Edinburgh commissioners, with ample powers to treat of a nearer union and confederacy with the Scottish nation. The persons employed, were the Earl of Rutland, Sir William Armyne, Sir Henry Vane the younger, Thomas Hatcher, and Henry Darby, attended by Marshal and Nye, two clergymen of signal authority. In this negotiation, the man chiefly trusted was Vane, who, in

* Hume's History, vol. 6, p. 462. Eng. ed.

eloquence, address, capacity, as well as in art and dissimulation, was not surpassed by any one, even during that age, so famous for active talents. By his persuasion, was framed at Edinburgh, that solemn league and covenant, which effaced all former protestations and vows taken in both kingdoms: and long maintained its credit and authority." So speaks Hume.

From what has been said, it will be seen that the objections to our theory which have been raised by parties of opposite religious views, is founded upon ignorance or forgetfulness of the real nature and origin of the national and religious covenants.

It was the spirit and principles of these covenants, which were embodied and carried out in their application to *civil* and *constitutional* liberty, by the Harringtons, the Sydneys, the Miltons, and the Lockes, from whose immortal writings we have confessedly drawn all that is excellent in our Constitution, and all that is worthy in our practice.* And as we have shewn the indebtedness of the National Declaration of Independence to the Mecklenburgh Declaration, and also to the Scottish Covenants, we will now prove that its principles and language may be found in the writings of Milton and Locke, the former an actual co-worker in the great revolution to which these covenants led, and the latter an inheritor of the principles and spirit to which they gave permanency and strength.

TABULAR VIEW of *Mr. Jefferson's Declaration, in comparison with the language of Locke and Milton.*

MR. JEFFERSON'S DECLARATION.

"Prudence, indeed, will dictate, that government should not be changed for light and transient causes, and accordingly, all experience has shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed."

"But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing the same course, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future safety."

LANGUAGE OF LOCKE AND MILTON.

"It is true, men may stir whenever they please, but it will be only to their own just ruin and perdition, for until the evil be grown general, and the evil designs of the rulers become visible, the people, who are more disposed to suffer than to right themselves by resistance, are not apt to stir."—Locke of Government, vol. 5, p. 474–5. Lond., 1801.

But, if a long train of abuses, prevarications and artifices, all tending the same way, make the design visible to the people, and they cannot but feel what they lie under and see whither they are going, it is not to be wondered at that they should then rouse themselves, and endeavour to put the rule into such hands, which may secure to them the ends for which government was first erected."—Locke of Government, vol. 5, p. 472. Lond. 1801.

* See Cheatham's Life of Paine, p. 50.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness: that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; and that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundations on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

Speaking of "reason and free inquiry," Mr. Jefferson says: "Give a loose to them, they will support the true religion, by bringing every false one to their tribunal, to the test of their investigation: they are the natural enemies of error, and of error only."—Notes on Virginia, p. 236, New York, 1801.

"Men being, as has been said, by nature, all free, equal, and independent, no one can be put out of his estate, and subjected to the political power of another without his consent. It is true, that whatever engagements or promises one has made for himself, he is under the obligation of them, but cannot by any compact whatever, bind his children or his posterity; for his son, when a man, being altogether as free as his father, an act of his father can no more give away the liberty of his son than it can of any body else."

And though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so truth be in the field, we do injuriously to misdoit her strength. Let her and falsehood grapple,—who ever knew truth put to the work in a free and open encounter?—Milton's speech for the liberty of unlicensed printing, works vol. 1, p. 326. Lond. 1806.

It is thus made manifest that the ecclesiastical covenants referred to, were of such a public and national character, as to influence national opinion and lead to open avowal of sentiments similar to those embodied in our American Declarations.

But from what has been advanced, it may now be thought that these ecclesiastical documents, whatever may be their importance, are to be attributed to *political*, rather than to *religious* sources. We are led, therefore, to remark, that while these covenants were *adopted* by the political authorities in both the kingdoms of England and Scotland, they were originated, framed, drawn up, and presented by the ministers and ruling elders of the Church of Scotland. The earlier covenants were framed by Knox and his associates. The National Covenant was the production of Alexander Henderson,—the John Knox of what is known as the second reformation in Scotland. It was* "on the 23d and 24th of February, the Presbyterians, now wonderfully increased in numbers, met in Edinburgh, in defiance of the proclamation. Here they seriously considered the alarming situation in which they were now placed by their opponents. It was recommended, with great affection, by Henderson, that all their hearts should be strongly united one to another, in a bond of union and communion. He said, that as they were now declared outlaws and rebels by

* See Dr. Aiton's Life of Henderson, p. 264.

their sovereign, they should join in covenant with their God, and avow their obedience to him as their protector; for he alone would save them from the present and all such evils. As they were not assembled mutinously by one, or a few, but by God and a good cause, he recommended that all, in a conjunct motion, nobility, gentry, burgesses, ministry, and people should now renew the covenant which was subscribed by their forefathers, in the year 1550, with such additions as the corruptions of the times required, and such Acts of Parliament as were in favor of true religion. The idea was not only at once adopted by the meeting, but sounded like an alarm-bell throughout the kingdom. To that effect, Henderson and Johnson were appointed to frame a Confession of Faith, and Rothes, London, and Balmerino, were requested to revise it. By way of preparing the minds of the people for it, Sunday was appointed as a fast, and Dickson, Rollock, Adamson, and Ramsay, were desired to preach, and to accommodate their sermons to the circumstances. It was also suggested by Rothes, that a voluntary contribution should be raised, for putting the zeal of every one to the test, and defraying the common charges which the business might require. Next day, (Sunday,) the ministers in the stern, yet affectionate eloquence of the times, called on the people to descend into themselves, and thoroughly to search their own hearts, and their consciences would tell them, that they had broken their covenant with the Lord, and brought his wrath on the land. They were urged, at great length, seriously to repent, as the only means for obtaining the special favour of the Most High; and many precedents for renewing their covenants were pointed out from Old Testament history. The minds of the populace had been long and warmly excited, and it may well be conceived, that the hearts of all of them reëchoed the sentiments of the preachers. On Monday, (26th,) the three noblemen met in the morning, to receive from Henderson and Johnson the draught of the covenant; but they were told that, notwithstanding the utmost diligence, it could not be ready before Tuesday.

Wednesday, the 28th day of February, 1638, was a proud day for Henderson, and one of the most memorable mentioned in the history of that period. By this time the Presbyterians had crowded to Edinburgh, to the number of

sixty thousand; and to give all solemnity to the occasion, a fast had been appointed to be held in the Church of the Greyfriars. All were astir by the morning's dawn; the Commissioners of Barons were early met, and about half-past eight, Rothes and London joined them. Long before the appointed hour, the venerable Church of the Greyfriars, and the large open space around it, were filled with Presbyterians from all parts of Scotland. At two o'clock, Rothes, London, Henderson, Dickson, and Johnston, arrived, with a copy of the Covenant, ready for signature. Henderson constituted the meeting by prayer, "Verrie powerfullie and pertinentlie" to the purpose in hand. London, then, in an impressive speech, stated the occasion of their meeting. After mentioning that the courtiers had done every thing in their power to effect a division among the Presbyterians, and when thus weakened, to introduce innovation, and that they should therefore use every lawful mean for keeping themselves together in a common cause, he said that in a former period, when Papal darkness was enlightened only from the flaming faggot from the martyr's stake, the first reformers swore in covenant to maintain the most blessed word of God, even unto the death. In a later period, when apprehensions were entertained of the restoration of Popery, King James, the nobles, and people throughout every parish subscribed another covenant, as a test of their religious principles. The covenant now about to be read, had a similar object in view, and had been agreed to by the commissioners. In conclusion, he, in their name, solemnly took the Searcher of Hearts to witness, that they intended neither dishonor to God, nor disloyalty to the King. The covenant was next read by Johnston, "out of a fair parchment, about an elne squair." When the reading was finished there was a pause and silence still as death. Preliminaries occupied till about four o'clock, when the venerable Earl of Sutherland stepped forward, and put the first name to the memorable document. Sir Andrew Murray, minister of Ebby in Fife, was the second who subscribed. After it had gone the rounds of the whole church, it was taken out to be signed by the crowd in the churchyard. Here it was spread before them, like another roll of the prophets, upon a flat grave-stone, to be read and subscribed by as many as could get near it. Many, in addi-

tion to their names, wrote "*Till death*," and some even opened a vein and subscribed with their blood. The immense sheet, in a short time, became so much crowded with names on both sides, throughout its whole space, that there was not space left for a single additional signature. Even the margin was scrawled over; and as the document filled up, the subscribers seem to have been limited to the initial letters of their names. Zeal in the cause of Christ and courage for the liberties of Scotland, warmed every breast." Such was the covenant of 1638.

"The solemn league and covenant"—afterwards adopted by the Westminster Assembly and by the English Parliament and nation,—was also the production of the Rev. Alexander Henderson. When the commissioners from England, in 1643, arrived in Edinburgh, the General Assembly, of which Henderson was Moderator, was then in session, by whom they were received. "The English ministers first held a private conference with Henderson, who stated to the Assembly, that they required to know the most convenient way of dealing with the court. Henderson, Ruth-erford, Dickson, Baillie, Douglas, and Gillespie, as ministers, with Maitland, Angus, and Warriston, as elders, waited upon them to compliment them, and offer them free access as spectators. A loft of the High Church, next the Assembly House, was appointed as a place of conference between them, and the Committee of the Assembly. The Convention of Estates sent a similar Committee, consisting of Balmerino, Argyle, and others."

After long and earnest debates upon their line of conduct, it was agreed that, "as this cause of liberty and religion was dear to them, it was best to enter into a confederacy with Parliament. In the conferences with the Committees, the English argued for a *civil* league, and the Scots for a *religious* covenant. The English tried, in a covert way, to keep an open door for Independency, while the Scots were equally eager to keep it shut. After a time of much painful discussion, Henderson was appointed to frame a draught of the well known solemn league and covenant of the three kingdoms.

From the private conferences, Henderson carried this important document to the Assembly, on the 17th of August, 1643. Henderson recommended it to their favorable recep-

tion, by a long and splendid oration. It was publicly read, and received with the greatest applause, says Ballie, "I ever saw, and with hearty affection, expressed in tears of pity and joy, by many grave, wise, and old men." It was then read the second time, and many of the most eminent ministers and lay elders were desired to deliver their opinions about it, who did all magnify it highly, and although the King's Commissioner pressed a delay till, at least, it was communicated to the King, yet the approving of it was put to the vote and carried unanimously; and it was ordered that Maitland, (afterwards Duke of Lauderdale,) Henderson, and Gillespie should carry it up to Westminster. From the Assembly it was instantly sent to the Convention of Estates, and in the afternoon of the same day it was passed with the most cordial unanimity.

The *religious* origin of these national covenants of Scotland and England, is thus incontrovertible, and while, therefore, their political importance renders them the *very probable* models and sources of the American Declarations, their ecclesiastical origin claims for the religious spirit, principles, and conduct of the Puritans and Presbyterians, the glory, under God, of their undoubted inspiration.

In reaffirming this claim, we would again repeat what we have already said, that in tracing to these covenants the original models of the Declarations of American Independence, we have no intention to lead to the conclusion, that in our opinion, these covenants led to the purpose and plan of American Independence, or that no such political declarations would have been framed, had not these ecclesiastical covenants existed. On the contrary, the same spirit prevailing in this country which led to the original framing of those covenants, would have led to the framing of these declarations, in a style and manner of correspondent strength and unction.

But the question before us is a question of *fact*—not as to what *might* have been, but what actually *has* occurred. Here are two separate Declarations, which are unquestionably indebted for many phrases and much of manner—the national to the Mecklenburg—or else both are indebted to *some* common papers of similar character. Which of these conclusions is the true one? This is the question, and the only question—and it is a question altogether distinct from

the literary merit of these papers, or the *primeval* source of that spirit of freedom which they breathe.

Tom Paine says he discovered the principles from which they sprung. Others say that these principles were the native growth of instinctive liberty. We can regard them as the offspring neither of infidelity nor of chance; and having found a religious source from which they may, and probably did, originate, we rejoice in giving that glory to the Bible and to the God of the Bible, which the enemies of both have claimed for themselves.

We have now done with the Declarations of American Independence, and turn our attention to the American Constitution, and to that struggle of opinion and that heroism of feeling which nerved the most loyal and devoted citizens that ever owed allegiance,* to take up arms in defence of their "immemorial rights," and seal their triumphant conquest with the blood of husbands, fathers, and friends.

Speaking of our national independence, Lord Brougham, in his treatise on Political Philosophy,† says, "After a series of extraordinary successes, considering their inadequate resources for military operations, and an uninterrupted display of political wisdom as well as firmness and moderation, they finally threw off the yoke of the mother country, gloriously establishing their own entire independence, and winning for themselves a new Constitution, upon the federal plan, and of the republican form.

"This is perhaps the most important event in the history of our species. Its effects were not confined to America. It animated freemen all over the world to resist oppression. It gave an example of a great people not only emancipating themselves, but governing themselves without either a monarch to control, or an aristocracy to restrain, and it demonstrated, for the first time in the history of the world, contrary to all the predictions of statesmen, and the theories of speculative inquirers, that a great nation when duly prepared for the task, is capable of self-government—in other words, that a purely republican form of government can be founded and maintained in a country of vast extent, and peopled by millions of inhabitants. The principal variations from the British Constitution, were the sub-

* See Cheatham's *Life of Paine*. † London, 1844—p. 329.

stitution of an elective chief magistrate, personally responsible, for one hereditary, and only responsible through his ministers and agents; the upper house being elective like the lower; and the nation consisting of a confederation of republican states, each independent, in many essential particulars, but all combined, as regards foreign relations, under one head, and all governed by a central Legislature, of powers limited by law as to its jurisdiction over each individual member of the Union, though quite absolute as to the general concerns of the whole confederacy, and the federal relations of its component parts. The fundamental principle of the Constitution is, the vesting of the supreme authority, executive and legislative, in the people, to be exercised in every case by their chosen representatives—in no case, except in their elections, by themselves. And this at once distinguishes the great modern republic from all the democracies of ancient times. The representative principle is fully and universally introduced into it, and the people depart completely with all their power to their chosen deputies. It is another, and an essential principle, if indeed it be not involved in the former, that the choice of representatives and a chief magistrate is the only elective function exercised by the people—all civil and military officers, and especially all judicial functionaries being appointed by the executive government."

CONFEDERATION and REPRESENTATION are therefore the two essential principles which lie at the basis of the American Constitution. Now to detail all the points on which the ecclesiastical constitution of the Presbyterian Church develops these principles as its grand, prominent, and most ostensible features, would require a volume, and has been spread out in the work on "Ecclesiastical Republicanism," placed at the head of this article. It would seem as if, in defining the two cardinal features of the American Constitution Lord Brougham were transferring those of the Presbyterian system, both doctrinally and ecclesiastically.

"Wherein," says Mr. Junkin, "does *liberty* consist? I answer in the right use of the principles of *covenant representation* and *imputation* resting upon the principle of *faith* as the only legitimate basis of the whole. That is—where a people, under a social covenant, do, in an enlightened manner and in the fear of God, make and execute

laws and transact their own business by *representatives of their own choice*, they are a free people. Where they are deprived of the privilege of choosing their representatives—i. e. where they are not represented by those in whom they, or a majority of them, have *faith*, they are not a free people. Here then we have the elements of all social government: and the principles of all *practicable* democracy, i. e. *representative republicanism*. And where did we get them? *From the Calvinistic creed*, as clearly deduced from the Book of God. There and there *only*—there *primatively* are they found. There is the doctrine of *covenants*—there the doctrine of *representation* or *vicarious agency*—there the doctrine of *imputation*, and there the vital spirit of them all, the doctrine of *faith*. * * *

A corollary from the statement made is, *that Presbyterian government is the natural and necessary result* of Calvinistic doctrines. The principles of Presbytery are found in the very bosom of this creed. Presbytery is but the natural development, in the external form of the church, of the doctrines of grace which warm her bosom. And for a Calvinistic church to wear any other form of government would be a monstrous development—so monstrous indeed, that the world has never for any great length of time witnessed such a wonder. *No other form of government can naturally grow out of Calvinism*—and although repeated attempts have been made to preserve a union between this faith and other forms of government, none has ever succeeded.*—pp. 22, 23.

In the above volume on Ecclesiastical Republicanism, will be found evidence to shew that in its history, Presbyterianism has ever been found working out the spirit and principles of constitutional, representative, and republican government, and giving impetus to the onward progress of

* It is indeed said that as our ruling elders hold their office permanently, and our ministers are ex-officio members of our session and Presbytery—the analogy fails. But in our view, it is by these very circumstances rendered more complete. "The Constitution of the United States peremptorily denies to the PEOPLE in mass, absolutely withholds from them, the election of their President, (Cheatham's Life of Paine, p. 142,) and of Judges and of numerous other officers. It is not a DEMOCRACY, but a REPUBLIC. The people wisely act through REPRESENTATIVES, and not INDIVIDUALLY. Neither is suffrage *universal*, for women and children, and foreigners, and all who have not become members or citizens by an open

civil and religious liberty. Such has been its glory, when glory has been attached to such principles, and such its infamy, its reproach and its standing denunciations by all its enemies.

"History," as Mr. Junkin remarks, "with the augmented voice of eighteen centuries, proclaims the truth, that the Calvinistic faith, united to the Presbyterian government, has been most productive of glory to God and good to man. It was in the use of this simple and unpretending, but mighty and majestic moral machinery, that the illiterate fishermen of Galilee, assisted by the learned and indefatigable Paul, accomplished, in the face of the bitterness of Jewish persecution, and the iron sternness of Roman cruelty and power, one of the mightiest revolutions that have ever changed the aspect of our world. It was Presbyterianism that preserved religion in its purity, throughout those centuries of trial and corruption, which commenced with the day when the cross was planted on the throne of Constantine. And when Rome, that "mother of harlots and abominations," extended her leaden sceptre over the world, and began to be "drunk with the blood of the saints," the Presbyterian Church furnished a large proportion of her victims. And throughout those ages of darkness, that gloomed at the rise of Popery, and reached their midnight after the inundation of the barbarians of the north—*where* and *who* were the *seed* that God, according to his promise, had preserved to serve him? If some Christian Elijah, had heard the voice of Jehovah proclaiming, "yet have I left me seven thousand in Israel, all the knees that have not bowed unto Baal, and every mouth that hath not kissed him"—where, in that age of darkness and rebuke, could the prophet have found the faithful remnant? At the foot of an *European* and not an *Asiatic* Horeb were they found. In

profession of their allegiance, and by a regular form of naturalization, are excluded. In all this there is the exact counterpart of Presbyterianism, as there is also in the system of progressive courts, not merely as advisory bodies, but as courts of review and controul. Our government, too, is a confederated GOVERNMENT—OR UNITED BODY—and not a mere congeries of local and independent communities, which would not be a government or COMMONWEALTH at all; and in like manner there are independent CHURCHES—but there is no independent church or government in any sense analogous to our national government. Presbyterianism is the true ecclesiastical analogy to our civil commonwealth.

the fastnesses of the Alps, those mighty barriers which have baffled many a tyrant's rage, the people of God, driven from their eastern home, and hunted for the truth's sake, from land to land, had taken refuge, and there, despite the rage of the Romans and the fury of the Frank, they preserved and practiced the truth in its primitive beauty and simplicity. And *who* and *what* were these dwellers of the Alpine vallies? *Presbyterians all!!* The faith we hold was their faith—the government under which we rejoice was their government. And faithfully did they maintain them. Amid the flames of their burning villages—or unsheltered amid the desolation of Alpine winter—hunted from mountain to mountain and from valley to valley—oppressed—imprisoned—burnt and driven from their homes, still, with unbending firmness, they held on to the truth of God; until by that very *dispersion*, by which Rome thought to crush them, was sowed the seeds of that Reformation that makes Rome totter to her fall. The great Reformer of Geneva learned much from the Waldenses in regard to that primitive and Apostolic Christianity, of which he was so learned and eloquent an advocate: and the enemies of the other Reformers often charged them with deriving their opinions from these godly and faithful victims of Rome. Indeed, the candid searcher of history will be constrained to believe, that from the Apostolic times, a church maintaining the Presbyterian doctrine and order, was by the providence of God preserved, until she gave to the purest branch of the great Reformation, the doctrine and ecclesiastical image, which she had preserved unmarred, through so many centuries of darkness and of blood."

In this argument, we repudiate altogether the artifice by which the glory due to Presbyterianism is given to the Independent denomination. As it regards the origin and progress of constitutional principles in England, there can be no distinction drawn between Presbyterians and Independents. They were but the two wings of one great army. Originally, and for a long period, their common name was "The Puritans," and their common principles were—the supremacy of the Scriptures, as the constitutional directory of the church, in doctrine, order, worship and laws;—the purely ministerial and teaching character and authority of the ministry;—the purity of the ministry,

the purity and simplicity of ordinances, and the sacredness of the Sabbath;—the constitutional character of government;—and the responsibility of kings to the laws and liberties of their kingdoms.

Adhering to these *common* principles, the Puritans began to differ in ecclesiastical views, and finally divided into the two main bodies of Presbyterians and Independents, differing originally not in doctrine, not in order, not in worship, but in the single point of the NECESSITY of regular and standing courts of AUTHORITATIVE review and control.

As it regards the principles of toleration and liberty there have been noble examples and numerous exceptions among both these parties. Luther was a Presbyterian, and yet a constant advocate of toleration. Zuinglius was the same. So was Calvin in his earlier and wiser opinions. And in like manner, says Archdeacon Blackburne, "It is to the controversy about the Geneva discipline, that we owe the efforts of the excellent Castallio, to disgrace the infernal doctrine of punishing heretics capitally."* Howe, too, who was the favorite chaplain of Cromwell,† a Presbyterian, and Owen, his chief divine, have left on record the evidences of their Presbyterian preferences.

It is true that independency was, under the circumstances of the times, and the fact that these were a hampered minority, the most natural outlet for those free and tolerant principles, which were even then restrained in their full development, by the spirit of antiquity and of national establishments. The Independents of the Westminster Assembly and the Commonwealth, were in fact the real prototypes and representatives *in almost every sentiment* of the present Presbyterians, while the Presbyterians of that day would only find their perfect likeness in the lingering relics of some of the smaller branches of Presbyterianism. Presbyterians and Independents are, therefore, of common origin—the former being Puritanism in its development of democracy; and the latter in its form of constitutional and representative government, as in England and in these United States. Both denominations have worked off the slough of Romish and prelatie intolerance;—both discard

* Ecclesiastical Republicanism, p. 133.

† See Roger's Life of Howe, p. 361, 365.

and denounce the principles of tyranny and bigotry ; — and both rejoice to run together *pari passu* the race of freedom.

In every question of a political bearing, we regard the Puritans as the parents equally of the Presbyterians and Independents, between whom, (as they were found among the colonists of New England and these Southern States,) there was but little difference and no separation.*

And looking at the subject in this light, will any man question the influence of Puritanism, and of the Puritans in gradually fashioning those elements of *republican* government which gave origin to the Commonwealth, to the Revolution, to these United States, and to the still rapidly extending measures of reform in England? Surely not.

Here again we wish to be understood. We are not now inquiring into the ultimate and original source of English liberty. That many forms of popular privilege, on the part of landholders and men of note, existed in Saxon times, and were, under a regulated form, continued under the Norman dominion, we believe; and that many struggles were from time to time made to regain these privileges, when subsequently destroyed, we also believe. But the question now before us is, as to the origin and source of POPULAR power, in contrast with the power of THE RICH AND NOBLE of the people; — of popular representation and not merely of constitutional monarchy. What we seek to trace up, is the theory and doctrine of a COMMONWEALTH OR REPUBLIC, in which the people are *recognized* as the ultimate source of power, and their welfare as the ultimate end of government; and in which the *jus populi* takes the place of the *jus regis* and the *vox populi* of the mere arbitrary *dictum* of a king.

Now, it will not be pretended that any such form of government, by which a whole people govern themselves under the guidance of a constitution of their own adoption and by representatives of their own election, ever existed either in Greece, or Rome, or in Britain, — in Saxon or Norman times. The only ancient model of such a government, *we* find in the Jewish Commonwealth; and the only fountain from which its principles have flowed in modern times, has been the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. Christianity

* See also Mr. Junkin's Discourse, p. 25.

alone originated, and this alone can sustain a free, representative republic. And it was only at the era of "The Commonwealth," the spirit of free discussion and of popular liberty, nerved by the genius of Christianity, burst all the fetters of power, prejudice, and bigotry, and gave birth to a REPRESENTATIVE REPUBLIC.

It was not, therefore, in America, but in England, the theory of a representative republic was perfected. The principles, the spirit, and the general outlines of American republicanism, were all fashioned in the great laboratory of English freedom; and the Puritans, who were originally Presbyterian, and who, up to the time of the Protectorate, when the constitution of a republic was formally and forcibly crushed—were still by an overpowering majority Presbyterian—these were the artizans by whose skill, industry, sufferings and genius, the heavenly form was gradually shaped.

It is therefore by what these Presbyterian Puritan ancestors have achieved, we are republicans. Had the British Parliament been left free, England would have been a Republic; and it was only when the Presbyterian Parliament and city of London were overawed and dispersed by an army of independents; and when the constitution of a republic was snatched from the very hands of the members who were about to adopt it as the government of the country—that the first practical organization of a representative republic was left for these United States.*

For the liberty we enjoy, therefore, we agree with Mr. Cheatham, a warm advocate of England:† "For the liberty we enjoy in the United States, we are indebted to our ancestors. We have acquired nothing of it ourselves: not a jot of it is our own. All that we have done, is the effecting of a separation from the parent country: all that we have achieved is independence. But we have no liberty but that which we have received from England. We owe it all to our ancestors."

And when it is said that much of the Magna Charta and

* "Had Presbytery," says Mr. Junkin, "obtained the ascendancy in the English mind;—had it stamped its system of a *regulated and balanced Commonwealth*, England, and not America, had won the glory of having first solved the problem of *national self-government*." Disc., p. 27.

† Life of Paine, p. 193.

other ancient instruments of English liberty were adopted into our Constitution,* we ask, who was it that brought these all to light from amid the darkness under which they had been long buried; and who gave them fresh unction and authority and power, by republishing and reestablishing them in the popular mind? Can any one deny, that for this we are indebted to the Presbyterian party in Scotland and in England, who waged the war with Charles, and led to the establishment of the Commonwealth? Calvin, and Luther, and Zuingli, taught men to be free and independent in the exercise of all their *spiritual* rights and in the government of the church;† and having learned to be free, religiously, they soon learned to seek freedom politically. Knox, the Reformer of Scotland, and founder of the Presbyterian Church there, “was a great admirer of the polity of republics.”‡ Under his teaching,§ “more just and enlarged sentiments were diffused, and the idea of a Commonwealth, INCLUDING THE MASS OF THE PEOPLE, as well as the PRIVILEGED orders, began to be entertained.” “Buchanan’s Treatise,” says, the Anti-Republican and Tory Edward Irving, and Knox’s “first blast of the trumpet against the monstrous regiment of women,” contains essentially what makes Scotland the most formidable seat of radicalism and rebellion in the world.”||

“The Puritanism of Scotland became,” says Carlyle, “that of England, of New England.”** Buchanan’s great work, ‘*De Jure Regni apud Scotos*, published in 1579,” powerfully contributed to awaken the people of both kingdoms to a just sense of their own rights and of the king’s responsibilities. Andrew Melville, in his lectures, fanned the flame of popular liberty, and deepened the conviction of sovereign accountability.†† Welwood, his friend, and professor of laws, was silenced by king James, because, as he said, his writings were apologies for rebellions and trea-

* Cheatham’s Life of Paine, 131, 141.

† See this subject illustrated in *Ecclesiastical Republicanism*, p. 112, 113, &c.

‡ M’Crie’s Life of, vol. 1, p. 303.

§ Ibid., p. 304.

|| Lectures on Heroes, p. 235.

** M’Crie’s Life of, vol. 2, p. 115, 116.

†† Irving’s Confessions of Faith, Historical Introd., p. 130, 131. Lond. 1831.

sons.* These principles of popular liberty were promulgated and diffused by Rutherford, in his "Lex Rex;"† by Guthrie, in "The Causes of God's Wrath," a work which was burned by the common hangman;‡ by Brown, of Wamphray, in his Apologetical Narration;§ by the "Jus Populi," a work written by Stewart, of Goodtrees; by "Naphthali," and by many other works, which brought down upon their authors and abettors the severest penalties of an enraged government.||

To these sources, of which the Covenants were summaries, the Harringtons, the Sydneys, the Vanes, the Miltons, the Cokes, and the Lockes, were indebted for much of that light and enthusiasm, by which their genius was fired in the defence of popular freedom. And hence, it is a remarkable fact, to which we will have occasion to refer, that Roger Williams, Lord Baltimore, and William Penn, had all matured their views of freedom of conscience in England, and under the influences of these Puritan controversies and instructors.**

Sir Henry Vane, who technically was neither an Independent nor a Presbyterian, but the true archetype of the *modern* religious views and religious principles of both—did more probably than any other man in his day to defend and develope the true principles, as laid down by Lord Brougham, of a CONSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATIVE REPUBLIC. He was a member of the Westminster Assembly, and a chief commissioner from the Parliament and Assembly to Scotland, when, as has been seen, he was instrumental in affecting the solemn League and Covenant. After the death of Hampden and Pym, he was the acknowledged leader of the Commonwealth party.†† He was so true to his republican principles, that he *openly* condemned the powers assumed by Cromwell, and in 1659, as president of

* In his True Law of Free Monarchies.

† Pub. in 1644.

‡ History of Westminster Assembly, p. 363.

§ Published in 1660.

¶ See in Watts' Bibliotheca Britannica, vol. 4, under the head "people," the titles of the *numerous* works in which these principles were propagated.

** See Bancroft's History of the United States.

†† Forster's Statesmen of the Commonwealth, p. 329, 330. Harper's edition.

the council to whom the supreme power was entrusted, until the parliament could make further arrangements,* "he discharged his last noble effort for the great cause his life had been devoted to, by reporting a bill for the future and permanent settlement of the government, of which the following were the heads: 1. That the supreme power delegated by the people to their trustees, ought to be in some fundamentals not dispensed with; that is, that a CONSTITUTION ought to be drawn up and established, specifying the principles by which the successive trustees, or representatives assembled under it, should be guided and restrained in the conduct of the government, and clearly stating those particulars in which they would not be permitted to legislate or act. 2. One point which was to be determined and fixed in this Constitution, so that no legislative power should ever be able to alter or move it, was this: That it is destructive to the people's liberties, (to which by God's blessing they are fully restored,) to admit any earthly king or single person to the legislative or executive power over this nation. 3. The only other principle reported as fundamental, and to be placed at the very basis of the Constitution, was this: That the supreme power is not entrusted to the people's trustees, to erect matters of faith and worship, so as to exercise compulsion therein."

The interest Vane took in this matter, and in the solemn league and covenant, were prominent charges brought against him in his trial, and prominent topics in his noble vindication and defence at the bar of the house, and upon the scaffold. On the former occasion, speaking of his adherence to the government, he says—"*And whatever defections did happen by apostates, hypocrites, and time-serving worldlings, there was a party among them that continued firm, sincere, and chaste unto that cause to the last, and loved it better than their lives — of which number I am not ashamed to profess myself to be; not so much admiring the form and words of the covenant, as the righteous words therein expressed, and the true sense and meaning thereof, which I have reason to know.*"

These sentiments Sir Henry Vane carried with him to

* Forster's *Statesmen of the Commonwealth*, p. 338, and 341.

New England, where he was governor, and where he no doubt watered the seeds of liberty and independence which had been carried over by the Puritan settlers. And in this constitution he unquestionably stated, according to the analysis laid down by Lord Brougham, the elemental principles of the Constitution of the United States.

"The spirit of liberty was, therefore, grafted, as we have affirmed, upon the stock of religion, and was *thus* quickened with a heavenly ardour, and an impetuous zeal which nothing could stand. 'When the Protestant faith,' says Swift, 'was restored by Queen Elizabeth, those who fled to Geneva returned among the rest, home to England, and were grown so fond of the government and religion of the place they had left, that they used all possible endeavors to introduce both into their own country. From hence they proceeded by degrees to quarrel with the KINGLY GOVERNMENT, because, as I have already said, the city of Geneva, to which their fathers had flown, for a refuge, was a commonwealth, or government of the people. During the latter part of the reign of Elizabeth, the youthful Hercules was found strong enough to crush the serpent, in the question of monopolies. While Whitgift contended for the absolute despotism of monarchy, Cartwright, in England, and Buchanan and others, in Scotland, gave utterance to the principles of a democratic republic. In the reign of James, the number of Puritans in England became greater, and their exertions in the cause of freedom more apparent. With their growing intelligence and wealth, the spirit of popular liberty increased until in the reign of Charles I, a universal enthusiasm seized the nation, pervading not only the middle classes, but also many of the gentry, which declared not only in words, but actions, that while the King was resolved to be absolute, the people were determined to be free. THE REPUBLICAN PARTY, in England, as an open and organized body, dates its origin from the early campaigns of the civil war. Coke laid its foundation in the Petition of Right, endued with the form of law, in 1628. Selden built on this foundation. Hampden, Pym, Vane, St. John, Cromwell, and Sydney completed the superstructure which Sydney has immortalized by his writings, as both he and Vane have by their blood. "Protestantism," says Carlisle, "was a revolt against spiritual sove-

reignities, Popes, and much else. PRESBYTERIANISM CARRIED OUT THE REVOLT AGAINST EARTHLY SOVEREIGNTIES and DESPOTISMS. Protestantism has been called the grand root, from which our whole subsequent European history branches out; for the spiritual will always bodied itself forth in the temporal history of men. The spiritual is the beginning of the temporal. And now, sure enough, the cry is every where for liberty and equality, independence, and so forth; instead of kings, ballot-boxes, and electoral suffrages." "The honest truth is," says Archdeacon Blackburne, "that these very controversies, (respecting the Genevan discipline,) first struck out, and in due time perfected those noble and generous principles of civil and religious liberty, which too probably without those struggles, or something of that sort, would hardly have been well understood to this very hour."

We have thus endeavored to point out the relationship between American and English Republicanism, and to trace the spirit and theory of a representative republic to its true source, and that is, as we honestly believe, the religious freedom, as it is found embodied in Christianity, quickened and diffused by the reformation, and systematically applied to civil liberty by the reformers and covenanters of Scotland, and by their coadjutors, the Presbyterian Puritans of England and of these American colonies. From this nursery, the original stock of that tree, American Republicanism, which now waves its branches over twenty-six States and several Territories, was first transplanted.†

We now proceed to draw out another link of evidence, in confirmation of this opinion, from the depths of history. In his "History from the Accession of George III, to the Conclusion of the Peace, in 1783," Mr. Adolphus, in tracing

* Ecclesiastical Republ.—pp. 130, 137, 131, 132, 133.

† In a recent lecture on the wrongs of Ireland, as published in the Catholic Herald, we find the following candid admissions, which are more important as coming from a Roman bishop and an Irishman:

"Some indeed assert that the Catholic religion is the cause of the degradation of Ireland. I have said enough to show that, in part, it has been the occasion of the degradation of Ireland. But I am willing to go farther, and admit, that in one sense the Catholic religion has been the cause of that degradation; for I have no hesitation in expressing the opinion, that if the Irish had been by any chance Presbyterians, they would have from an early day obtained protection for their natural rights

the causes of the *combined and determined* opposition of the colonies to the impositions of the mother country, has this language—"The **FIRST** effort towards an **UNION** of interests was made by the Presbyterians, who were eager in carrying into execution their favorite project of forming a synod. Their churches had hitherto remained unconnected with each other, and their union in synod had been considered so dangerous to the community, that in 1725 it was prevented by the express interference of the lords justices. Availing themselves with great address of the rising discontents, the convention of ministers and elders at Philadelphia, inclosed in a circular letter to all the Presbyterian congregations in Pennsylvania, the proposed article of union. They digested a plan by which a few gentlemen of Philadelphia, with the Presbyterian ministers, should be chosen to correspond with their friends in different parts, to give and receive advices, and to consult on measures tending to promote their welfare either as a body or as connected in particular congregations. A number of what were termed most *prudent and public spirited* persons in each district of the province and three lower counties, were to be elected for the purposes of corresponding jointly with the ministers in those districts, with one another, and with the gentlemen in Philadelphia. A person was to be nominated in each committee to sign and receive letters in the name of the whole, to convoke the committee, and for their deliberation, impart the advice they should obtain. Deputies were to be sent by the committee in each county or district, yearly or half-yearly, to a general meeting of the whole body, to consult and give advice; and each committee to transmit to Philadelphia their names and numbers, with periodical accounts and alterations. In consequence of this letter, an

or they would have driven their oppressors into the sea. The Scotch escaped all these calamities. They were never conquered. Their soil was never trodden beneath their feet. They merged themselves spontaneously, and at their own time, into the state of England. They kept always the property of their own religion for their own social and religious use. Already, before the change, parish schools had been established in Scotland, afterwards they were multiplied, improved, and endowed out of the church property. Yet in Ireland every thing was the reverse."

See also a long and corroborative testimony to the spirit of Scottish Presbyterianism, by Victor Cousin, in his work on the History of Moral Philosophy, in the Presbyterian, March 6, 1817.

union of all the congregations took place in Pennsylvania and the lower countries. A similar CONFEDERACY was established in all the southern provinces, in pursuance of similar letters, written by their respective conventions. These measures ended in the establishment of an annual synod* at Philadelphia, where all the Presbyterian congregations in the colonies were represented by their respective ministers and elders, and where all general affairs, POLITICAL as well as religious, were debated and decided. From this synod orders and decrees were issued throughout America, and to them a ready and implicit obedience was paid.

The discontented in New England recommended an union of the congregational and Presbyterian interest throughout the colonies. A negotiation took place, which ended in the appointment of a permanent committee of correspondence, and powers to communicate and consult on all occasions, with a similar committee, established by the congregational churches in New England. Thus the Presbyterians in the southern colonies, who, while unconnected in their several congregations, were of little importance, were raised into weight and consequence; and formed a dangerous combination of men, whose principles of religion and policy were equally adverse to that of the established church and government.

BY THIS UNION A PARTY WAS PREPARED TO DISPLAY THEIR POWER BY RESISTANCE, and the stamp law presented itself as a favorable object of hostility. Yet sensible of their own incompetence to act effectually without assistance, and apprehensive of counteraction *from the members of the Church of England, and those dissenters who were averse to violence*, they strove with the utmost assiduity to make friends and converts among the disaffected of every denomination.

The prevailing discontent which extended to the most respectable ranks of society, was favorable to their hopes, and when the news arrived that the stamp act had passed in Great Britain, the measures adopted were conformable to their most sanguine wishes."

The influence of this course of proceeding, on the part of the Presbyterians, was not remarked by Mr. Adolphus

* Vol. 1, p. 203.

alone. Mr. Reed, of Philadelphia, himself an Episcopalian, in a published address, remarks—"The part taken by the Presbyterians in the contest with the mother country, was indeed *at the time often* made a ground of reproach; and the connections between their efforts for the security of their religious liberty, and opposition to the oppressive measures of parliament was *then distinctly seen*. Mr. Galloway, a prominent advocate of the government, ascribed, in 1774, the revolt and resolution, *mainly* to the action of the Presbyterian clergy and laity *as early as* 1764, when the proposition for a general synod emanated from a committee appointed for that purpose, in Philadelphia. Another writer of the same period says—"You will have discovered that I am no friend to the Presbyterians, and that I fix ALL THE BLAME of these extraordinary American proceedings upon them."

"A Presbyterian loyalist," adds Mr. Reed, "was a thing unheard of." Patriotic clergymen of the established church, were exceptions to general conduct; for while they were patriots at a sacrifice, and in spite of restraint and imaginary obligations, which many found it impossible to disregard, it was natural sympathy and voluntary action that placed the dissenters under the banner of revolutionary redress. It is a sober judgment which cannot be questioned, that had independence and its maintenance depended on the approval and ready sanction of the Colonial Episcopal clergy, misrule and oppression must have become far more intense before they would have seen a case of justifiable revolution. The debt of gratitude which independent America owes to the dissenting clergy and laity never can be paid.*

"This testimony of our Episcopalian, is corroborated by Dr. Elliott, the able editor of the Western Christian Advocate, the organ of the Methodist Church in the west, in noticing an attack made on the Presbyterians by Bishop Purcell: "The Presbyterians" says he, "of every class, were prominent, AND EVEN FOREMOST, in achieving the liberties of the United States; and they have been all along the leading supporters of constitution, and law, and good order. They have been the pioneers of learning and sound

* See in Eccl. Republ., as above.

knowledge from its highest to its lowest grade, and are now its principal supporters.*

These opinions are sustained by further and numerous facts. The Synod of New York was the very first body, a year before the declaration of independence, to declare themselves in favour of open resistance, and to encourage and guide their people then in arms.†

This is certainly a most remarkable fact. "Of the independence of the colonies, for some time after the affair at Lexington,—that is, in 1775," says Mr. Cheatham, "few thought and no one wrote. Here and there it was indistinctly mentioned, but no where encouraged."‡ "Independence," says Thomas Paine, "was a doctrine scarce and rare, even towards the conclusion of the year 1775."§ Even in October, 1775, when the news of the rejection of the petition of Congress to the king was received, and had produced universal indignation, still even now few thought seriously of independence. The mind was overpowered by fear rather than alive to safety."¶ And yet among those few, who not only thought upon, but *openly* advised independence, were the Presbyterians as a body; they having openly commended it months before the publication of Paine's Common Sense, which was not issued until Jan., 1776, and which was itself the offspring of a suggestion made by Dr. Benjamin Rush,** who was brought up under the Rev. Samuel Finley, afterwards President of the College of Princeton, of which college he became a graduate under the presidency of the Rev. Samuel Davies.

During the continuance of the revolutionary war, the Presbyterian body sustained and invigorated the forces of their beleagured country; so that Presbyterians were every where treated with special cruelty and revenge, and at the close of the war, they again addressed their people, and offered up praise to God who had given them the victory.††

* The whole article is one of the most enlarged Christian liberality and generosity.

† Life of Thomas Paine, p. 41.

‡ See his Crisis, No. 3 and 7.

§ Cheatham do., p. 45.

¶ See Cheatham, as above, p. 37.

** See Hodge's Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church.

†† In this connexion it may be interesting to our readers, to hear the sentiments expressed by the Old Synod of New York and Philadelphia,

"And after the conflict was over," says Mr. Junkin, "and the sages of America came to settle the forms of our government, they did but *copy* into *every* constitution, the simple elements of representative republicanism, as found in the Presbyterian system. It is matter of history that cannot be denied, that Presbyterianism, as found in the Bible, and in the standards of the several Presbyterian churches, gave character to our free institutions. Am I reminded of the glorious part which New England Congregationalists took in our country's deliverance? My heart's best feelings kindle at the recollection: and in according to New England all the glory that she has so well earned, I yield not my position, for New England is *substantially Presbyterian*. It must not be forgotten that the Pilgrim Fathers, after witnessing the sad effects of simple independence in their own land, had been nursed in the bosom, and had drank of the spirit of Presbyterian Holland and Geneva, *before* they reached the rock of Plymouth, and from the very first, their institutions partook of the Presbyterian form." Dis., p. 28.

in their Pastoral Letter, published in 1783, just at the close of the Revolutionary war. The following is an extract:

"We cannot help congratulating you on the general and almost universal attachment of the Presbyterian body to the cause of liberty and the rights of mankind. This has been visible in their conduct, and has been confessed by the complaints and resentment of the common enemy. Such a circumstance ought not only to afford us satisfaction on the review, as bringing credit to the body in general, but to increase our gratitude to God, for the happy issue of the war. Had it been unsuccessful, we must have drunk deeply of the cup of suffering. Our burnt and wasted churches, and our plundered dwellings, in such places as fell under the power of our adversaries, are but an earnest of what we must have suffered, had they finally prevailed.

The Synod, therefore, request you to render thanks to Almighty God, for all his mercies, spiritual and temporal, and in a particular manner for establishing the Independence of the United States of America. He is the Supreme Disposer of all events, and to Him belong the glory, the victory, and the majesty. We are persuaded you will easily recollect many circumstances in the course of the struggle, which point out his special and signal interposition in our favour. Our most remarkable successes have generally been when things had just before worn the most unfavorable aspect, as at Trenton and Saratoga at the beginning—in South Carolina and Virginia towards the end of the war. It pleased God to raise up for us a powerful ally in Europe; and when we consider the unwearied attempts of our enemies, to raise dissensions by every topic that could be supposed inflammatory and popular, the harmony that has prevailed, not only between the allied powers, but the troops of different

The service rendered in securing the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, by the Rev. Dr. Witherspoon, a Presbyterian clergyman from Scotland, and also President of the College of Princeton, and who was a member of the Continental Congress, is thus graphically described by Dr. Krebs: "When the Declaration of Independence was under debate in the Continental Congress, doubts and forebodings were whispered through that hall. The houses hesitated, wavered, and, for a while, the liberty and slavery of the nation appeared to hang in an even scale. It was then that an aged patriarch arose, and venerable and stately form,—his head white with the frosts of years. Every eye went to him with the quickness of thought, and remained with the fixedness of the polar star. He cast on the Assembly a look of inexpressible interest and unconquerable determination; while, on his visage, the hue of age was lost in the flush of a burning patriotism that fired his cheek. 'There is,' said he, when he saw the house wavering, '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 own slavery. That noble instrument upon your table, which insures immortality to its author, should be subscribed 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 a 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

nations and languages acting together, ought to be ascribed to the gracious influence of Divine Providence. Without mentioning many other instances, we only further put you in mind of the choice and appointment of a *commander-in-chief* of the armies of the United States, who in this important and difficult charge, has given universal satisfaction, who [was] alike acceptable to the citizen and the soldier, to the State in which he was born, and to every other on the Continent, and whose character and influence after so long service, are not only unimpaired, but augmented. Of what consequence this has been to the cause of America, every one may judge; or, if it needs any illustration, it receives it from the opposite situation of our enemies in this respect. On the whole, every pious person, on a review of the events of the war, will certainly be disposed to say with the Psalmist, 'The Lord hath done great things for us, whereof we are glad.'"

hands of the public executioner, than desert at this crisis, the sacred cause of my country.' Who was it that uttered this memorable speech, potent in turning the scales of the nation's destiny, and worthy to be preserved in the same imperishable record in which is registered the not more eloquent speech ascribed to John Adams, on the same sublime occasion? It was John Witherspoon, at that day the most distinguished Presbyterian minister west of the Atlantic ocean—the father of the Presbyterian Church in the United States."

"We have the authority, also, of the late Chief Justice Tilghman for stating that the framers of *the Constitution of the United States* were (chiefly through the agency of Dr. Witherspoon, who was one of them,) greatly indebted to the standards of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, in modelling that admirable instrument, under which we have enjoyed more than half a century of unparalleled national prosperity."*

And still further, the Hon. W. C. Preston, of this State, has given publicity to the following remarkable words:

"Certainly it is the 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. This may be regarded as an earnest of our beloved national Union. We fondly regard our federal Constitution as the purest specimen of republican government that the world ever saw; and on the same pure principles of republicanism, as its basis, we find established the constitution of this republican church. The two may be supposed to be formed after the same model."

An inquiry into the matter would shew, by an actual biography of the veterans of the revolution, that a large proportion of them were members of the Presbyterian Church. Without attempting to make such an investigation, we will merely state the following facts which have incidentally fallen into our hands, in reference to South Carolina:

The battles of the "Cowpens," of "King's Mountain"—and also the severe skirmish known as "Huck's Defeat," are

* See Fourth of July Discourse, by the Rev. Mr. Stedman, of Wilmington, N. C.

among the most celebrated in this State, as giving a turning point to the contest of the revolution. General Morgan, who commanded at the Cowpens, was a Presbyterian elder, and lived and died in the communion of the church. General Pickens, who made all the arrangements for the battle, was also a Presbyterian elder. And nearly all under their command were Presbyterians. In the battle of King's Mountain, Colonel Campbell, Colonel James Williams, (who fell in action,) Colonel Cleaveland, Colonel Shelby, and Colonel Sevier, were all Presbyterian elders; and the body of their troops were collected from Presbyterian settlements. At Huck's Defeat, in York, Colonel Bratton and Major Dickson were both elders of the Presbyterian Church. Major Samuel Morrow, who was with Colonel Sumpter, in four engagements, and at King's Mountain, Blackstock, and other battles, and whose home was in the army, till the termination of hostilities, was for about fifty years, a ruling elder in the Presbyterian Church.

These facts we have collected from high authority, and they deserve to be prominently noticed. Here are ten officers of distinction, all bearing rule in the church of Christ, and all bearing arms in defence of our liberties. Braver or better officers cannot be found in the annals of our country—nor braver or better troops. It may also be mentioned in this connection, that Marion, Huger, and other distinguished men of revolutionary memory, were of Huguenot, that is, full blooded Presbyterian, descent.

Joseph Reed, whose memoirs we have placed at the head of this article,—the military secretary of Washington, at Cambridge—Adjutant General of the continental army; member of the Congress of the United States; and President of the Executive Council of the State of Pennsylvania—Joseph Reed, in whom more than in any other man, General Washington confided—was the son and grandson of Irish Presbyterians. His grandfather came from Carrickfurgus. His father was one of the trustees of the Third Presbyterian Church, Arch street, Philadelphia.* He was educated at Princeton. "He was firmly attached to the Presbyterian Church, in which he had been educated. In one of his publications, when far advanced in life, he

* Memoirs, vol. 1, p. 26.

said of it: "When I am convinced of its errors, or ashamed of its character, I may perhaps change it. Till then I shall not blush at a connection with a people, who, in this great controversy, ARE NOT SECOND TO ANY, IN VIGOROUS EXERTIONS AND GENEROUS CONTRIBUTIONS, AND TO WHOM WE ARE SO EMINENTLY INDEBTED FOR OUR DELIVERANCE FROM THE THRALDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN."*

In his will, General Reed desired,† "If I am of consequence enough for a funeral sermon, I desire it may be preached by my old friend and instructor, Mr. Duffield, in Arch street, the next Sunday after my funeral." "He was buried in the Presbyterian ground, in Arch street, above Fifth, by the side of his wife."‡

One of the two chaplains appointed by Congress in 1777, was Mr. George Duffield of the Third Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia§—the other being Bishop White.

The venerable and patriotic Mr. Duponceau, of Philadelphia, remarked to a gentleman known to the writer, that he considered George Bryan, Samuel Adams, and Patrick Henry, the three men of the Revolution. Now Mr. Bryan, who was a member of the stamp-act Congress of 1765—President of Pennsylvania—a Judge of the Supreme Court, and a member of the Council of Censors, and one of the leading whig members of the new Assembly,|| was also a Presbyterian.** To him *principally*, in conjunction with a Mr. Cannon, a schoolmaster, is attributed by Mr. Graydon, the Constitution of Pennsylvania.†† "These," says Mr. Graydon, constituted the "duumvirate, which had the credit of framing the Constitution, and thence laying, in Pennsylvania, the corner-stone of that edifice which, however retarded in its progress by aristocratical interferences, towers like another

* Memoirs of Gen. Reed, vol. 2, p. 172.

† Ibid. vol. 2, p. 420.

‡ Ibid. p. 416, where is given the inscription on his tomb.

§ See extract from letter of Mrs. Adams, in Updike's Narraganset Church, page 242.

|| Mem. of Gen. Reed, vol. 1, p. 36—vol. 2, pp. 23, 133, 197, 481.

** His son and grand-children are members of a Presbyterian congregation in Charleston, S. C.

†† Memoirs of his own Times, and Reminiscences of Men and Events of the Revolution, by Alexander Graydon—Philadelphia, 1846—p. 286—who was himself brought up very strictly by a Presbyterian grandmother. pp. 20, 21, and 43.

Babel, to the skies, and will continue to tower, until finally arrested and dilapidated by an irremediable confusion of tongues—for anarchy ever closes the career of democracy." For a correct statement of this fact, Mr. Grandon was a most competent witness; and President Adams, therefore, in associating Timothy Matlock, Thomas Young, and Thomas Paine in this work, was doubtless misinformed.*

From this Constitution we make the following extracts, to shew that this Presbyterian Constitution of Pennsylvania was the first in the United States, since the Revolution, which provided for THE COMPLETE AND UNIVERSAL TOLERATION OF RELIGIOUS OPINIONS. This constitution was adopted in 1776, (from July 15th to September 28th.) Article II. is as follows:† "That all men have a natural and unalienable right to worship Almighty God, according to the dictates of their own consciences and understanding: and that no man ought, or can of right be compelled to attend any religious worship, or erect or support any place of worship, or maintain any ministry, contrary to, or against his own free will and consent. Nor can any man, who acknowledges the being of a God, be justly deprived or abridged of any civil rights as a citizen, on account of his religious sentiments, or peculiar modes of religious worship: that no authority can or ought to be vested in, or assumed by any power whatever, that shall in any case interfere with, or in any manner controul, the right of conscience in the free exercise of religious worship."

IT THUS APPEARS THAT THE DECLARATION OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE WAS FIRST FAVORED BY THE PRESBYTERIAN SYNOD, THEN THE HIGHEST BODY IN THAT CHURCH—THAT THE FIRST ACTUAL AND PRACTICAL DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE WAS MADE BY PRESBYTERIANS IN MECKLENBURGH, N. C.—THAT THE FIRST STATE CONSTITUTION MADE UNDER THAT DECLARATION, PROCLAIMING UNIVERSAL AND COMPLETE TOLERATION OF RELIGIOUS OPINION, WAS FRAMED BY A PRESBYTERIAN, AND THAT THE OVERTHROW OF THE THEN EXISTING ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION IN VIRGINIA AND SOUTH CAROLINA, AND THE COMPLETE DIVORCE OF THE

* See Cheatham's Life of Paine, pp. 317, 318.—Note.

† See the Constitutions of the several Independent States of America. London, 1783—pp. 182, 183.

CHURCH AND THE STATE WAS MAINLY OWING TO THE EFFORTS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

These observations we have ventured to make, in order to give just weight to the claims instituted on behalf of the ancient standards and spirit of the Presbyterian Church, and to shew that when Isaac Taylor calls "Presbyterianism the republican principle,"* he had well considered the nature of a system, of which, doctrinally and ecclesiastically, representation is the fundamental element.† For to use the words of Dryden, while we deny the appropriateness of his epithets :

"As the poisons of the deadliest kind;
Are to their own unhappy coasts confined,
So PRESBYTERY and its pestilential zeal,
CAN FLOURISH ONLY IN A COMMON WEAL."‡

It is no part of our business to depreciate the patriotic character and claims of Episcopalians before or during the revolutionary struggle, nor to undervalue their services in contributing to the formation of the Constitution of the United States, and the permanent glory of the country. God forbid that we should have either the desire or the design to do so. *Their* fame, and character, and glory, are ours—are the common property of the nation—and he must have a heart dead to all true patriotism, and to all true charity, who can reverence and admire Washington or Patrick Henry the less, because they were members of the Episcopal Church. Unquestionably, there were many great, and wise, and brave men in all parts of the Union, and proportionably more in the Southern States, than any others, who were Episcopalians.

Still, however, and for the reasons stated, the fact is undeniable, that while Presbyterians were *to a man* revolutionists, Episcopalians were *very generally* loyalists. "During the revolutionary war," says Bishop White, "a considerable number of the American people became inclined to the British cause; and of them a great proportion were Episcopalians."§ "During this period," Bishop White further

* Spiritual Despotism, Sect. iv., p. 177. Eng. ed.

† See Woodgate's Bampton Lectures, p. 20, 349, 352.

‡ Dryden's Hind and Panther.

§ Memory of Protestant Epis. Church, p. 48.

informs us,* "there was no resource for the supply of vacancies, which were continually multiplying, not only from death, but by the retreat of very many of the Episcopal clergy to the mother country, and to the colonies still dependent on her. To add to the evil, many able and worthy ministers, cherishing their allegiance to the king of Great Britain, and entertaining conscientious scruples against the use of the liturgy, under the restrictions of omitting the appointed prayers for him, ceased to officiate. Owing to these circumstances, *the doors of the far greater number of the Episcopal Churches were closed for several years.* In the state in which this work is edited, there was a part of that time in which there was, through its whole extent, but one resident minister of the church in question who records the fact."

"Again," adds Bishop White, "many worthy ministers entertained scruples in regard to the oath of allegiance to the States, without the taking of which, they were prohibited from officiating, by laws alike impolitic and severe." "There is a remarkable fact in Virginia, countenancing the sentiments delivered. After the fall of the establishment, a considerable proportion of the clergy continued to enjoy the glebes—the law considering them as freeholds during life—without performing a single act of sacred duty, except perhaps that of marriage. They knew that their public ministrations would not have been attended."†

In the Convention of 1785, a service for the fourth of July was prepared. Of this, Bishop White says: "What must further seem not a little extraordinary, the service was principally arranged, and the prayer alluded to was composed by a reverend gentleman, (Dr. Smith,) who had written and acted against the Declaration of Independence, and was unfavorably looked on by the supporters of it, during the whole revolutionary war. The greater stress is laid on this matter, because of the notorious fact, that the majority of the clergy could not have used the service, without subjecting themselves to *ridicule and censure.* For the author's part, having no hindrance of this sort, he contented himself with having opposed the measure; and kept the

* Ibid., p. 8 and p. 60.

† Memory of Protestant Episcopal Church, p. 59.

day from respect to the requisition of the Convention; but could never hear of its being kept in above two or three places besides Philadelphia."

Dr. Hawks also testifies that in Virginia, "The error" of taking part with Great Britain, "was not confined to the clergy, a portion of the laity adopted their opinions; it was, however, very small, for the great mass of the population in Virginia was opposed to England; and this rendered the situation of the clergy only the more disagreeable. Nor were all the clergy loyalists; they numbered in their ranks some sturdy republicans, though these formed a minority, including not quite one-third of the whole body."

In 1767, Dr. Chandler published "An appeal on behalf of the Church of England in America," in which he claims for it peculiar privileges and support, because "Episcopacy can never thrive in a republican government,—nor republican principles in an Episcopal church. For the same reasons, in a mixed monarchy, no form of ecclesiastical government can so exactly harmonize with the State, as that of a qualified Episcopacy. And, as they are mutually adapted to each other, so they are mutually introductive of each other." The same argument was urged about the same time, and for the same purpose, by Archbishop Seeker.† And it is to this very opinion, then generally entertained, "that Episcopacy itself was unfriendly to the political principles of our republican government," Bishop White attributes the violent prejudices which universally prevailed against it.‡ Dr., now Bishop Hawks, admits the same fact. "The effect," he says,|| "of the American revolution upon the church, had been to attach to it no small share of odium, and few cared to enrol themselves among the clergy of a communion, small in numbers, and the object also of popular dislike."**

* Protestant Episcopal Church in Va., p. 136, where he enters into an explanation of the reason.

† This is in our possession, and quoted in *Ecclesiastical Republicanism*, p. 153, 154.

‡ See in *Ecclesiastical Republic*, *ibid.*, p. 154.

§ *Mem. of Prot. Epis. Church*, p. 48.

|| *Constitutions and Canons of the Prot. Epis. Church*. N. York, 1841.

** President Adams has shewn from facts which fill a long letter, dated Quincy, Dec. 2, 1815, and represented in the *N. Y. Evangelist* of Nov. 9, 1843—that Episcopacy was one cause of the Revolution.

It is true the Rev. Jacob Douche, an Episcopalian of Philadelphia, was appointed chaplain to the Congress in 1776, and officiated for a short time. But, it is equally true, that Mr. Douche turned traitor to the cause, and wrote a long letter to General Washington, urging him to do the same, and with or without the consent of the people, "to negotiate for America at the head of his army;"—that is, to employ the army, in order forcibly to suppress the spirit of independence.*

In support of the opinion, as to the anti-republican character of the Episcopal Church, the whole weight of *English* authorities might be produced, during every period up to the present time.† And hence, in order to revive and

* See this letter,—General Washington's letter, enclosing it to Congress,—and the letter of Mr. Hopkinson, (a signer of the Declaration, and brother-in-law of Mr. Douche,) in Graydon's Memoirs, p. 428, &c. Mr. Updike, in his History of the Narraganset Church, alludes to the fact of Douche's officiating as chaplain, as a striking proof of his declaration, that "EPISCOPALIANS WERE THE LEADING ARCHITECTS OF THE GREAT WORK OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE." (See p. 241.) and gives Adams' letter, written on the occasion, (see p. 242-244.) Mr. Updike is *very* careful, however, not to *allude* even to the subsequent conduct of Mr. Douche. And among the list of his *Episcopalian* architects of independence, culled from all quarters of the Union, he is under the painful necessity of introducing Franklin! Thomas Jefferson!!! and John Randolph. But, while eminent names are, and may be found among the *laymen* of that church, who favored and advanced the cause of Independence, Mr. Updike does not quote the names of any *clergymen*, except Mr. Douche!!! and Bishop White. In the course of the volume, however, he shews that the few Episcopal churches in Rhode Island were closed during and after the Revolution, *because the ministers* would not act as their *lay* brethren thought patriotism required. See p. 265, 358, &c. Here lies the difference. We have a curious pamphlet published in Charleston, in 1795, (*Strictures on the Love of Power in the Prelacy, &c.*, by a Member of the Protestant Episcopal Association of S. C.) which combines, with many other facts, to shew that the laity of the Episcopal church then were much opposed to the clergy and to prelacy, because of their anti-republican tendency and bias. Mr. Updike's enthusiasm, however, is so great, that he ventures in the face of all such facts, to allege, that "it is also possible that a majority of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were Episcopals"—and in demonstration of his position, he affirms that out of the *FIFTY-ONE* signers, *eighteen* (of course including Franklin and Jefferson,) were certainly such.—*Q. E. D.*

† See Eccl. Republicanism, pp. 108, 127, 152, 172, &c. Mr. Bartlett, in his Memoirs of Bishop Butler, speaking of his plan for introducing the Episcopate into this country, says; (p. 122.) "It is much to be regretted that the deliberations of the government upon this reasonable and important measure, should have terminated without its adoption. It is said to have been the opinion of that distinguished statesman, Mr. Pitt, that had the Church of England been efficiently established in the United

reëstablish the Episcopal Church in this country after the revolution, it was found necessary to embody in the Constitution of the church, some essential principles of the Presbyterian system, so that Bishop White was openly charged with "a design to set up an Episcopacy on the ground of presbyterial and lay authority."* But, if Presbyterianism had influence enough to commend itself in any measure, as a model or type for the reconstruction of the Episcopal Church, it is easy to conceive that it might exert a silent and indirect influence in shaping to some extent the outline of our civil constitution.

¶ We have heard it urged that the liberal views of Episcopalians in South Carolina and in Virginia, during the period referred to, are evidenced by the fact, that while in both cases they enjoyed the monopoly of a religious establishment, they voluntarily resigned them. Now, while we freely admit that the revolutionary spirit prevailed among the members of the Episcopal Church in the States mentioned to a far greater extent, proportionably, than it did at the North; yet still facts constrain us to believe that in both cases the abandonment of the Establishment was more a matter of NECESSITY than of CHOICE. The truth is, that during the continuance of these establishments, the great proportion of the people in both States were non-Episcopalian. In Virginia, the Dissenters, as they were called, constituted at least two-thirds of the people;† and it was only when the Baptists and Presbyterians *required* the abolition of the establishment and common privileges, as a *necessary* encouragement to their brethren to enlist in the service of the country, any steps were taken for its removal.‡ To the Presbyterians, Dr. Hawks justly attributes

States, it was highly probable that those States would not have been separated from Great Britain." "We can easily believe," adds the Churchman's Monthly Review, "that if this design had been carried into execution, or if the noble undertaking of Berkeley had not been arrested by Walpole, the United States might, at this day, have been a well-ordered possession of the British crown."

* See Bishop White's "Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States Considered," which is obviously drawn from the Presbyterian Model; and also his Mem. of the Prot. Epis. Church, p. 82 and 345.

† See Dr. Hawks' Prot. Epis. Church, in Va., p. 140, where he admits that such may have been the case, and offers little argument to disprove it.

‡ See Dr. Hawks' Prot. Epis. Ch. in Va., p. 138, and the petition of the

the zeal, talents and energy, with which the subject was publicly discussed, and the abolition of the establishment finally carried. Of this fact, the evidence is given at some length in one of the volumes before us.* The divorce therefore between church and state in this country, was not effected, as has been lately affirmed,† “by the agency of Mr. Jefferson.” The very contrary can be proved. Mr. Jefferson did indeed do much to divorce and drive away *religion* from the state, but “Presbyterians,” says Dr. Laing, “forced upon the state, the doctrine of the entire independence between Christianity and the civil power.” Presbyterians first proclaimed this doctrine on the American shores. Presbyterianism was opposed by Episcopacy, in her efforts to establish this doctrine in Virginia. And the universal establishment of this doctrine throughout the United States, and in the Constitution, was the result of the movement made by Presbyterians.”‡

Nor was the case different in South Carolina. Here too the great body of the people were non-Episcopalians. Episcopalianism was indeed the established religion, but not as has been recently affirmed, “the *predominant* religion.” Presbyterians were among the first settlers in South Carolina. They have been proportionably numerous in all periods of its history, and during the latter part of the eighteenth century, the great majority of emigrants were Presbyterians. In 1704, when there was but *one* Episcopal Church *in the whole province*, then numbering towards six thousand white inhabitants, the dissenters had *three* churches *in Charleston alone*. As early as the year 1690, the Presbyterians, in conjunction with the Independents, formed a church in Charleston, which continued in this united form for forty years.

Williamsburgh was settled by a Presbyterian colony from Ireland,§ and multitudes more thronged into this State from that country, at a later period.|| Indeed the great majority

Presbytery of Hanover, which sought the complete removal of the establishment, “and gave it a decisive blow,” p. 139-140. The Methodists he represents as being generally suspected. See p. 133, 134, 137.

* Eccl. Repub., sec. xi., p. 94-103.

† Charleston Courier, Jan. 25th, 1848.

‡ Religion and Education in America.

§ Hewett's History of South Carolina, vol. 2, p. 64.

|| Ibid. pp. 270, 271.

VOL. I.—No. 4.

of the emigrants, during the latter half of the eighteenth century were Presbyterians,* and a Presbytery existed at *an early period of that century*.† Great numbers of French Protestants sought an asylum in South Carolina, at different periods,‡ who were also Presbyterian. And the adherents of this form of ecclesiastical government were led to continue and uphold it, under every discouragement, not merely because of early education, but because, as Mr. Hewett testifies, they believed it to be most in accordance with the spirit of civil and religious liberty.§ The establishment of the Episcopalian religion in South Carolina was the act of a small minority—there being, in 1698, when it was formed, but one Episcopal Church in the province, out of a white population of between five and six thousand, while non-Episcopalians had three churches in the city, and one in the country.|| That establishment was also obtained surreptitiously,—by surprise,—and by a majority, even then, of only *one* vote.** It never expressed the views of the colonists, and was never otherwise regarded than as unjust, tyrannical, and unchristian. Failing to receive justice here, the non-Episcopalians appealed to the British House of Lords.†† “In consequence of their application a vote was passed, ‘that the act complained of was founded on falsity in matter of fact—was repugnant to the laws of England—was contrary to the charter of the proprietors—was an encouragement to atheism and irreligion—was destructive to trade, and tended to the depopulation and ruin of the province.’” The Lords also addressed Queen Anne, beseeching her “to use the most effectual methods to deliver the province from the arbitrary oppression under which it lay, and to order the authors thereof to be prosecuted according to law.” To which her Majesty replied, “that she would do all in her power to relieve her subjects in Carolina, and protect them in their just rights.” It was not, however, until the period of the revolution, that this monopoly

* Ramsay's History of South Carolina, vol. 2, p. 26.

† Ibid. pp. 25, 26.

‡ Ibid. p. 38.

§ History of South Carolina, vol. 2, p. 53.

|| Ramsay's History, vol. 2, p. 2.

** Ibid. p. 3.

†† Ibid. vol. 2, pp. 4, 16, 17.

of religious privilege was broken up, and Presbyterians and other denominations of Christians were restored to equality of rights, and freed from a taxation which required them to support an established faith, with which, in many things, they could not agree. Nor was this deliverance *then* granted them, but from stern necessity. For they had now an unquestionable majority in the colony, and the physical force necessary for war and defence was theirs. Without union among all parties there was no prospect of success, and therefore after seventy years of exclusive authority, the established church was under the necessity of yielding to a constitution which gave equal laws, equal rights, and full and free toleration to all sects and parties.* Thus it is doubly proved, that to the efforts of Presbyterians we are indebted for the overthrow of all establishments of religion in this country, and for the complete and final divorce between church and state.

In concluding this article, let us once more say, that in

* We have been favored with a copy of a manuscript letter, from which we make the following extracts:

"To Hon. George Bryan, Vice President of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, at Lancaster—fav'd by the Hon. Ric'd Hutson, Esq, Delegate in Congress—from James Cannon.

"CHARLESTON, S. C., March 14th, 1778.

"Dear Sir,—I was greatly surprised when I arrived here, to find, notwithstanding we were told so confidently by the opposers of our Constitution, that the people of South Carolina had reformed their Constitution, and were extremely happy under it, that they *had not yet established their Constitution, and had several reasons to fear that it would not pass.* It lately passed the Council *with great difficulty*, as they made a bold effort to continue the choice of their Legislative Council, (now Senate,) in the Assembly, because then Charlestown would have governed the State. However they were obliged to give that up. They then tryed two other ways, one by reducing their Legislature to $\frac{1}{2}$ of their present number; the other to have the members of their Senate chosen any where in the State. In either of these cases Charleston must have ruled the State, and they failed here too.

"But at the very time that every body expected to have a Constitution in a few hours he called the Council and Assembly into the council chamber, and in a farewell speech, gave the Constitution the negative. This produced great consternation for a day or two, but the Assembly resolved to choose another; made an adjournment for three days, which they were obliged to do before they could bring in any rejected bill, chose a President, and passed the Constitution, and it is expected to have the new President's sanction in a day or two. Several propositions were made by the party opposing the Constitution, to have it set aside, but those for it prevailed, having determined to pass no tax bill, nor do any other business,

thus asserting and vindicating the patriotism of Presbyterians, and the influence of this denomination in all ages of its history, (and especially since the reformation,)* in defending and diffusing the principles of civil and religious liberty, we neither stigmatize nor detract from the patriotism of other religious denominations.

To the Roman Catholic colony of Maryland must be attributed the glory of having founded a colony and established a constitution upon the principles of toleration and liberty of conscience. To Roger Williams and his Baptist associates, belong still greater glory, for having through so much suffering and endurance, laid the foundations of the colony of Rhode Island in the most unlimited principles of civil and religious liberty. To the Baptists also as we have seen, every honor is due for their patriotic efforts during the Revolution, and especially in Virginia. To William Penn, also, and the Quakers, the same undying gratitude is most justly due. And many a record of glory and many a hero of renown, in the annals of American patriotism could be doubtless produced to deck the brow of each of these bodies. Let them flourish and abide, green and radiant forever, since patriotism is patriotism wherever it is found, and by whomsoever it is displayed. Let it, however, be borne in mind, that all these parties matured their liberal principles under the influence of that very Puritan teaching we have described, and only sought in this country an oppor-

until the Constitution was established. The church, I mean the church clergy, seem by their sermons very much displeased, that their establishment is likely to be abolished. One of them told me that a State could not subsist without an established church. That an establishment was the support of the State, and the State of an establishment—being inseparable. I told him that we had in America two happy instances to the contrary, viz: one where all religions were established, and one where none were established. That these two were the most populous and flourishing on the continent. He made no reply. There is, however, great nervousness on the religious head in the South Carolina Constitution. Your merits in supporting it, and vigorous measures are such as Pennsylvania can never sufficiently reward, and I shall ever be ready to exert every thing in my power, to procure every reward which such merit deserves." * * * * *

"P. S.—The President's name is Rawlins Lowndes, who was proclaimed the 11th inst., under the discharge of the artillery both from the troops and forts, and the discharge of small arms."

* On the history of Presbyterianism prior to the Reformation, see Smyth's *Presbytery* and not *Prelacy* the Primitive Policy of the Church, B. III, p. 441—542.

tunity of carrying them into practical operation.* Lord Baltimore was brought up a Protestant and had in him, therefore, the innate seeds of its liberal principles, and naturally sought, as the founder of a colony, to obtain preëminence for it by its liberality, as Romanism could not be legally or successfully† established. And when Bancroft lauds him as the first in the Christian world “to advance the career of civilization by recognizing the rightful equality of all Christian sects,”‡ he contradicts himself and contradicts the facts of the case. For as Lord Baltimore’s colony was only chartered in 1632, and established in 1634, while Roger Williams arrived in New England in February, 1631, from which time, until 1636, when he established his colony, he was fighting the battles of freedom with his own brethren of the independent persuasion, so of him Mr. Bancroft justly says “he was the first person in modern christendom to assert, in its plenitude, the doctrine of the liberty of conscience—the equality of opinions before the law”§—“he was a Puritan, * * * and he alone had arrived at the great principle”|| on which “it became his glory to found a State.** The chartered Constitution of Maryland limited its toleration and equal rights to Christians. It was “of all Christian sects it recognized the equal rights,” and Christianity by this charter, was made the law of the land.”†† This also is the provision of the Constitution of Maryland, adopted in 1776, which even admits of taxation for supporting the Christian religion.‡‡ The toleration of Roger Williams, however, was unlimited.§§

Of William Penn it is also certain that he inherited Puritan feelings, and was personally intimate with the expounders of Puritan liberty,||| and yet even by his Constitution of 1682, Christians alone were eligible to office.***

* See Bancroft’s Hist. of U. S., vol. 1, pp. 244, 367, 239, and vol. 2, p. 378.

† See *ibid.* vol. 1, p. 242.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 244.

§ *Ibid.* pp. 375, 376.

|| *Ibid.* p. 367.

** *Ibid.* p. 375.

†† *Ibid.* pp. 243, 244, 248.

‡‡ Const. of the several States, &c. London, 1783, pp. 243, and 244.

§§ See Bancroft’s History of the United States, vol. 1, pp. 367, 375, 376.

||| *Ibid.* vol. 2, p. 378.

*** *Ibid.* p. 387.

Nay, even in his revised Constitution, of 1701, the assent of the Governor is necessary to any law, and "a profession of faith in Christ," is made necessary for any public employment.*

These apparent exceptions, therefore, only substantiate our claims for Puritanism, and leave all that we have advanced in favor of the liberal and free spirit of Presbyterianism and of its patriotic achievements in America, untouched. Our glory is not sought in the humiliation or depreciation of others.

On the contrary, in speaking of the early Puritan principles and spirit, we have already shewn that it characterized alike all its divisions and burned in all its denominational churches, as a flame of pure and ardent patriotism and liberty. To suppose, therefore, that facts, illustrating the glory of a common ancestry, even though that be in the form of Presbytery, is derogatory to the dignity or honour or patriotism of any branch of the now widely extended family of non-Episcopalian churches, is certainly a most selfish and suicidal policy. And he who would tarnish the lustre thrown around THE RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES AND SPIRIT OF THE REFORMERS AND PURITANS, as the fountain of our constitutional laws and liberties, and attribute these to the mere natural impulses of the human heart, is not more absurd in reasoning than he is profane in spirit.

We may have been somewhat hyperbolic in claiming for the GENERIC SPIRIT AND PRINCIPLES of Presbyterianism the founding of empires. But he who will consider its influences in sustaining the Jewish Republic; in preserving the system and independence of the Waldenses; in creating the republic of Geneva; in confederating the republic of Switzerland, and making Geneva "the focus of Protestantism and of practical republicanism;"† in combining the States of Protestant Germany against the threatened extermination of the Emperor and the Pope; in resuscitating the united provinces of the Netherlands, when they threw off the yoke of Philip II., and founded in their morasses a confederation, very nearly resembling that which

* See Bancroft's History of the United States, vol. 3, p. 42.

† See the Oxford Chronological Tables of History, p. 28.

had been founded on the mountains of Helvetia;* in creating an empire within the despotic and unquestionably Popish France;† in erecting the Commonwealth of England upon the ruins of civil and religious despotism; in giving origin to that liberty and reform which are still at work in the gradual transformation of the British Constitution; in moulding and fashioning the character of the Scottish people, so as to make them preëminent among the nations of the earth; and, not to enlarge,—in giving birth to the spirit of independence in these colonies, inspiring courage to declare it, union to maintain it, and wisdom, in some degree at least, to mould the Constitution of these United States;—when, we say, these facts are contemplated with a searching and unprejudiced eye, our words may well be tolerated as not unwarrantably eulogizing the genius of Presbytery as the genius of civil and religious liberty.‡

ARTICLE III

THE MORAL CONDITION OF WESTERN AFRICA.

By REV. JOHN LEIGHTON WILSON, of S. C.

Missionary at the Gaboon River, Western Africa.

The Prophet Isaiah, in the 18th chapter, and 7th verse of his prophecies, has these words: "In that time shall the present be brought to the Lord of Hosts of a people scattered and peeled, and from a people terrible from the beginning hitherto; a nation meted out and trodden under foot, whose lands the rivers have spoiled, to the place of the name of the Lord of Hosts, the Mount Zion." As may be

* Viller's Essay on the Reformation, p. 71, 136, &c. Baird's Northern Europe, vol. 1, p. 82-93.

† In fact, in France the Huguenot body soon made pretensions equivalent to a partition of the monarchy. See Villiers' Essay as above.

‡ This was the title selected for a work, for which the late Rev. Dr. Winchester, of Natchez, had made large preparation, when death cut short his labours.