

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL IV.

FEBRUARY 1838.

No. 2.

RIOT AT ALTON.

Death of Lovejoy. General Reflexions on the Nature and Results of Abolitionism.

COMMOTIONS in the body politic, are as real evidences of social disease, and as clear prognostics of the event of the particular malady—as the pangs which wring the sick-man's brow, are proof that the vital organ through which they shoot is dangerously oppressed, and that not only dissolution in general, but a specific death must ensue; unless relief can be administered.

Social order, is not less valuable than liberty itself; and in our afflicted country at this moment, we behold both these fundamental necessities,—put in jeopardy by the violence of opposite and heated parties. But what is most remarkable, and in Protestant countries, absolutely without a parallel,—the party which endangers social order, professes to be a *religious* party!!

All past ages have demonstrated, that however great an evil slavery may be in itself considered—yet every form of government is consistent with its existence, and every state of society compatible with its exercise. But, on the other hand, we defy the wit of man to show, that the principles of the so-called abolitionists, are consistent with the permanent duration of any sort of social system; just as we defy the most laborious research to find in all past time a single illustration of the long continuance of them,—a single attempt to adopt them in any age—which did not end in the total dissolution of society!!

We do not speak of the phrensied opinions, of particular abolitionists—such as *Garrison*, who denounces the Sabbath day as a Jewish relic, and the Christian ministry as a useless corruption;—nor the nameless vagabonds, who lecture in the pay of the societies against parental and civil government; nor the crazy women—who fill the news-papers, with unfeminine and irreligious nonsense; nor

yet of BEMAN, and such spirits, whose former slaves are still in bondage, while they are enjoying their price, and traducing better men, whose consciences revolt alike at their conduct and their principles. We speak not of such men,—nor even such classes of them; though of all fanaticism this seems the most rife in its various and incoherent sub-sects. It is of the general party—the common avowed, recorded sentiments of the body at large—that we deliberately assert—they are hostile to the first principles of all society—and must convulse every state into which they are introduced.

The agrarianism of ancient Rome, was a mere attempt to limit the inequality which civilization, under the ancient order of society, was obliged to produce in the relative conditions of men,—by limiting the increase in the wealth of individuals. The attempts to enforce the agrarian laws were partly, in true accordance with the spirit of the Roman code—and partly the pretexts of wicked men, who convulsed the state for their own purposes. The political objects of those patriots who devised the laws, to preserve if it were possible the republican equality of the citizens, are better secured by our laws of descent, which ordinarily prevent the too great accumulation of estates. But the point to be observed here is, that agrarianism and abolitionism, agreeing in the very point which made the former an everlasting source of convulsion and blood-shed in Rome—the latter must by inevitable necessity, produce the same results here. They both assert, principles which produce equally universal levelling, in estates;—and this single principle, rudely enforced, drenched Rome, again and again in social blood. But even at the worst days of agrarianism, the worst fanatics in the imperial city, did not desire the thorough sub-version of the political constitutions of the state,—nor claim for the plebeans, patrician rights and dignity. So that, *a fortiori*, there is more assurance now of civil commotion, than there was at Rome.

In precisely the same way, the Jacobins of France, set about a system of universal and instantaneous *political* levelling—and the result is recorded in the blood of the reign of terror. But does not all the world know, that the free negroes of the northern states, and the slaves of the whole south, are more unfit to be subjects of such an experiment, than the canaille of Paris was in '92? The truth is that all former political convulsions which mankind have endured are insignificant compared to that which would immediately occur over the whole southern country—if all the slaves were enfranchised in a day, and vested with absolute political equality with the whites. Yet this is the great fundamental claim of northern abolitionism, and therefore, it is to us, most certain, that this fanaticism can end, if pushed, only in blood.

In relation to the great doctrine of amalgamation, which stands prominently out, as one of the fundamental axioms of the party—they have the advantage of being absolutely original. No party, as such, was ever before organised to advance a dogma which in all ages before, has been abhorrent to the soul of man. It tramples on the inherent and fundamental principles of our nature, as exhibited in all past time; it sets at nought all the light of history and of God's providence; it conflicts with the physical laws of the universe, as

far as we understand their influence, in modifying the varieties of the race by climate, habits, condition and civilization; and it disregards all fixed principles, touching the moral and mental condition of man, as affected by all these mighty influences. It is a base, vulgar, brutal sentiment, sanctified with the name of religious principle—and fit only to demoralise and degrade individual men, and to rend society in pieces.

These solemn conclusions, we have deliberately arrived at after as thorough and extensive an investigation of this whole subject, as we were capable of giving to it; and we have repeatedly uttered them by way of admonition to our countrymen, for some years past. And it has been marvellous to us, that all men have not seen the progress of things, as the events of the last six years have developed themselves; and it is not less so now, that any can look on the past and hesitate a moment, as regards the future.

The case of LOVEJOY, is a mere item in the progress of abolitionism. That it had not occurred sooner is matter rather of surprise, than that it has at last occurred should be. It was *obliged to occur*—and thousands of cases like it will occur—and the land itself will smoke with blood, if things only progress, as for the last few years.

There will be indeed a very decided difference in the blood-shed of the north and the south respectively. At the north, we shall have *social war*, at the south we shall have *servile war*; and if the abolitionists conquer at the north, and the slaves are conquered at the south, then we shall have *civil war*. But our firm belief is, that whenever the sword is fully drawn, and drawn it cannot but be, as matters go—the slaves of the south, and the abolitionists of the north, will be the *principal* victims of this tremendous madness; and that the union of these states will not only be preserved, but that no *civil war*, properly so called, is to be apprehended,—if the south uses ordinary prudence. But of this, more presently.

The case of LOVEJOY, as we have said, has in it nothing that surprises us. Indeed he was not the first victim. The poor stranger who fell by his hand, a mere spectator of a scene of wo—and who will fill a nameless grave;—he was the first victim of abolitionism. Posterity will record, what wisdom foresaw, that **ABOLITIONISTS SHED THE FIRST BLOOD IN THIS CONTEST!!** Write it on tables of brass; remember it to the latest ages; record it for the everlasting instruction of mankind—**ABOLITIONISTS SHED THE FIRST BLOOD.** They have appealed to the sword. Their doom is fixed, whenever that keen arbitrator shall utter his terrible award; and then they will find God's words true; and the earth will see, that *wonders* are done in the name of Jesus, by men whom Jesus neverknew.—No, never can the attempts now made to conceal the fearful truth, that **ABOLITIONISTS SHED THE FIRST BLOOD**—be crowned with success. A poor stranger, nameless, perhaps innocent of wrong intentions, certainly guiltless of injury by open wrong—this unhappy man, and *not Lovejoy*, was the first martyr, to outraged liberty and social order, the first victim in a career whose end is covered with a pall of blood, over which our country's image bends in speechless grief.

All that is personal in this matter loses its interest, in the magnitude of the principles involved and illustrated by it. But yet the truth should be understood and remembered; the more so, as much pains are taken by the abolition press to circulate falsehood, and to establish unsound and unchristian principles of action, as the result of the melancholy affair.

It appears that Mr. Lovejoy was an eastern man, who went to seek his fortunes in the great west; and settled at St. Louis in the state of Missouri, some years ago. He was first a school-master and student at law; then the editor of a political journal, of extremely violent character; then a minister in the Presbyterian church, and finally the editor of a religious news-paper. When abolitionism arose; he was occupying the last named position in the town of St. Louis. At first he wrote and argued lengthily and vehemently *against the abolitionists; and solemnly and repeatedly denied being of their number.* Gradually his paper, went over to them; and popular indignation drove him from St. Louis. ALTON, in Illinois, is situated but a few miles from St. Louis, and thither he went to establish himself. There also, he repeatedly declared, in private and in public that the paper he proposed to establish in his new location, not only was not to be an abolition news-paper—but that he would not advocate abolition doctrines in it. These pledges were all violated; new popular commotions arose: his press was destroyed—another obtained and also destroyed before being set up—and the one which he died in defending, was obtained by funds contributed after an earnest public appeal by him,—accompanied by pledges to publish at Alton an abolition press, to do this if needful, by the shedding of the blood of his townsmen—and if necessary, at the expense of his life.—The press came to Alton; Mr. Lovejoy, following the dictates of his own principles and sentiments, backed by the advice of many leading abolitionists throughout the nation; undertook to defend it, with arms in his hands, aided by a number of armed friends; and in this attempt after a man had been killed by the abolitionists, Mr. Lovejoy was shot, in the act of shooting another person.—Such is the brief outline of the case.

Now we take the responsibility of saying, that according to our notions of the religion of the Bible, Mr. Lovejoy, was utterly unjustifiable, as a Christian, and still more clearly so as a Christian minister, in the whole of this affair. He gave and broke repeated pledges; he pursued a course most eminently calculated to enrage those around him,—then attempted by the help of foreign aid to defy the public sentiment he had aroused against himself; then deliberately provided the means of death, and slew, or caused another to slay a fellow being in carrying out a settled purpose to brow beat the society into which he came, contrary to their wishes, to propagate sentiments believed by them to be absolutely inconsistent with the integrity of the American Union, and the peaceful continuance of any sort of social organization. We believe the Bible will be searched in vain for precept or example to justify such proceedings.

Still further, we venture to express the settled conviction, that Mr. Lovejoy's conduct cannot be defended upon the ordinary principles which should regulate the behaviour of orderly and peaceable

citizens—leaving religion entirely out of the question. We do not now insist on the duty of studying the peace of society and respecting the feelings, the opinions, and even the prejudices of others, our equals, as far as is possible, even when performing the most necessary duties; though all this is obvious enough. We need not urge the fact, that Mr. Lovejoy, a stranger in the west, and doubly so in Alton—was on these accounts the more obliged to push his schemes of reform with decorum and modesty—and certainly to stop within the verge of revolution. *But what we mean is, that nothing short of extremest necessity can justify a private person in taking human life; and that the life of man is of more value than a printing press.* No state, with whose laws we are acquainted, either in ancient or modern times, would justify the shedding of blood, under the circumstances in which Mr. Lovejoy and his companions killed one man, and endeavoured to kill a multitude of others. If the mob had stopped, and the affair ended, when the stranger out side the house, was shot, by those within, the case would have been a clear felony, by the common law; nor do we believe that the code of any civilized state that ever existed—would tolerate the act.—It is perfectly obvious to the meanest capacity—that if private persons may take the lives of others, for the protection of property of small value, and may themselves judge of the fitting time and manner—then indeed law is ended far more really than the worst mobs have yet contended for. Mobs profess to act against law, because of the infirmity of the laws. But here are men professing to be good citizens, humble Christians, and zealous ministers of Christ, who avowedly take human life to protect property of small value against mere trespassers,—and boldly avouch law for the act!! And the land is full of men calling themselves quiet citizens and true Christians who defend the deed!!

It may indeed be argued that the true reason of the conduct of Lovejoy was not because he valued the property, he killed a man, and died himself in defending—but because of the vital principles, staked on the defence of that property. In other words, the issue stands thus; there is a party in this country whose principles are so abhorrent that their publication leads to blood-shed; and they love those principles so ardently, that they will insist on the right to publish them at the price of blood! Be it so; then the issue is complete—and our streets must run with blood, shed by violence, if one or other of these parties, does not alter its principles and conduct. Then liberty and social order, as we have said at the beginning, are both put in jeopardy; and the latter by men acting in the name of the religion of Jesus!?

Let us suppose, the past course of things a true criterion of the future. It appears to us that the same intense hatred which the great body of the people of the north has manifested every where, to abolition principles—must not only remain as deeply fixed as ever; but that it must increase in extent and power as those principles become better and better known. The very existence of society is involved in putting down these principles; and the mobs and convulsions already produced in so many places, are irregular and spasmodic effects of this fearful truth instinctively perceived; and

not the innate love of man, for the evils of slavery, as the abolitionists foolishly pretend. Amongst the enemies of abolition, there is a class of us—who reason against them; there is another class that mobs them. Between these classes there is no other sympathy, than that which a common aversion may create; and there can be no bond of union, except that produced by the drawing of the sword by the abolitionists. This they have manifested their readiness to do. They will therefore find their enemies at the north, more united, more determined, and more numerous than ever. It is inevitable—that the principal explosion of this affair must be in our northern states; and the great battle when fought in truth, will be between the *enlightened* and *religious* abolitionists, and the lowest classes of the whites, in our large northern towns! This is a most tremendous and shocking degradation of religion and knowledge, the like of which nothing but the ill-regulated instincts of the one side, and the stupidest fanaticism on the other, could possibly have produced. Lazaroni, and pretended ministers of the gospel, shedding each others' blood, in fierce and brutal contention, in the streets of our cities! Alas! for virtue, for decency—for piety;—is your fall indeed so great!

In the south there are no abolitionists—at least none who dare avow themselves. Even in those states where the cause of rational amelioration of the condition of the slave had made most progress—few, very few, have embraced the new opinions—and those few have almost without exception emigrated. This has resulted from the plain fact, already several times stated, that great as may be the evils of slavery, society can exist under them; but the principles set forth as the means of its cure are radically hostile to the very being of any sort of social state, and lead directly to revolution after revolution, terminating at last in the rule of the worst elements that entered into the body preternaturally dissolved.

It is a most remarkable fact, that all the early, enlightened and constant friends of the slave, are with one accord, the open denouncers of this new and mad scheme of revolution—as being above measure hostile to the interests of the black race,—especially in the southern country. The slaves are rendered jealous and stubborn, impatient and revengeful; the free blacks have become more idle, saucy, and unprofitable; the friends of gradual emancipation outraged by the fanatics of the north, wearied with opposition from the free blacks and ingratitude on the part of the whole race, and spent with cares and labours, which have been rendered nearly fruitless, by a foreign and wicked interference, remain almost silent; while the community at large sees the absolute necessity of checking all intercourse between the abolitionists and the coloured people of the south—and prepares itself for the probable event of these contentions. It is manifest beyond all contradiction that the least hope of any early and general movement in the southern country in favour of slave emancipation, is for the present futile; and that this melancholly change, has been the consequence of the agitations at the north. All that is left to ruin the poor black man's cause past redemption, is the lighting up of a servile war,—which the whole conduct and principles of the abolitionists have been long calculat-

ed to produce, and which they who defend the conduct of Lovejoy, cannot with decency or consistency, as appears to us, for a moment disapprove. If a minister ought to shoot a man, to save a printing press, presented to him,—assuredly, a slave “ought to cut his master’s throat”—as George Thompson urged, three years ago, for a hundred stronger reasons.

There are two or three things in the enemies of abolition, which we feel called on, most decisively and clearly to condemn; things which we consider hardly less hostile to liberty, than the course of the other party has been to public order.

And first, we condemn all mobs, under all pretexts, and for every kind of purpose. When laws become intolerable let them be amended; and if this cannot be done otherwise, let it be done by revolution. We admit, yea contend for the great republican principle, that men may alter, and if they please abolish governments; and that if need require they may do this with arms in their hands. But there is a wide difference between this sacred right—to reform society in its very elements; and the right to make a mob. Let this distinction be broadly kept up. Let *the civil authority* (not private persons)—put down all mobs,—instantly, promptly, and at every risk. This must be done, or the country is ruined. If the laws cannot protect men, they will protect themselves; and when this result is arrived at, society is already dissolved. The Mayor of Alton ought to have put down that mob—if he had slain his first born son to do it—or died by his father’s hand, in attempting it. The true spirit of republican liberty is—let the laws reign.—We utterly deny the right of Mr. Lovejoy to say and print what he pleased, irrespective of consequences. Still less to kill men in enforcing so preposterous a pretention. But we as utterly repudiate, the right of any to stop him, by organized violence irrespective of, and in opposition to the laws. The laws forbid wicked talking as well as wicked acting; let them rule.

Again; we consider the threats of many southern people, and of some persons high in rank and office, to dissolve the union, on account of abolition principles spreading at the north,—to be both absurd and wicked. Absurd, because the very surest way to furnish the abolitionists with means of annoyance, is to dissolve the national confederacy; and wicked, because the great bulk of the people of the north, are neither abolitionists, nor responsible for the conduct of those who are. But such conduct as is too often pursued towards the people of the north, is calculated to make nominal abolitionists, of many who would otherwise be neutral, or adverse to their plans. As an example, the recent conduct of the bulk of the delegation of the slave states in congress, appeared to us, most unreasonable and ridiculous. Surely no man in his senses, will deny that Congress has power to legislate *concerning* slavery in the District of Columbia; and if so, of course, to deliberate and decide about the mode and kind of legislation; and beyond all question the sacred and inestimable right of petition, belongs to the country, touching any question about which Congress can act. Yet on so plain a case, gentlemen considered it expedient, to make a great fuss; to take for granted that in what may lawfully be done, some-

thing will occur, not lawful; and so endanger the quiet of the country—by the morbid action of their over-sensitive tempers. It is the very germ of disorganization—where a system provides a way to arrive at certain conclusions—for those who administer it to jump at their passionate conclusions, by unprovided methods. Is there provision in the Constitution or laws of this country, for the southern Congress-men, to hop up like parched peas, and bounce out of the house, because some body, male or female wishes to petition congress about slavery in the District of Columbia? Such behaviour, is unworthy of a great cause—we need not say of great men; and they who adopt it, may rest assured they gain nothing but pity from their friends, and ridicule from their enemies.

And thirdly; we most solemnly protest, against all attempts to defeat abolitionism, by establishing the legality and humanity of slavery. Our full and solemn conviction is that slavery as an abiding relation is contrary to the natural rights of man—to every principle of republican liberty, and to the entire spirit of the Christian religion. This conviction is not an atom less deep and fixed, than that of the total absurdity, impracticability and wickedness of the schemes of abolitionism; and while we combat the latter with all our hearts—may God forbid that we should ever be found conniving at statements on the other side, which we have spent so large a portion of our prime manhood, in endeavouring to confute. There are three great parties, with systems perfectly distinct on these exciting topics; that, namely, of the *abolitionists*, that of the *pro-slavery men*, and that of the *gradual emancipationists*. To the last of these three, we unchangeably belong; and feel ourselves called on, to resist the pretensions of both the others. Abolitionism can be fruitful only of ill; pro-slaveryism is capable of comparatively but little good; gradual, prudent, but finally efficacious emancipation, with the consent of the owners, and by the action of the states respectively, and coupled as much as possible with foreign colonization; this is the scheme, which we believe ought to commend itself to the interest, the duty and the enlightened conscience of all the parties interested—and which must finally be adopted as the only peaceful mode of terminating the great and difficult questions, and adjusting the mighty conflicting interests involved in the subject.

Upon the whole aspect of the subject, no considerate man can fail to be struck with the present dangerous posture of the country—and to feel the weighty obligations imposed upon all good citizens, and true Christians,—to come to its rescue before it be too late. There is solid sense, and true principle enough left in the land, to carry us safely through even greater trials than the present. But the north and the south, must understand each-other fully—and the principles of the national confederation be fairly and justly adhered to on both sides. Good temper, mutual forbearance, and candid construction will at once enable each to see, that their interests are equally great and direct in urging them to banish these pestilent practices and opinions from the earth; and the way to do this, is by the regular action of the laws, and the open exercise of truth and reason.

In a most special manner, is it the duty of all good citizens to frown upon the attempt now systematically made, by the abolition party, to sanctify their terrible dogmas by the alledged martyrdom of Lovejoy; and to give currency to principles, which if followed out and acted on by others, introduce at once, a reign of personal vengeance in the room of public order;—and under the guise of praise to the victim of their unhappy proceedings, to disseminate a defence of every principle which leads to social and servile war. *Let it never be forgotten that ABOLITIONISTS have taken the ground openly and clearly, that they are ready to shed blood in propagating their creed; let it be held in everlasting remembrance, that THEY HAVE SHED THE FIRST BLOOD; let it be set down ineffaceably, that NORTHERN and not SOUTHERN hands have the first mutually embued themselves in social blood, shed through the machinations of this audacious fanaticism, which in the abused name of liberty convulses for the present, only those regions where no slavery exists!—*

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF SLAVERY,

No. 4.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—

IT was my intention, at first, to extend these essays one or two numbers beyond the present, which would have enabled me to go into an exposition of all those passages of the New Testament, which slave-holders consider as justifying the system of slavery in this land. But in order to close with the end of the volume, as well as to guard against wearying your readers with an unpleasant subject, I will try to finish with the present number. Indeed, if I have been at all successful in my views of the teaching of inspired prophets, and of our Saviour himself, nothing more will be necessary than to glance at some *principles* in the writings of the Apostles; for no Christian will contend that Paul and Peter and John, inculcated doctrines on this point, at variance with those of Jesus Christ himself.

1. Paul says—“*the labourer is worthy of his reward:*” 1 Tim. v. 18. The connection shews that he is treating of the support of ministers of the gospel; but the principle is precisely the same, when applied to bodily labour. Hence, the Apostle utters the command—“*masters give unto your servants that which is just and equal.*” Can this mean any thing less than a fair equivalent for services rendered? And does it not fairly include in it, also, time and opportunity to use and enjoy it? But why spend time in proving that every man should have a just compensation for his labour? It is acknowledged by the ablest apologists for slavery. Professor Hodge says, it is “a plain principle of morals, and a command of

the Bible that cannot be violated with impunity." Now, as the tree is best known by its fruit, can there be a better test of the righteousness or unrighteousness of United States' slavery, than to lay it, as it exists in practice, along side of this honest Bible maxim? And in order that our opponents may have every advantage, we will not adduce the conduct of wicked, or even of worldly men, but that of professors of religion; and that too in a part of the country where slavery appears in its mildest aspect.

A gentleman of high standing and great moral worth in Kentucky, and whose name, did we think proper to mention it, would add greatly to the force of the testimony, thus writes in the N. Y. Observer, of August, 1836. "What would be the effect of a practical recognition by slave-holders, of the Scriptural doctrine of a full compensation to the labourer? They would feel that nearly all that was valuable to them in slavery was gone. . . The worth of a slave to his master arises from the legal right which the master has to *appropriate to himself* the proceeds of the slave's labour. . . An extensive acquaintance with Christian masters enables us to point to *not more than three or four* who are acting in this matter, on the principles of the gospel. *There is not one in a hundred*, with whom we have ever become acquainted, who, if solemnly appealed to, could declare that he is even making an approximation to his duty, or giving any thing like a *fair compensation* for the services rendered by his slaves. . . In the region where we reside there is no pretention to the merit of compensation. Every one knows that among us there is, except in some rare instance, nothing of the kind. The slaves well know that even their *Christian* masters never dream of remunerating them for their services." Again—"the intellectual improvement and *compensation* of the bondman are gospel duties. They are every where neglected. We see it, and yet are silent. Sin stalks around us unrebuked. Our moral sensibilities can only be awakened by the sins of the abolitionist. Our virtuous indignation finds him out though a thousand miles distant from us, and hurls its anathemas at his head. We wish, we exclaim, for no foreign interference. No truly—for it may make us feel that we are slumbering at our posts." Again—"We have recently known of two ministering brothers selling into the terrible bondage of the far south, the one, two thousand, the other, five thousand dollars' worth of slaves. Alas that truth and duty should compel us to record such facts! We could weep over the occurrences which are daily exhibited throughout our slave-holding churches," &c. This gentleman's testimony is fully corroborated by that of a large committee of ministers and elders of the Presbyterian Synod of Kentucky. They say, in an address to the churches—"we know that the idea of a bondman receiving a *just and equal remuneration for his labour, never enters the minds of slave-holders.*" And they tell us, too, very justly, that "the precepts against *fraud*, oppression, pride and cruelty, all cut directly through the heart of the slave system." Surely the inspired epistles are full of such precepts; and yet we are told forsooth, that the Bible sanctions the slavery of this land. *James* says to rich men—"weep and howl for your miseries." And why? "Because the hire of the labourers which is of you kept

back by fraud crieth, and the cries of the reapers have entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth." If keeping back a just compensation for the labour of a few days produced such a threatening from the Lord, surely the fact mentioned by the committee, (several of them owning slaves,) that slave-holders never think of giving such compensation, but keep it back all their lives, forebodes nothing but ruin and destruction, unless they repent.

The question is often asked—what is the proper compensation for the labour of a slave? And the insinuation is common, that food and clothing are entirely adequate. Now it is well known that an ordinary male slave will hire in most parts of the south for from fifty, to one hundred and twenty dollars per annum; and the person who hires, must furnish him with food, clothing and medical attendance. This then is the proper compensation for his labour, for it is the current market price. And does it not, in all honesty, belong to the man who earns it by his toil? We are told, however, that the owner of this slave has several others in his possession; that some of them are old and others sickly; consequently he must pocket the earnings of the healthy, to enable him to support the others. Does he act thus, we ask, with the approbation and consent of those that are able bodied? This will not be pretended. Is it not a strange kind of morality then, that permits a man to defraud A and B, that he may be generous to C and D? It is not true, however, that they receive an equivalent for their labour, even when taken *en masse*; for slave-holders talk loudly of their great sacrifices, should they consent to set all the slaves free. They tell us that at the late high prices they are worth one thousand millions of dollars. Surely if their services are worth this vast sum in advance, over and above their keeping, it will never do to say that their keeping alone is a fair compensation for their labour. It is a melancholy consideration, that immortal souls, hastening to the bar of God, can hoodwink themselves, by flimsy sophistry, into a habitual violation of one of the most explicit commands of Holy Writ. Is this language too strong? You, Messrs Editors, will not say so. For the senior editor once declared that slavery is that condition "in which one portion of the community called masters, is allowed such power over another portion called slaves; as 1, to deprive them of the entire earnings of their labour, except only so much as is necessary to continue labour itself, by continuing healthful existence; *thus committing clear robbery,*" &c. This is slavery according to law; and as is the root so are the branches, as the foregoing testimony abundantly verifies. Why should we not feel alarmed for our country? When we read the denunciation of Scripture—"woe unto him that useth his neighbour's service without wages; and giveth him not for his work."

2. Paul tells us that the law was made for "men stealers," as well as for liars and murderers. What law? That found in Exod. xxi; 16. "He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, shall surely be put to death." Slave laws make *property* of men, and we are told that the Bible sanctions it. Yet here we find that death was the penalty for stealing a man, while for stealing any thing else called property, no such penalty was enacted. But

for what purpose was he stolen? Simply to be used as a slave. He was coveted as property that he might either be *sold*, or *worked* for the benefit of another. And no matter how kindly he might be treated, or how much his physical condition might be improved. God makes no allowance for such vain pleas.

3. Again—Paul says—“*marriage is honourable in all.*” Now he was aware that the law of marriage declared that “a man shall leave his father and mother, and cleave unto his wife.” Thus we see that even parents could not detain a man lawfully, after his arrival at mature age. Is it possible that any other can have a stronger claim? Yet slavery sets at defiance parental claims, and utterly denies to male and female marriage according to law. The Bible calls it *honourable*, while slavery tramples it beneath her feet; yet grave doctors of divinity tell us that the Bible sanctioned slavery of a worse description, than that which is prevalent in these United States!! It is said, however, that Paul commanded servants to be *obedient* to their masters; and Peter says—“be subject to them, not only when good and gentle, but also to the froward.* Very true. And our Saviour also said—“if a man smite thee on one cheek, turn to him the other.” *Submission* being the duty of one party, does not authorize *aggression* in the other. Indeed Peter speaks of the servant in that case as “suffering *wrongfully*,” yet he is required to submit. But if the command to servants to obey their masters, can be constructed into a sanction of the laws then in force in Roman territories, which reduced them to poverty, then the command to wives to be obedient to their husbands, and children to obey their parents, sanctioned also the iniquitous Roman laws, which gave power to the husband to sell his wife, and the parent to sell his own child. Will any one contend for such latitude in expounding the word of God?

4. It was intended, at first, to point out the severity and even *cruelty* of the slave laws; and show the carrying out of this spirit to an astonishing extent in practice by the testimony of many eminent men at the south. Our limits, however, forbid such a range. We pass it, therefore, with a remark or two, in which the existence of such laws is taken for granted. No person of sense and information will think of denying the fact. Now the cruel laws to which we allude are either necessary for the tranquillity of the south, or they are not. Our opponents, must take one horn of the dilemma. Do you say they are entirely *unnecessary*? If so, what are we to think of the humanity of those who enact such laws; or who, while living in the states where they exist, make few or no efforts, by petition and remonstrance, to have them blotted from the statute book? Such an acknowledgement carries with it more severity of rebuke than can be contained in many words. It will be said, however, that these laws are *necessary*; and that it would be unsafe to inhabit the south, were they to be materially relaxed. What then, let me ask, is the fair inference to be drawn from this plea of necessity? Manifestly, that slavery is a most unrighteous system. Must we believe that slavery is a *righteous relation*, and yet demanding for its support and continuance, a system of unrighteous and cruel

laws! Are we going over to the rank of the Jesuits, by adopting the maxim that the end sanctifies the means;—that “it is lawful to do evil that good may come?” Let any man who supports the cruel slave code, in any way, get out of this difficulty unscathed, if he can. It was not without reason, certainly, that the committee of the Synod of Kentucky declared—“*the maintenance of this system breaks not one law of the Lord, or two laws—it violates the whole code. It leaves scarcely one precept unbroken.*”

5. We next invite attention to two general remarks. The first is, *that God in his providence has poured his rebuke upon slavery in this land.* Does any one deny the fact? Let him look at those portions of the south, where slavery has had time and opportunity to develop itself most fully. See the worn out fields, the dilapidated dwellings, the poverty stricken aspect of a large portion of those states. Behold, too, the moral condition of vast numbers of the inhabitants, both blacks and whites. But this is a picture which we will not attempt even to sketch. The testimony of Jefferson, and other southern writers and orators, settles the question beyond doubt, as to the *vitiating tendency* of slavery upon all classes of the community; in addition to the fact that it acts as a damper to the prosperity of any country where it exists. The question then forces itself upon us.—Is not the God of *providence* the God of the *Bible*? And is it possible that he reads us a lesson in his *word* in favour of slavery; and then reads us, in his *works*, or providential dealings with men, a lesson against slavery? Such a question needs no answer. The statement alone is sufficient for every unprejudiced mind. The second remark is this:—If the word of God justifies slavery as it exists in this land, *why dont the masters exert themselves to have all the slaves taught to read the Bible?* Could any thing act as efficiently, in reconciling them to their situation, as to know that God intended them to occupy their present place as a righteous and permanent position? How can we reconcile the conduct of masters in upholding laws which hinder their being taught to read, with their profession of faith that the Bible sanctions slavery? What! take the utmost pains to keep men in ignorance of that very truth that would justify our conduct before heaven and earth!! Is this human nature? Must the very laws that govern mind be overturned, in our zeal to support this cherished institution? We first plead the Bible in favour of holding them in bondage, and then justify ourselves for so blinding their eyes, by statute, that they cannot read the Bible, lest they might become so enlightened as to refuse to stay in bondage!! Is there not reason to believe, however, that there is really more of blind prejudice, or even passion, than of honest conviction, in the cry now raised, that the word of God sanctions slavery? Conscience and common sense revolt at the idea; and in fact the clamour *within* is often so loud that even slave-holding ecclesiastics find it difficult to allay the tumult, with all the stupifying potions that their ingenuity, and perverted Bible-reading enable them to prepare.

This assertion is verified on the very face of a pamphlet published some months since by the *Rev. James Smylie*, of Mississippi. He acknowledges that “the abolition maxim, *that slavery is in itself sin-*

ful, had gained on, and entwined itself among the religious and conscientious scruples of many in the community." This, recollect, was in Mississippi. Now observe the manner in which this herald of the cross comes forth to plead the cause of the poor and needy. Take his own *delectable* words. "How beautiful and delightful will it be to an honest, scrupulous and conscientious slave-holder, to learn from the word of God, *the glad tidings* that slavery itself is not sinful. Released now from an incubus that paralyzed his energies, in discharge of duty towards his slaves, he goes forth cheerfully to energetic action. . . Instead of hanging down his head, moping and brooding over his condition, *as formerly*, without action, he raises his head and moves on cheerfully in the plain path of duty. He is no more tempted to look askance at the word of God, and saying hast thou found me, O mine enemy, come to filch from me my slaves, while not enriching them, leaves me poor indeed? Instead of viewing the word of God, as formerly, come with whips and scorpions to chastise him into paradise, he feels that "its ways are ways of pleasantness, and all its paths are peace." It is difficult to repress laughter at this attempt to quiet uneasy consciences, as it sounds so much like a burlesque on slavery. The author, however, writes in downright earnest; and his production is plausible enough to delude the unwary, or impose upon ignorant minds. But the man who honestly desires "to do *justly*, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with God," will require other arguments to persuade him that slavery is a Divine institution. When some towering genius shall rise, and convince men that kindness and oppression mean the same thing, that justice and injustice are words of similar import, and that cruelty and humanity are synonymous terms; then, *and not till then*, may it be proved that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments sanction the system of slavery established in these United States.

Finally.—If Slavery be a sin, it is certainly a sin of no common magnitude. The cry that it is wholly a political affair, and that the church steps out of her sphere in meddling with the subject, is worse than idle. Its political aspect, we grant, is bad enough, and fairly belies our high sounding professions of republicanism; but its evils, in a moral point of view, may truly be termed *legion*. The church has cherished it in her bosom, and sustained it by her example, until it has reared its head so high in the sanctuary, as almost to bid defiance to her authority. This is evidently one of the worst signs of the times. But if we must wait for civil authorities to take the lead in opposing this sin, what is it but an acknowledgment that politics are purer than religion? We are truly in a woful plight, if the church must abandon her contest with sin, and lean for support upon the arm of the world. Perhaps nothing tends so much to perpetuate this monstrous system, as the acknowledged fact that men truly pious, support it by their example. This hallows it in the eyes of the world. Would the church only see to the removing of such props, the unsightly fabric must soon totter and fall. Many church officers and members, in former years, were in the habit of dram drinking. It was thought no sin to manufacture the liquid poison, and sell it. These good men partook of it themselves, and

no doubt aided, unintentionally in drowning the souls of many in destruction and perdition. But see what has been done by discussion, and the testing of such practices by the principles of the Bible. What evangelical church would now choose a dram drinking minister to instruct them, and be an example to the flock? A few years has produced this great change. Is it at all improbable, that a few years more will find slave-holding ministers in the same predicament? Nay, if they would now refuse any longer to touch the unclean thing, would not such conduct be approved and admired by every candid mind? If reformation do not commence at the house of God, assuredly judgment will begin there, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. When the Israelites practised the sin of oppression, God's wrath smoked against them; but when they repented and humbled themselves, he lifted upon them the light of his countenance. Have we not to do with the same God? And does he expect less from us, in this era of light, than of the Jews under a darker dispensation? His word is pledged, also, that if we "loose the bands of wickedness, undo the heavy burdens, let the oppressed go free, and break every yoke," then shall our "light break forth as the morning," and our "health shall spring forth speedily," our "righteousness shall go before us, and the glory of the Lord shall be our rear-ward." Oh! that we had but a heart to obey the command; then might we confidently expect the fulfilment of the promise.

You may find my principal reason for furnishing these essays in Prov. xxxi; 8, 9. "Open thy mouth for the dumb, in the cause of all such as are appointed to destruction. Open thy mouth, judge righteously, and plead the cause of the poor and needy." Who are the *dumb* in this land? Not the slave-holders certainly, but the slaves. For, although God has furnished them with organs of speech, yet does the tyranny of man forbid them to open their mouth in their own cause. Others must do it for them, and the consciences of men must be speedily reached on this subject; otherwise iniquity will prove our ruin. The people of the south may take their choice, either to rid themselves of the sin of slavery peaceably and righteously, or by persevering in their present course, leave a legacy of blood to their children. May the Lord give them wisdom and understanding? *Amen.*

A PRESBYTERIAN.

AN ELDER'S TESTIMONY FROM WESTERN NEW YORK.

THE following letter, is a clear and melancholy, while it is a voluntary testimony, of a venerable office bearer in God's house—to the dreadful pollutions which have privily crept into it. It is addressed to one of the editors of this Magazine, and is published entire, the full name of the writer, only excepted. And though it seems meant rather as the out-pouring of the full heart of the writer, under his great and long continued trials—and as a testimony to encourage the individual to whom it was written, in the trying duties to which he has been called; yet we venture so to use it, as seems most likely to promote the good cause—in which he and we have so long laboured, and for which we have alike been called to suffer through false brethren.

Here is the simple story of an aged Ruling Elder, in one of our churches—whose heart has been crushed and broken, as by the space of years together, he has heard the doctrines of the cross, reviled by men calling themselves ministers of Christ—seen the very form of his church pass away under the devices of men, professing to be Presbyterian preachers,—and felt the progress of vile revolutionary and revolting agitations, tear away the very foundations of society around him. Alas! who does not weep with him in his sorrows over such things.

Let this be added to the ten thousand proofs, under which the press has groaned for the last eight months;—and which unitedly prove that things were ripe for the action of the church, years before she could be induced to believe it.—Instead of the action of the last Assembly, being harsh and premature—every developement which has been made, makes more and more evident, the overwhelming necessity, which existed, and had long existed for that action.

We assert deliberately two things, which we are ready to prove, and which in our opinion, impartial history will record of the times through which we are passing. The first is, that the Presbyterian church has stood for seven or eight years, on the very brink of a wide-spread, Pelagian apostacy; and that the poison of this “subtle pest of Christianity” as Jeremy Taylor well calls it,—had well nigh insinuated itself into the whole ranks of its clergy. The second is, that this state of the clergy and the church, has been kept hid from public view, and concealed from the evangelical members of both—by a system of sustained and general fraud and deceit, unparalleled in the progress of modern society.—

RIPLEY, Nov. 28, 1837.

Rev. and Dear Sir:—I rejoice to think that you and the majority of our venerable and experienced ministers and elders have taken

such a decided stand in regard to the purity and peace of our church. The course you have taken is in my view the only safe one you could have taken under all the circumstances of the case—I hope the Lord will enable you to maintain the ground you have got.

I live in the bounds of the Buffalo Presbytery, and as far as my knowledge extends, every effort is making to cast odium on your proceedings as a church judicature. The fact is, they are any thing but Presbyterians. I have heard the standards of our church ridiculed from the pulpit, and the scriptural doctrine of the atonement awfully perverted:—also, that there was no sin but a wilful transgression of the law, and that regeneration was only a change of purpose in the creature. These views since the action of the last Assembly have not been so plainly declared;—but I have every reason to believe these men are the same at heart.

The church in Ripley, was formed eighteen or twenty years ago, on the Presbyterian plan. I was then ordained an elder. We lived in love and peace till seven or eight years ago, when a large lump of New Haven leaven made its appearance, and it continued to work, till the whole lump was leavened,—with the exception of one or two besides myself and family. The trials I have had for some years past, have been neither few nor light. I hope the Lord is about to purify his church and cause these trials to work out for his glory and our good. The plan proposed by Dr. Spring (in the Synod of New York) to make peace, I think would be a poor one,—as a vast many churches on the Presbyterian plan have New School ministers.

Since the decision of the last Assembly, I have withdrawn from the church, and intend to move where I can feel at home. I would rather meet in a log cabin with but a few that I could place confidence in, than to spend the time as I have done for years past with a multitude in a splendid house. I get the name of bigot, and many others of the same character. But none of these things move me, as I never can barter away truth, conscience and principle, for the sake of going with the multitude,—as I have reason to fear many of my brethren have done.

The most of the ministers in this Presbytery, are from the Eastern States; all New School I believe, with the exception of one (Mr. Remington);—I believe he is about going to the west.

Dear Sir,—if you lived in a place where you heard nothing but New Heaven divinity, immediate abolition and moral reform, you would be almost tired of such a home, and would be well prepared to sympathise with those that did.

Respectfully yours.

J. D.

(For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.)

“HE IS MY REFUGE.”

A Hymn, by J. L. G.

I.

WHEN I behold my heart
 With sin's deep stain imprest,
 Feign would I draw a curtain dark
 Across my guilty breast—
 Hiding from all—but most from thee
 My God, its vast iniquity!

II.

Oh! could I mount the wing
 Of the ascending morn,
 And be to earth's remotest ring
 Ere close of evening, borne,
 I'd haste, I'd fly o'er land and sea
 To hide me, from myself and thee.

III.

Alas! how vain the thought!
 The power that guides the Sun,
 Must bear the flying fugitive—
 And when the day is done
 Within thy hand must be my bed—
 Beneath thy wing must rest my head.

IV.

Oh! whither shall I fly
 Omnipotent, from thee?—
 Within the deep impervious folds
 Of night's dark canopy?—
 'Twere vain—I could not—'scape thy sight,
 For thou thyself, my God, art—light!

V.

Oh! Christ, to thee I fly,
 Beneath thy wing to rest;—
 Oh! shield me from thy Father's frown
 Within thy shelt'ring breast.—
 But no! within that hiding place
 Frowns turn to smiles, and wrath to grace.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE PAPAL CHURCH ABROAD.

No. 5.

*A letter from the Rev. Edward Nangle to the Rev. Mr. Stanley,
Rector of Alderley.*

SIR,—The publicity which Dr. M'Hale's animadversions upon your pamphlet have given to your name, may excuse the liberty which I take in addressing to you a letter without any previous personal acquaintance. As I have not seen the publication which has called forth the expression of Dr. M'Hale's displeasure, I do not undertake to pronounce any judgment on its merits or its faults; but I am fully prepared to justify the statement which you have embodied in the sentence charging that ecclesiastic with clinging to the *obsolete* doctrines of religious persecution "in all their odious integrity."

If the disclosures I am about to make should inflict a painful wound, the Titular Archbishop of Tuam can have no just reason to complain, since he himself has provoked the infliction. "I fearlessly," he writes, "appeal to all the spoken and written language of my life, and challenge Mr. Stanley, or any other person, to find a word which can justify the charge that I may be an advocate for persecuting any human being for speculative religious opinions."

It is my intention in this letter to convict Dr. M'Hale, *out of his own mouth*, of criminality in the particular in which he disclaims it; but before I proceed to that more direct proof, I must remind him that a man's deeds, and sometimes even his silence, are more truly declaratory of his real sentiments than words.

I would also premise that, as Dr. M'Hale, in his episcopal office, exercises an absolute authority over every priest in his diocese, I cannot be judged unfair in making him responsible for their actions, when those actions being of common notoriety, receive his tacit approval in not being made the subjects of a distinct episcopal censure. Now, Sir, at the Quarter Sessions recently held at Castlebar, two men were tried for a savage assault upon a most respectable person employed under me as a Scripture reader, in the Island of Achill. Counsel was employed for the defence of the culprits, and Mr. Hughs, parish priest of Newport, and Mr. Conolly, parish priest of Achill, sat behind the learned gentleman in the public court suggesting, from time to time, such hints, and communicating such information, as his brief did not supply. Both these priests are under Dr. M'Hale's jurisdiction; the former is known to be his most intimate associate, and the latter, as one whose identity of taste and principle with those of his superior would secure implicit obedience to his commands, was stationed, by his *special appointment*, in the Island of Achill. I wish it to be borne in mind that these two priests, in the presence of the Assistant Barrister, the Magistrates who sat with him on the Bench, and the crowd which filled the Court-house, identified themselves with Mr. O'Dowd, a

Roman Catholic Barrister, who defended the prisoners. A reference to the report of the trial will show you that the assault was proved by two witnesses, whose veracity came forth unsullied after the most trying cross-examination; the Barrister's charge admitted the guilt of the prisoners in language as plain as is considered consistent with judicial neutrality. I fearlessly appeal to the respectable magistrates who presided on the Bench, if ever fact was established by clearer proof than that of the assault with which the prisoners stood charged? And what was the ground on which the Roman Catholic lawyer, prompted by two priests, the minions of Dr. M'Hale, chiefly rested the defence of his clients? Why, that the plaintiff had spoken against the doctrines and rites of the Romish religion, especially the Mass, which, as a consistent member of the Protestant Church, he must have believed to be "a blasphemous fable," "a dangerous deceit," and "idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians." Yet, for asserting these peculiarities of a Protestant faith, in language not stronger than that which is used in the authorized formularies of our national Church, a blameless individual is held up to a jury of his countrymen, by the organ of priestly malevolence, as one who had forfeited all right to the protection of British law! The result of such an harangue was, that the jury, composed principally of Roman Catholics, refused to bring in a verdict of guilty against the prisoners, and the poor Bible reader, instead of finding redress, discovered that the rampant genius of Romish intolerance can convert even a British Court of Justice into an Inquisition. The rabble, seeing that those who presume to impugn the doctrines of Mother Church stand outside the pale of legal protection, gave unrestrained indulgence to their holy ferocity, and the servant of Christ, ere his feet had well passed the threshold of the Court, is again assaulted in the full blaze of noon.

Now, Sir, if Dr. M'Hale be really sincere in his professed abhorrence of persecution, why has he not denounced this most outrageous transaction, in which two of his own priests and a lawyer of his own creed, "over whose opinions he possesses some influence from his station," stood forth to public view as the principal actors? I, Sir, who, from years of careful observation, can often discover the designs of the varied evolutions and manœuvres of Romish ecclesiastics, can answer this question. Dr. M'Hale and his priests clearly see that nothing but the iron hand of persecution can arrest the progress of the Gospel in Achill. To bring this instrument into operation, a Romish lawyer, well tutored by his ghostly advisers, works upon the worst passions and prejudices of a Romish jury—*truth* falls in the streets and *justice* cannot enter; and then the priests of Achill returns to tell the executioners of Mother Church's vengeance, that they may go fearlessly on in the work of persecution, since her blighting touch has paralyzed the arm of justice. Let it not be said that this is declamation—it is a statement of fact; for I am prepared to prove that the mail bag could not hold the numerous copies of the paper containing the report of the trial to which I have alluded, which were forwarded to the parish priest for the edification of the Achill peasantry. But,

Sir, in England, a different game is to be played. In that country the Church of Rome must supply her lack of strength to intimidate by a dextrous application of all the deceiveableness of unrighteousness. In the retirement of our western desert she roars with the voice of the *dragon*; but in England she exhibits the horns of the *lamb*. When Dr. M'Hale, in person, or by his representatives, the priests, addresses a congregation of Irish peasantry in their native tongue, without fear of any echo of his words falling on the ears of the English public, he breathes the most savage intolerance against the very name of Protestantism; but when he writes for English Protestants, he protests that all the weapons of his wrath are directed against the temporalities of the Established Church—that persecution of every kind has always called forth his severest censure, which has never been qualified but by the expressions of pity for those who might have been ever betrayed into so cruel and unchristian a practice.

Permit me to call your attention to other facts more directly confirmatory of the truth of the charge which you have brought against the Titular Archbishop of Tuam. In the month of September last, the island of Achill was visited by that individual, accompanied by a numerous staff of priests. The congregation received instructions to meet their Bishop at one of the parish chapels; and in order that I might have the most certain information of their proceedings, I sent two intelligent and confidential persons to the place of meeting. The congregation were addressed by two priests—one, the priest of the parish, the other a stranger. The exalted dignity of Dr. M'Hale, as "*the representative of Jesus Christ on the earth,*" was described in high-sounding language. The religion of Protestants was presented as *having its origin and its end in hell*; IN HELL IT BEGAN, AND TO HELL IT WOULD LEAD ITS PROFESSORS. The saving clause of invincible ignorance, which is so convenient in softening down the harsh doctrine of exclusive salvation to the delicate sensitiveness of English ears, was not so much as alluded to; but Protestants, root and branch, were consigned to hopeless perdition. The progress which Protestantism had made in Achill was deplored; and Mr. Conolly, rightly judging that the hatred of neighbours and the fear of persecution were the best means of securing submission to his authority here, mentioned his refractory parishioners *by name*, making such remarks as were calculated to render them at once odious and ridiculous in the eyes of the congregation. The poor people who were engaged in reclaiming our mountain tract, were described as base wretches, who were resisting the dictates of conscience for money; and in conclusion, the congregation were commanded to hold no communication with us; above all, not to listen to "our hellish, devilish preaching," neither to borrow or lend, buy or sell, in a word, to make no interchange in the way of courtesy, kindness, or business. When these anti-social addresses were concluded, *Dr. M'Hale stood up and expressed his entire approbation of all that his clergy had uttered in his hearing.*

Now, Sir, I wish it to be particularly marked that the persons whose annoyance and damage were contemplated in these author-

itative prohibitions, had no share in those tithes which Dr. M'Hale labours to represent as the parent of all the dissention, and rancour, and violence, which make unhappy Ireland a proverb among the nations; they are supported in the work of the Gospel solely by the voluntary contributions of Protestants, and, therefore, we may judge how far Dr. M'Hale spoke the sincere conviction of his mind, when he wrote to put down that spirit of persecution which the rector of Alderley deplures,—we must take away the tithes, the accursed aliment that feeds it, and it will not be difficult, with the blessing of Providence, to smooth the way to a general reconciliation. In the case to which I have alluded, Dr. M'Hale had to deal with Protestantism without tithes, and the result proves that the attempt to conciliate Romish kindness by divesting Protestantism of that or any other outward appendage, exhibits the same practical wisdom as he would display who should think to subdue the instinctive ferocity of wolves or tigers towards our kind by casting a human victim naked among them.

To this hour, Sir, the baneful effects of Dr. M'Hale's visit are felt in the island. I can produce a person who, in consequence of the anti-social harangues to which I have alluded, was cast out of his dwelling. I can name others whose neighbours refused to sell them provisions. Many more are ready to testify that their former associates refuse to hold any communication with them even to the extent of returning the customary salutation. Instead of the interchange of kind expressions, for which our country is remarkable, many of the devoted subjects of the Papacy, when addressed, cut the sign of the Cross, which they are taught to believe is a most effectual means of repelling Satan, muttering at the same time, "the Cross of Christ is between me and you," as if the very approach of their former friends and companions, now under Dr. M'Hale's curse, exposed them to the danger of spiritual contamination.

As this letter has already been drawn out to a length which some may think unreasonable, I shall bring it to a close by relating one fact more, of which I have been a personal witness. A young woman, a native of Achill, the child of Roman Catholic parents, whose heart the Lord opened to receive his truth, was engaged as a servant in my family. From the time she manifested affection towards the ancient faith of Christ and his Apostles, and a consequent dislike to the novelties and human inventions of the Church of Rome, she was subjected to a constant and fretting persecution both by her own relatives and the more bigoted portion of the natives. At length, when these comparatively mild methods of persecution were found ineffectual to shake her constancy to Christ, the priest declared that he would not receive the confessions of her parents or grant them absolution, unless, *nolens volens*, willing or unwilling, they brought their daughter to mass. It may readily be imagined how such a declaration as this must have operated on ignorant persons, who regarded the priest's absolution as a passport to heaven. The unhappy girl was forced to the mass-house, and there, overcome by her feelings and the ill usage which she had received, she fainted. Still, Sir, the language of her heart was, "none but Christ! none but Christ!" To him, as her Lord and

Saviour, she was determined to cling, whatever might be the consequence. Having been informed of the circumstance which I have related above, I invited the sufferer to take refuge from persecution in my house. The offer was gladly and thankfully accepted; but she was not long suffered to enjoy the peace and security which she found in the bosom of a Christian family. On Friday, Oct. 30th, her mother came to my house apparently in much grief and alarm; she stated that a sister of our protégé, who was married and settled in a neighbouring village, was seized with a sudden illness and at the point of death. B., who possesses strong affections, and is tenderly attached to her family, immediately accompanied her mother to see her dying sister; but what was her surprise, on arriving at the house she found her sister in perfect health. The plot was now discovered, poor B. saw that the tale of woe was a wicked fabrication to decoy her from the security of her asylum. Immediately the priest, who was in waiting, entered; but neither his exhortations, nor the prospect of all the cruelties which stood in fearful array before her imagination, could shake the fidelity of this helpless and unprotected girl, or extort from her a word which bore even the semblance of acquiescence with the requirements of Dr. M'Hale's representative. Her relations, filled with rage, forced her to return that night to her father's house. The next day she found opportunity to inform two persons, whom I sent to enquire after her fate, that she would return and claim protection in my family, if she could elude the vigilance of her keepers. This she could not do, and the next day, Sunday, she was forced to the chapel, but could not be induced to enter it. On Monday morning, as I was leaving home for Newport, where I write this letter, while the boat, which was to carry me to the main, was preparing, I was informed that B. was coming along the road which runs by the avenue leading to my house. I saw the poor girl in the custody of her brother-in-law. When she came opposite our gate she endeavoured to turn up our avenue. Her keeper rudely pushed her forward, and, after a hard struggle, he succeeded in driving her before him. I immediately walked towards them; poor B. recognising the presence of a friend, frequently endeavoured to turn and come towards me and some who accompanied me, for protection. We soon overtook them; and, that I might not do any thing rashly, I asked B. whether she went with that man voluntarily or by compulsion. He replied, that "she should go whether she liked it or not." At this time the father of the poor girl came up, and having asserted his right as a parent, I desisted from farther interference. Perhaps, as the girl is of age, I ought to have acted otherwise; but, in such cases, it is difficult at all times to act as one would afterwards wish that they had done on cool and deliberate reflection. The old man informed me before many witnesses, that he had beaten his daughter severely that morning, and that he was determined never to desist from such cruelty until he had forced her to submit to the priest and conform to popery, whatever her inclination might be. The poor girl was then forcibly hurried to a village about three miles distant, at which the priest was hearing confessions. What has since become of her I cannot tell, as I left home immediately after my interview with her father.

Now, Sir, is it not a monstrous thing that, in a civilized country, a respectable young woman should be dragged along the public road like a common felon, and subjected to the most cruel treatment, because she chooses to become a Protestant? And is it not still more monstrous that Dr. M'Hale, who is the main-spring which keeps the whole machinery of persecution in operation, should have the effrontery to come before the British public most vehemently protesting that he utterly abhors every thing in the shape of persecution? I repeat it, Sir, that Dr. M'Hale is responsible for the cruelty with which this poor girl has been treated. Her parents are not destitute of natural affection. Without pretending to any peculiar skill in physiognomy, I could discover a momentary expression of relenting kindness passing over the old man's countenance when he was reminded that the poor girl was his child, his flesh, and his bone, and that therefore he should treat her with tenderness. His severity originated not in any want of natural fondness for his child; *it may be traced to the priest's refusal to give him absolution unless she submitted to the Church*, and this priest exercises his functions in Achill *by virtue of Dr. M'Hale's special appointment*. Heartless bigotry! base ingenuity! which by a cruel artifice seeks to shift the odium of actual persecution from itself, and employs a parent's arm to execute its malignant purposes against his own offspring!

If I mistake not, Sir, you were among the persons who visited our little settlement* last summer. I regretted extremely that I happened to have been from home at the time of your arrival, and that your engagements would not permit you to sojourn for a few days among us. I can only say that should you find it convenient to repeat your visit, I shall *prove* to your satisfaction the impeachment of Dr. M'Hale's tolerance contained in this and other letters, and supply you with many additional facts to strengthen your conviction that the Titular Bishop of Tuam is one of those who cling to the obsolete doctrines of persecution in all their odious integrity.

I am, Sir,

Your faithful servant in Christ,

EDWARD NANGLE.

Newport Pratt, Nov. 3, 1835.

* Mr. Nangle alludes to the little Protestant Missionary settlement which he has recently founded in the Island of Achill, and at which he resides and superintends.

DOCUMENTARY HISTORY OF THE ASSEMBLY OF 1837.

No. V.

Case of the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia.

HOWEVER much it may suit a certain party in the Presbyterian church, to conceal and when necessary, deny the true character of the painful controversy which has of late years torn that body;—nothing is more certain than that the whole difficulty has been throughout, a *doctrinal* one, and that it has been produced and kept up from first to last, by a settled, organised and vehement attempt of semi-pelagians, to revolutionize that ancient communion. The history of the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia—puts these statements beyond the reach of honest contradiction; and we trust that all the world will bear that history in mind when its judgment is formed on the other subject.

MR. ALBERT BARNES of Philadelphia, was the *occasion* for the necessity of creating this Presbytery. Holding views utterly repugnant to the standards to which he pledged his adherence—and excited by the morbid vanity of authorship,—his whole progress, from the moment of his application for admission into the Presbytery of Philadelphia up to the present hour—has been amid contentions and confusion, produced directly by himself—and sustained for the sake of the heresies it seems the business of his life to propagate. He found the city of Philadelphia and the churches there calm and orderly. His doctrines and plans, and those of his party,—in the progress of their developement—were many times and in many forms before Presbytery, Synod and Assembly; caused the making and unmaking of both the former bodies;—convulsed the whole church through six years of strife—and resulted in an open act of rebellion by himself and his immediate friends, against the final decision of its highest authority. There he stands at present;—a mournful proof of the magnitude of the flame which a little fire may kindle—of the immense evils which a few unreasonable men may at last effect. Alas! that a single dead fly, should make the most precious ointment stink.

We have heretofore had occasion to explain the whole cause of these sad affairs; and therefore will at present, barely refer our readers to preceding articles, in this Magazine, on this branch of them. Suffice it to say, that the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia was avowedly created on principles (*of elective affinity*), which the church by immense and repeated majorities, has decidedly condemned, as hostile to its purity—its peace, and its constitution; and that it was beyond question originated, upheld and continued for purposes, the most dangerous, unreasonable and unjustifiable. Here was a Presbytery created by the General Assembly, which had no shadow of authority, as many believed, to do any such act,—upon mere petition; and then created contrary to the petition

itself, on which it professed to act. Here was a Presbytery created merely by a list of names, without any bounds or meets whatever; and when at last pretended bounds were assigned it, after years of contention, they were bounds which did not embrace half its own members—but which did embrace many members of other Presbyteries. Here was a Presbytery, which two Synods (that of the Chesapeake, and that of Delaware) had been successively created, only to receive and protect—and successively dissolved under the weight of public odium in the church;—which had itself been twice or thrice dissolved by the only permanent Synod to which it could be attached, with a show of propriety; which set up pretensions and claims, of forcing its members into other Presbyteries upon principles which put all others at its mercy,—and which stood prominently out, the most agitating, heretical, and contentious body then known amongst us.—By the mercy of God, the orthodox held the power in the Assembly of 1837, and there passed the following minute, by a vote of 75, to 60.

Be it resolved, by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America,

1. That the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia, be, and hereby is dissolved.

2. The territory embraced in this Presbytery is re-annexed to those to which it respectively appertained before its creation. Its Stated Clerk is directed to deposite all the records and other papers in the hands of the Stated Clerk of the Synod of Philadelphia, on or before the first day of the sessions of that Synod, at its first meeting after this Assembly adjourns.

3. The candidates and foreign missionaries of the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia, are hereby attached to the Presbytery of Philadelphia.

4. The ministers, churches, and licentiates, in the Presbytery hereby dissolved, are directed to apply without delay to the Presbyteries to which they most naturally belong, for admission into them. And upon application being so made by any duly organized Presbyterian Church, it shall be received.

5. These resolutions shall be in force from and after the final adjournment of the present sessions of the General Assembly.

The propriety in a moral, religious, constitutional and especially, doctrinal point of view, of the dissolution of this Presbytery—has been so fully and so repeatedly asserted by the church, that we deem it useless to argue such a question. Is the principle of elective affinity—in the erection of Presbyteries—tolerable in our church? No; responds, almost the entire church, it is an innovation, at once absurd, fatal and wicked. Are the purposes for which *this* particular scheme of elective affinity was concocted lawful, and tolerable purposes? No; replies the church; and straight way dissolves two Synods created to save this Presbytery,—adjudges its doctrines and pretensions to be heretical and revolutionary—and at last, wearied out with its evils,—dissolves the Presbytery itself.

But the ground taken by those opposed to this act of the Assembly is not ordinarily that there was any necessity for the creation, or continued existence of this Presbytery; nor even that it was *inexpedient*, all things considered, to dissolve it. But only, the mode and authority in and by which the act was performed, are called in

question—and while some contend that the act of the Assembly recorded above, was such an act as no Assembly could pass by reason of want of power; others argue, that the act is much to be censured because, it did not exercise powers still greater, and after dissolving the Presbytery, attach its members to others. We propose to consider very briefly these several objections; the more readily as they are sometimes heard in the mouths and found in the writings of orthodox men.

1. It will never be denied by any considerate or enlightened mind that the General Assembly, or any other body, has, and must of necessity always have an equal power, over all subjects submitted to it. One Assembly is not the master of another; all are equal, in all respects. If therefore there was ever any original power in any Assembly to act on its own motion in creating or dissolving Presbyteries, that power existed equally in the Assembly of 1837. Whatever power any preceding Assembly ever had to pass an act about a Presbytery—that had also. Whatever power any ever had to *abstain* from passing such an act, or to *withdraw* its consent from its continued force when passed—that is to repeal it—that Assembly had in precisely the same degree. To evade the force of these clear statements, it is necessary to show, that our system never contemplated the dissolution of Presbyteries when once they are formed; or that the act forming them is of the nature of an irrevocable contract. But the very reverse of this is the truth; and there is express contemplation in our system of Presbyteries ceasing to exist, by direct action of superior bodies. Since then the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia, was created by act of Assembly, passed on its mere original power, and by virtue thereof alone existed; it is perfectly clear, that the withholding any further assent to that act was in the full competency of any subsequent Assembly—and that the Presbytery must cease to exist, the moment such consent is formally withdrawn. It is the most usual of all legislative proceedings—the passing and repealing of laws; and if the case had been about a Legislature and a County, instead of an Assembly and a Presbytery, cavil would have been too absurd for utterance.

2. It may be said the repeal of the act creating the Presbytery, merely restored all things to their former state. But this is a mistaken view of the matter both as to law and fact. The formal declaration of the character of an *unconstitutional* law, does indeed have this effect; because such a law never could have any force. But when a law confessedly constitutional is repealed, then every thing stands where it was when the repeal takes effect, and not where it was when the repealed law was passed. Supposing then, any Assembly had power to create this Presbytery—no subsequent one could undo the lawful effects of a lawful act, retrospectively; but only arrest *future* effects, by a lawful arrest of their cause.—A moment's consideration will convince any one,—that if the doctrine here combatted were true, there is no community on earth could ever permit any law whatever to be repealed, without the most ruinous derangement of its affairs.

3. If it be answered, that according to the theory of the orthodox, the General Assembly has no power to make a Presbytery—and

therefore the foregoing reasoning can never be used by us; then we reply; that on this point, after elaborate discussion for seven years, the sense of the church repeatedly expressed was that the Assembly might perhaps in certain cases, make a Presbytery; that as it had repeatedly done so and the question was one of doubt, and greater evils would arise *now*, from an absolute renunciation of the power as never granted—than from a simple acquiescence in the past—with a firm refusal to permit future repetitions; that moreover there is a wide distinction between what is *merely voidable*, and what is *void per se*,—and that amongst things of the former class, time, circumstance, expediency, the public good, and ten thousand considerations may enter, to control the course that wisdom and justice may decide on regarding them; on these and similar considerations, it was deemed best to waive all doubtful questions and all hurtful agitation, in a case that admitted otherwise of easy and plain solution—by the simple and indisputable right to undo what our predecessors had done, *in future*, and by way of mere repeal. It is certainly true that the *doubtful* constitutionality of the act, was a conclusive reason for repealing it. And they who believe the power of the Assembly to be complete, contradict themselves, when they question the right to repeal its own acts, because others doubted the legality of the first act. The view of the act printed above, will satisfy the reader that it was so drawn as to avoid these niceties,—and that a man holding either view of the original powers of the Assembly might well vote for it. For if the original act was lawful, it was lawful to repeal it; and if it never was lawful to pass it, it was only the more necessary to undo it. —

4. It is alledged by some, that the Assembly should have gone farther—and after dissolving this Presbytery, attached its members to others. We reply *first*, that potentially this was done, as far as there was power to do it. *Id certum est, quod certum potest reddari*; is a universally received maxim of law. And no man can by possibility mistake the order given by the Assembly, to the members of the dissolved Presbytery.

We reply *secondly*, that no man has yet undertaken to prove,—what we invite and challenge all who think they can do it, to prove, that the Assembly has any power whatever, on its own motion, to put a minister into any particular Presbytery without its consent. The Presbyteries are the original, constituent, sovereign elementary parts, of the whole system. They are of divine appointment; exist before and independently of the General Assembly; and that very Assembly of 1837, so far from supposing itself vested with such a tremendous power as this—not only recognized the absolute right of every Presbytery to examine all applicants—but enjoined it on all to do this very thing, in the present agitated times; and if to examine, of course to reject the unworthy. Every Presbytery must decide on the qualifications of its own members, or the fundamental principle of the system is overthrown; and whether sister Presbyteries, or the General Assembly, usurp the power to force men upon us,—our last barrier is broken down, when we surrender this inherent, and inalienable liberty.

We say *thirdly*, that the posture in which the members of that Presbytery were left, after it was dissolved, if there was any hardship in it—was all of their own seeking: seeing they had not only forced the thing upon themselves but had done it, under violent opposition, at every step, from those who were now called on to give up all other plans, hopes and purposes—merely to keep them from being examined by such Presbyteries as they might desire to be admitted into. But verily, their violent hostility, to an examination, might be a reason requiring it, rather than one to violate our duty or transcend our powers in order to save them from it. And after all, they stood in all conceivable respects, on as good ground at the door of any Presbytery to which they might apply for admission—as any other minister in the church could stand on. And why should more be asked or granted? Some one of them demands admission, with the act of Assembly in his hand; and at the same time and place a like demand is made by some one else, with a regular dismissal in his hand. Is the dismissal of more force than the act of Assembly? Shall one not be examined as well as the other? Has not one the same means,—rights, principles and opportunities, to get redress from higher tribunals for supposed wrongs from the body applied to—as the other? It is a new rule of law and morals indeed, that men shall wontonly do wrong and then derive advantages from their evil deeds, which are denied to the orderly and virtuous conduct of others!

5. It is sometimes insinuated that it would have been better if the Assembly had only settled the principles of the case, and then left it with the Synod of Philadelphia, to carry them out. But the history of the case in its previous stages shows the unreasonableness of such a method; and this is fully confirmed by the very result of the matter, in the subsequent Synod (that of 1837.) For the Assembly was bound by equity and honour, to follow in regard to this Presbytery, the same course it had adopted in regard to the *four Synods*; and such was the unanimous opinion and vote of the orthodox convention which preceded the Assembly. And it was only a secret influence industriously exercised out of doors, by a few individuals in Philadelphia, that caused a moment's wavering in relation to the subject afterwards, in the Assembly. But moreover, the whole case had been many times already before the Synod of Philadelphia—which at least twice dissolved the Presbytery, which had been again restored by the Assembly. So that it was most especially due to that Synod, and to the peace of the churches in it, that the Assembly should settle completely, a business which it had itself caused to be so vexatious. And as to denying power to the Assembly to undo what wrong it had itself effected—it were better to dissolve even the Assembly than let it exist upon principles calculated only to give trouble and do mischief.

We have said then, the action of the Synod of Philadelphia, at its late meeting, in relation to this Presbytery, demonstrates the extreme reluctance of that body, to have any thing more to do, in the case of this Presbytery; and furnishes new proof of the wisdom of the Assembly in doing what it did. We conclude this article with such extracts from the Minutes of that Synod, as will give the

public an accurate idea of what was done, and what refused. The whole will show, that the Assembly instead of going too far, will be obliged to go still farther in one direction or the other; or else to leave undetermined and dubious, several principles of the most momentous practical import, which have come up, by virtue of its own action, and which fidelity to all parties requires it settle.

The committee appointed to draft a paper relating to the late Third Presbytery of Philadelphia, reported the following, which was accepted, viz.

"The committee to which certain resolutions relative to the late Third Presbytery of Philadelphia were committed, report, that they would recommend for adoption by the Synod, the said paper, with modifications which have been made, as follows.

"Whereas, The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, at their sessions held in Philadelphia, in the months of May and June last, did, for just and sufficient reasons, by a special act, dissolve the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia, and

"Whereas, The General Assembly directed and required that the members composing the said Presbytery should, at an early day after the said dissolution, take measures to become connected with such Presbyteries, within the bounds of which they might respectively reside, and

"Whereas, It has appeared to this Synod, that the Presbytery did, in a formal and public manifesto, declare their determination to oppose and resist the operations of the above mentioned act, by retaining their previous organization; and have accordingly since proceeded to do business as a regularly organized Presbytery, and

"Whereas, The General Assembly directed the said Presbytery to place their records in the hands of the Stated Clerk of this Synod, with which order they have not complied, and

"Whereas, Certain members of the said late Third Presbytery of Philadelphia, appearing on the floor of this Synod, have claimed seats as members thereof. Therefore, it is hereby Resolved, 1st, That it would conflict with the established usages of this Synod, and with the constitution of the Church, to recognize any persons as members thereof who hold no Presbyterial relation, and are therefore not *recti in ecclesia*, inasmuch as it is a fundamental feature of Presbyterianism, that every minister should belong to some Presbytery. 2d, That a recognition of the members of the late Third Presbytery as members of this Synod, while maintaining an attitude of open hostility to the Supreme Judicatory of the Church, from whose decisions there is no appeal, would be a virtual sanction of their unconstitutional proceedings, and would involve the Synod as a participant in the resistance to the highest authority in the Church. 3d, That no members of the said late Third Presbytery can be enrolled as members of this Synod, until they shall have submitted to the authority of the Supreme Judicatory, and obeyed its express requirements, which is their obvious duty."

Mr. Breckinridge moved that the following be incorporated in the foregoing paper as an amendment, viz:

"Whereas, This Synod is solemnly bound to care for and look after the private members and churches situated within the bounds of said Presbytery, some of the clerical members, and ruling elders of which have continued until now in open rebellion against the act of the General Assembly, in their behalf. Wherefore,

"Resolved, That while this body leaves the clerical members of that Presbytery under the resolution now passed, to pursue the course they have marked out for themselves, the Synod does hereby declare the pastoral relations of such rebellious members, of said Presbytery, to be dissolved, and their charges vacant; and all the churches connected with said

Presbytery at the time of its dissolution, and which have not yet done it, are enjoined to apply without delay to be taken under the watch and care of those Presbyteries within whose bounds they are now located."

While Synod were occupied in considering the foregoing papers, Dr. Cuyler moved the following as a substitute for them, viz:

"A memorial having been presented to this Synod, signed by James Patterson, Eliakim Phelps, T. J. A. Mines, and John M. Bear, asking to be admitted to seats in this body, therefore,

"*Resolved*, That the request of the memorialists cannot be granted, inasmuch as they claim to belong to the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia, a Presbytery dissolved by the last General Assembly, and of course not known to this Synod."

After some progress in the discussion, the Synod adjourned until to-morrow morning at 9 o'clock. Concluded with prayer.

Synod now resumed the unfinished business of last evening, viz: the report of the committee on the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia, when Mr. Engles offered the following resolution, viz:

Resolved, That the original report of the committee, together with the amendment and addition by Mr. Breckinridge, and the substitute of Dr. Cuyler be postponed, with the view of adopting the following, viz:

1. *Resolved*, That this Synod, cordially approve of the great measures of reform adopted by the last General Assembly, and will in all lawful ways aid in their completion and consummation.

2. *Resolved*, That as one of these measures was the dissolution of the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia, the members of the said Presbytery, as they have failed to comply with the requisition of the Assembly, cannot be enrolled as members of this Synod.

3. *Resolved*, That the question of the ecclesiastical standing of the members of the late Third Presbytery, be referred to the next General Assembly, for the final determination.

The resolutions offered by Mr. ENGLER, were rejected by a vote of 51 to 28; those offered by DR. CUYLER, were rejected without a count; the amendment offered by MR. BRECKINRIDGE, was lost by a vote of 68, to 10; and then the first paper offered was adopted by a vote of 70 to 2.

It will be obvious to all who read these resolutions, that the Synod leave the whole case just where the Assembly left it. The only point they have decided is, that while matters stand as they are, the ministerial members of the late Third Presbytery of Philadelphia, can not be admitted to seats as members of the Synod. It seems very clear also to our minds, that the argumentative part of the Synod's resolutions, conducts the mind to far more ample conclusions than those stated in its resolutions; and that the clearness and fulness of the former contrast very strongly with the insufficiency of the latter. It is perfectly clear, in short, that *some* tribunal, ought to decide the important, nay, vital questions left behind by the Synod, as yet untouched, and which are stated with tolerable plainness, in the subjoined paper—which is also extracted from the Synod's Minutes. It will be observed from the face of the minute that no answer was moved or attempted, in the Synod, to the protest and complaint; and it is equally true that no movement was made to have the Synod defended before the Assembly. We leave the churches to judge whether the course adopted by the majority

of Synod, was so clearly right, as to require neither explanation nor defence—or so peculiar as to admit of neither.

Mr. R. J. Breckinridge read a protest in behalf of himself and others against the act of Synod, adopting the report of the committee in the case of the late Third Presbytery of Philadelphia, whereupon it was

Resolved, That said protest be admitted to the records of Synod without answer. The protest is as follows: viz.

“The undersigned, in the exercise of those rights usually allowed in our church courts, desires to spread on the journal of this Synod his Protest against its decision, in regard to the case of the late Third Presbytery of Philadelphia, and his complaint, with the reasons which are annexed, to the next General Assembly, of the action of the Synod in arriving at that decision, as well as against the decision itself. And he hereby couples with this protest and complaint, a prayer to the next Assembly, either to direct this Synod, or its Presbyteries, to take further and final order in the case, or that the Assembly complete the case itself, according to the statement and reasons which follow.

“The General Assembly of 1837 dissolved the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia, and directed its ministers and churches to apply for admission into the Presbyteries to which they were most naturally related. The great bulk of those ministers and churches declined doing as the Assembly directed, and the whole view of their conduct, and of the facts on this part of the case, is given in the preamble and resolutions of this Synod, as they finally passed.

“The undersigned assents to all the statements of those preambles as true, and gives his full approbation to each of the principles contained in those resolutions, as perfectly just. But he contends, that these very facts and principles, made it the more imperative on Synod to proceed with the case and settle it; and make its refusal or neglect to do so, more hurtful under the circumstances.

“The case presents two aspects; one as it relates to the ministers, the other as it relates to the churches and private members, in that Presbytery.

“In regard to the former, it is contended, that under the act of the Assembly dissolving that Presbytery, the ministers of it had the very same right to apply for admission into suitable Presbyteries, that any minister coming with a regular dismissal would have; and that in case of any difficulties, his case would furnish every means of redress, which any other case of application could. Their right to be in any of our Presbyteries was an imperfect right, rendered complete when their fitness, piety, and orthodoxy were made manifest to any Presbytery; and a Presbytery is the only original judge in such a case. But on the other hand there is a corresponding power over these ministers, on the part of the several Presbyteries within whose bounds any of them reside, subsequent to the dissolution of the said Third Presbytery. After any of them shall have been received, this power becomes complete, to its just extent, over such minister; and before his application, the *inchoate power*, if the expression is allowable, is equal and correlative to the *inchoate right* of admission.

“When therefore the Synod rightly refused to admit these members, as its members, before they were members of any Presbytery, the undersigned is clear, that it ought to have gone much further, than merely to enter this refusal on its record, unaccompanied by any intimation of the duty on the part of those ministers to apply to our Presbyteries, or any intimation to said Presbyteries how to act, in case this plain duty is still further neglected. But still farther, the minute as passed leaves a strong intimation, that these ministers have an indefinite period, (and that while they are in formal rebellion to the acts of the Assembly,) left for their application to our Presbyteries.

"It is admitted that this Presbytery, being in open and formal rebellion to the Assembly, and openly acting as a body, which had been properly, regularly, and constitutionally dissolved, it might be lawfully considered a new sect, and all its ministers treated accordingly. But in this case, the Synod should have formed a very different minute; and should have passed that in regard to the churches, which it refused to pass.

"In short, there was no other regular course, but one of these two, namely; either to declare these persons out of our communion, and so leave them to themselves and so direct our Presbyteries to regard them; or to follow them with discipline, and so direct the Presbyteries. The undersigned complains that the course of Synod is uncertain and incomplete, and leaves even the clerical members of the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia, as well as all our Presbyteries, in perplexity, as to the true principles of this interesting case. And while he considers this failure eminently unfortunate under the present circumstances of the parties and the whole church, he protests against the incomplete action that did take place, as worse in the peculiar state of affairs, than none at all.

"It is therefore the prayer of the undersigned, that the General Assembly of 1838, will cause to be fully settled, or itself settle, this whole case, as it relates to the clerical members of the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia, by declaring them to be out of our connexion, or ordering them to be followed by discipline.

"The second part of the subject relates to the churches and private members, under the care of that Presbytery.

"It is believed to be self evident that the church is as much bound to care for and look after *Pastoral as Presbyterial* relations; and Synod ought to do, or cause Presbyteries to do, all that is right and proper, touching the pastors of that Presbytery, simply considered as matter of duty to these erring pastors. But the Synod wholly neglected and refused to enter on this weighty matter.

"But again, the duty of this Synod to all the churches connected with that Presbytery, is fully as solemn and clear as any it can owe to the ministers themselves; and the relation of a church to the Synod, and to its Presbyteries, is tender and peculiar, at the same time that it is widely different, from that of a Bishop. So also of all the private Christians in all those churches, in whatever light they can be considered, whether as individual persons, as orthodox minorities, or erring and contumacious majorities; this Synod and its Presbyteries, owe all of them most solemn and weighty duties.

"Now it seems plain that Synod ought to have taken some effectual action on this branch of the subject, either to do itself, or to direct its Presbyteries to do, what the peculiar and painful situation of these churches, and private Christians required. If the Synod chose to consider the pastors as no longer of our church, it ought to have dissolved their relations with their flocks, and so made an effort to save the churches, or at least a portion of them. But if the Synod chose to consider the pastors as still in the condition of applying for admission into our Presbyteries, it ought to have ordered the Presbyteries to deal with them, in order thus to save the churches. By reason of the first error, a more grievous one followed; the Synod not only neglecting to take any step, but, by a solemn vote, positively refusing to take the only particular step put to vote, to act directly for the succour and warning of these churches and private Christians, against guides, believed by it to be erroneous, as to some, and contumacious, as to all.

"This *spiritual* aspect of the case, as to this part of it, is greatly strengthened, and the duty of Synod rendered abundantly more clear, by considerations drawn from the *temporal* situation of these parties. For the legal posture of these churches, individuals, orthodox minorities and

erroneous majorities, would be most materially changed, by an act of Synod, vacating, or ordering the Presbyteries to vacate, the pastoral relations, in these churches. And seeing, that the most generous propositions of the orthodox in the last Assembly, were rejected by the enemies of order and purity in the Church, and seeing the attempts constantly making to embarrass the Church by legal difficulties, it was the duty of Synod to care for the legal rights of the churches and minorities of churches, as well as for their spiritual welfare.

"The whole duty of Synod on this branch of the case was rendered exceedingly plain, by the fact that the Synod itself had settled the essential principles involved here, and the Assembly approved its act by acquiescence and approval of its minutes, in the case of the Rev. John M. Duncan, and the First Associate Reformed Church in the city of Baltimore, in the year 1825; to the full minute in which case, formal reference is made.

"But notwithstanding all this, the Synod neglected and refused to do, what the undersigned conscientiously believes to have been its duty in this important case. He does therefore protest and complain, and pray the Assembly to perform itself, or cause the Synod or Presbyteries to perform in this part of the premises what truth and duty require.

"It is with extreme pain, that the undersigned is obliged to call in question, in this public and formal act, the proceedings of a body, with which he has so cordially acted in so many trials. But he owes a great duty to his own character; a still greater to those bishops and churches, whether now or formerly attached to this Synod; and the greatest of all to the God of truth. And although he stood nearly alone, in this venerable and respected body, he is obliged to say, he was never called to act in any case, in which, with a more honest conscience, or a more clear conviction of right, he could appeal to time, to scrutiny, to the church of God, and to his adorable Master.

All which is submitted,

ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE,

Bishop of the Second Presbyterian Church, Baltimore.

W. L. McCALLA.

A. H. PARKER.

October 28th, 1837.

" E. MITCHELL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF N. C. "

The secret of the New School party revealed.

SHORTLY after the last meeting of the Synod of Philadelphia, various semi-pelagians, or the same one under various signatures and in several news-papers, published virulent attacks on it, and on several members of it by name. Being one of those most abused, and perhaps one of those most anxious that the good name of our Synod should be rescued from possible ill odour, through slanderous charges widely disseminated, the elder Editor of this Magazine took in hand to write a letter to MR. PLUMMER of the *Watchman*, giving what was meant to be, a fair account, both personal and general, of what was deemed important in the case.

This letter was in many points changed in its *form*, by the editor of the *Watchman*, before being published; and was therefore, as we

think, rendered less specific, as well as less direct and plain on some points than would have otherwise been the case. We mention this, for two purposes; *first*, namely, to say that the want of accuracy in statement charged on it, by some reckless of truth, would otherwise have possibly been out of the reach of malice to alledge;—and *secondly*, to enable us to inform “E. MITCHELL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF N. C.,”—that he is a great loser, by that letter having been moderated a letter in its terms, and so himself deprived of some show of reason, for his long, nonsensical, vain-glorious, and impertinent harangue, addressed to “Rev. R. J. Breckinridge,”—and occupying three mortal columes of the *Southern Religious Telegraph*, for December 29, 1837.

Who this “*E. Mitchell*” is, or what he is—we “have not the minutest atom of an idea.” He signs himself “*of the University of N. C.*” He may be a student there; and if so, we think his tutors are to blame. Mr. Converse of the *Telegraph*, prints him “Prof. Mitchell;” but of what art, or calling, he does not intimate. If it be either of logic, or good breeding,—we are bad guessers. It seems from his own statements, that he has been already before the public, in this Pelagian controversy, with certain overtures to Dr. Baxter, for a submission of the difficulties of the Presbyterian church, to arbitration before the supreme court of Virginia! Smile not reader—this is really his own account of his proposition! Then however he wrote under a feigned name; but now he comes, to battle with mask off, and visor up,—and a tirade worthy of his cause and aims, against the poor letter to Mr. Plummer; and pledges himself for more and harder things, as soon as he shall demolish “*a worthy father nearer home.*”—We pity the threatened father; but rejoice in our respite.

We deem ourselves of so small consequence to “Prof. Mitchell”—that we will not even make an attempt to recollect, far less reply to, what he says of us.—We assert nothing—we deny nothing. Why should we? For he declares of one of us; “*your denial is not worth a button.*” Sir, your humble servant.

Widely different is the notion this “E. Mitchell, of the University of N. C.” has of himself. Says he, writing of the same individual, whose possible denial, of certain propositions, he values at less than a button (whether brass or horn we know not); “of your respect I am secure; and that is enough.” Verily here is a lack both of logic and truth. It pains us, Sir, to undeceive you; but we dare not say you are *secure* of our respect. Not *absolutely* secure. Allow us time, till we hear further from you. These are ticklish times to pledge ourselves for other people; and we rather fear to be guaranty for *many* such Professors, as your present letter reveals.

But again; “though better prepared than most of my brethren, by previous habits of thought and study, to form an independent judgment,” &c. This may be true, as we know not who are the *most his* brethren; nor even who or what the *most of* them are. We deny not, his assertion. But we greatly doubt, whether either Dr. Baxter, Dr. Alexander or Dr. Miller, whom we are happy to find abused with ourselves,—or any known Professor of *modesty*, would speak of themselves in just such terms.

Again; after exhausting himself of epithets to glorify Chancellor Kent and his opinion, on our troubles, and to ridicule and belittle all who were confounded and silenced by it—as well as all who tried in vain to answer it; after lauding the principles of the opinion, and the greatness of its author, in much trashy English, and a little scrap Latin—he lets go the following blast for himself; “*long before the opinion of Chancellor Kent appeared, I had adopted as my own, all the great principles laid down in it.*”—Sir, said Æsop’s gnat, pompously seated upon the horn of an enormous ox—“Sir, be so good as to inform me, when I tire you, and I will immediately dismount!”

The professed object of this enormous desert of words, is to answer ten lines, or less, of the letter to Mr. Plummer. What, it was demanded, are the *real intentions*, of the Pelagian party in the Presbyterian church?—“Prof. Mitchell”—answers in three columns of close print. And for whom, think you reader, he stands sponsor? For himself and the *Telegraph*? Alas! he is a bold man, who will answer for the *Telegraph*; and if Mr. Converse has not forgotten our prophesy about the Synods of Va. and N. C., we will now venture to say, that if he lives five years, he need not be surprised to find himself the editor of some abolition paper north of the Chesapeake.—No verily, “Prof. Mitchell”—does not limit himself to responding even for the five members of the Synod of N. C., who nobly stood with him, against all the body besides; and to which five brethren, by the way, he might have had reference in the gentle hint already recorded, that his judgment, was far better matured than that of any three of the five. There was a functionary of Indiana who seized his “span of cattle” by the horns, and gnashing his teeth at them, vowed he had more sense than both of them put together.—Nay, nay, this Mr. “*E. Mitchell of the University of N. C.*,”—makes his speech as broad for compass, as it is long for form. It is for nothing less than the New School party—that the Professor speaks. And if he speaks with the vagueness of oracular wisdom—his mimicry is so far perfect, that he manifests oracular pretension too.

But surely, the anxious reader will demand,—he has at least answered the question, plainly;—and now the church may be at rest as to the intentions of the agitators who have convulsed it. Certainly, most certainly; Mr. Professor Mitchell has told all. He and his friends, are in favour of *justice—justice only*. True; but what is justice? Why justice—is justice. Nay, but how will he apply the word to the thing? Plainly thus—all he don’t like is unjust;—if you don’t believe him, ask Chancellor Kent, who great as he is, is not equal to him; or if you don’t believe both of them, ask his brethren, who wise as they are, have not ripe judgment like him. And so having fully discovered that all he wants is justice, if you don’t like his plans to get justice, which plans and which justice, are both already explained, why then arbitrate the matter as to what is justice; and if Dr. Baxter won’t agree to leave it to the Supreme Court of Virginia, why leave it to Chancellor Kent;—and then let the next Assembly do justice, in setting to right the doings of the last, which, however, being of equal power with the next, justice

forbids the next to disturb any of its doings, except such as justice requires; and which those are, and in what respects unjust,—and how precisely they are to be got at, and by whom set to rights—let justice decide; according to the clear detail already laid down.—There now, Mr. caviller, whoever you are—take that, and be off.—Thank you Mr. Mitchell—thank you a thousand times. “The imperceivities of man have arove at sich a hight of natur, ut there is no disenflaming on em;” said a coloured belle, to her gaily dressed escort. “Yes Miss” was the reply, “I have made the same remark a thousand times.” What remark? Ah! there’s the rub. Doubtless the lady and Mr. Mitchell, both *thought* they meant *something*. And possibly Mr. Converse and the gallant, who were relatively sponsors—thought they understood what they avouched!

It is alike melancholy and ridiculous to behold the conduct of the Pelagian party and press. The tone of their news-papers is weak, virulent and vile beyond any thing ever witnessed in this country in papers professing to be conducted by men of education and character. The *Philadelphia Observer*, is less reputable than a common *Tickler* or *Custigator*; and the *Southern Religious Telegraph* is following rapidly in its wake.—Articles unmatched for rudeness of expression, disregarded of truth, attacks on private characters and motives, and utter destitution of force, have filled the columns of both of them for many months,—and of the former for many years, under its various names; until at length a man need hardly wish more assured evidence that he is sound in doctrine, and faithful in conduct as well as strong in the regulation of affairs, than to find himself traduced in them and kindred columns. The best collection of sound literature is to be found in the *index expurgatorious* of the church of Rome; and the future historian of these sad times, will not err greatly, if he seeks in the tirades of the Pelagian press, the names of the bulk of God’s chosen servants, in the contests which wrested his heritage from their sacrilegious machinations.

If this “E. Mitchell” be indeed a Professor in the University of North Carolina—as Mr. Converse avouches him, the institution is greatly to be pitied. He says he was a member of the last Synod of N. C., and is therefore we presume either a minister or Ruling Elder in our church—unless indeed he may be a stray Committeeman, come down from one of “the four Synods.” We indulge the confident hope, that his respectable Synod, has as few who think, write and act, as he has done in the case before us—as he confesses it had few who voted like him, at its late sessions. Happy will that day be for the country and the church—when all our Synods are as nearly purified from foreign and heterogenous elements.

THE MYSTERY OF JESUITISM.

No. I.

A Catalogue of the Propositions, contained in an extract made of some of the most dangerous Propositions of divers Casuists, in point of MORALITY, faithfully taken out of their works. Collected by the Curés of Paris, and laid before the Assembly of the clergy of France in 1656.

I.

SAINT Thomas, (Aquinas) having clearly taught, *Quodlib.* 8. 2. 13. and *Quodlib.* 3. a. 10. that the opinions of *Doctors* hinder not but that a man may be guilty of sin, when he acts against the law of God; these *Casuists*, on the contrary, teach, that an opinion is *probable* when it is maintained only by *one* grave Doctor, and that a man may be confident he does not sin, though he quit an opinion which he knows to be true, and is the more safe, to follow that which is contrary thereto, and consequently less probable and less safe. This is affirmed by FILLIUCIUS, a Jesuit, *Mor. Qu. tr.* 2. 1. c. 4. n. 128. TANNERUS, a Jes. *Theol. Schol. Tom. 2. disp. 2. q. 6. dub.* 2. SANGHEZ, Jes. *in sum.* l. 1. c. 9. n. 7. LAYMAN, Jes. *Theol. Mor.* l. 1. tr. 1. c. 5. *Sect.* 3. n. 6.

II.

Of a strange imagination which these *Casuists* have, that their opinions, being supposed probable, do make that which was sin before, not to be such any longer. CARAMUEL, *in Epist. ad Ant. Dianam.*

III.

That the *Casuists* are at liberty to answer according to the opinions of others, though they think them erroneous, when they are likely to prove more acceptable to those that consult them, that is to say, they may answer one while according to one man's judgment, and another according to another's, though contrary thereto. LAYMAN, Jes. *Theol. Mor.* l. 1. tr. 1. c. 5. *Sect.* 2. n. 7. ESCOBAR, *Princ. ex.* 3. n. 24.

IV.

That the conditions which these *Casuists* require as necessary to make an action imputable as sin, may excuse an infinite number of crimes. BAUNY, Jes. *Som. des pechez*, c. 39. p. 906, of the 6, edition.

V.

How they elude and annihilate the laws of the church in the punishment of the most horrid crimes. ESCOBAR, Jes. *Th. Mor.* tr. 1. *Exam.* 8. c. 3. *Praxis ex Societ. Jesu. Doctoribus.*

VI.

That one may kill another to prevent a *box o' th' ear* or a blow with a stick. AZOR, Jes. *Instit. Mor. Part.* 3. l. 2. p. 105. *Filli-*

ucius, Jes. To 2. tr. 29. c. 3. n. 50. Lessius, Jes. de Just. & Jure, l. 2. c. 9. dub 12. n. 77. Escobar, Jes. Mor. Theol. tr, 1. Exam. 7. c. 3. Praxis Soc. Jesu. Becan, Jes. Sum. part. 3. tr. 2. c. 64. de Homicid. qu. 8.

VII.

That it is lawful even for an ecclesiastic and a religious man to maintain the honour he hath acquired by his learning and virtue, by killing him who derogates from his reputation by opprobrious speeches and calumnies. *Amicus, Jes. Tom. 5. disp. 36, n. 118.*

VIII.

The doctrine of Father *Amicus* that permits a religious man to kill him that threatens to calumniate, maintained by *Caramuel*, as being the only true judgment upon that case, the contrary being not so much as probable. *Theol. Fundam. Fund. 55. Sect. 6. p. 544.*

IX.

That it is doubtful whether a religious man having made use of a woman, may not kill her if she offers to discover what passed between them. *Caramuel ibid. Sect. 7. p. 551.*

X.

That as it is lawful for a man to defend his honour against him that would rob him of it, by charging him with a crime he is not guilty of, so may he do it also, by killing him. *Caramuel, Theol. Fundam. Fund. 55. Sect. 6. p. 550.*

XI.

That it is lawful, according to some, in the *speculative*, and according to others in the *Practick* also, for a man to wound or kill one that hath given him a box o'th' ear, even though the other run away for it. *Lessius. Jus. de Just. & Jur. l. 2. c. 9. dub. 12. n. 79. Reginaldus, Jes. in Praxi, l. 21. n. 62. Filliucius, Jes, tr. 29. c. 3. n. 51. Layman, Jes. l. 3. tr. 3. par. 3. c. 3. n. 3. Escobar, Jes. Mor. Theol. tr. 1. Exam. 7. c. 3. Praxis. Caramuel, Theol. Fundam Fund. 55. Sect. 8. page, 551.*

XII.

That a man may kill a *false accuser*, nay, the *witness* produced by him, and the *judge* himself, when they cannot be otherwise diverted from oppressing the innocent. *Tannerus, Jes. To. 3. disp. 4. q. 8. d. 4. n. 83. Sanchez, Jes. Oper. Mor. in Decal. l. 2. c. 39. n. 7.*

XIII.

That it is lawful to procure abortion before the child be quick in the womb, to save a maid's life or reputation. *Egidius Trullench in Decal. Tom, 5. l. 5. c. 1. dub. 4. n. 1. Et quidam Theologus Societatis Jesu apud Dianam, Part. 6. tr. 8. Resol. 37.*

XIV.

That it is lawful to kill him that give us the lye, or any way reviles us. *Escobar Theol. Mor. tr. 1. Exam, 7. c. 3. Praxis. Reginaldus, Jes. l. 2. l. c 5. n. 60.*

XV.

That it is lawful for us to kill him that takes away our goods from us, even though he run away to avoid it, provided the thing be of value. *Lessius, Jes. de Just & Jure, l. 2. c. 9. dub. 11. n. 66, & 72. Escobar, Jes. Theol. Mor. tr. 1. Exam. 7. c. 3. Praxis.*

XVI.

That it is lawful upon certain occasions to accept a challenge and to fight a duel. *Escobar, Jes. Theol. Mor. tr. 1. Exam. 7. c. 3. Praxis. Layman, Jes. l. 3. T. 3. part. 3. c. 3. n. 2. & 3. Hurtado de Mendoza, Jes. in 2. 2. disp. 170. Sect. 9. Sect. 82. Apud Dianam, Part. 5. tr. 13. Resol. Jes. 21. Idem Hurtado de Mendoza, Jes. reserente Diana, Part. 5. tr. 14. Miscellan. 2. Resol. 99.*

XVII.

That it is not *Simony* either to give or receive a temporal good for a spiritual, when it is given only as the *motive*, and not as the *price*. *Gregorius à Valentia, Jes. 3. to. 3. disp. 6. qu. 16. Pun. 3. p. 2039. & sequent. Escobar, Jes. Mor. Theol. tract. 6. ex. 2. c. 6. n. 40. Praxis. Milhard, Guide des Curez, ch 63. Inst. 1. n. 2.*

XVIII.

That it is not *simony* to obtain a benefice upon the promise of a sum of money, when a man hath no intention to pay it. *Escobar, Jes. Moral. Theol. tr. 6. Exam. 2. c. 2. n. 14.*

XIX.

That a fortune-teller is obliged to restore what he hath received for telling one's fortune, if he hath not advised with the stars, but that he is not obliged to restitution if he hath consulted the Devil. *Sanchez, Jes. Sum. Cas. l. 2. c. 38. n. 96.*

XX.

That a man is not obliged either according to the light of nature, or according to the laws of his Country to restore what he hath received for giving an unjust sentence, or committing an assassination, or an act of adultery, but may lawfully retain it. *Lessius, Jes. de Just. l. 2. c. 14. d. 8. n. 52.*

XXI.

The encouragement, and the gap which these Casuists lay open for domestic frauds. *Bauny, Jes. Som. des Pech. p. 213, & 214. Edit. 6.*

XXII.

That a man is not obliged to make restitution for the losses which a third person hath done upon our solicitation and procurement. *Bauny, Jes, Som. des Pech. p, 307, 308. Edit. 6.*

XXIII.

That a man is not obliged upon pain of mortal sin to restore the total sum which he hath gotten together by many little thefts. *Bauny, Jes. Som des Pech. p. 220. Edit. 6.*

XXIV.

Usury palliated by these Casuists under the name of *Major*, upon whom they impose. *Bauny, Jes. Som. des Pechez, p. 331, and sequent. Edit. 6.*

XXV.

That envy is no mortal sin when it is conceived only at the temporal good of our neighbour. *Bauny, Jes. Som des Pech. p. 123. Edit. 6.*

XXVI.

That a Priest who hath received money of one man to say a mass, may afterwards receive of another, as much as that part of the sacrifice which belongs to himself amounts to. *Escobar, Jes. Theol. Mor. tr. 1, Exam 11. c. 4. Praxis.*

XXVII.

That it is a sufficient hearing of the mass to hear the four parts of it at the same time. *Escobar, Jes. Theol. Moral. Tr. 1. Exam. 11. c. 4. Praxis, p. 146. Edit. Lugdun. Anno. 1644. Bauny, Jes. Moral. Theol. Par. 1. tr. 6. de præcepto audiendæ Missæ qu. 9. p. 312.*

XXVIII.

Relaxations absolutely destroying the obligation of fasting. *Escobar, Jes. Theol. Mor. tr. 1. Exam. 13. c. 3. Praxis.*

XXIX.

The Casuists have brought the care which confessors ought to have to judge of the disposition of their penitents, to a simple demand whether they are sorry for their sins, and have an intention not to fall into the like again; and pretend, that if they say, *Yes*, the confessors are obliged to believe them. *Filliucius, Jes. Mor. Quest. Tom. 1. Tract. 7. n. 354. Suarez, Jes. in 3. Part. Tom 4. disp. 32. Sect. 2. n. 2.*

XXX.

That the penitent, though interrogated by his confessor, is not obliged to acknowledge that the sin wherewith he charges himself is an habitual sin, into which he is wont to fall often. *Bauny, Jes. Theol. Mor. part. 1. Tract. 4. de Pœnit. q. 15. p. 137.*

XXXI.

That a *next occasion* of sinning being supposed to be that which of itself induces a man to commit mortal sin, and in which a man is seldom or never conceived to be, but he falls into that mortal sin; yet it is lawful for a man to continue therein, nay, to engage himself in such an *occasion*, out of a consideration of the spiritual or temporal good of himself or his neighbour. *Bauny, Jes. Theol. Mor. Part. 1. tr. 4. de Pœnit. qu. 14. p. 93, & 94.*

XXXII.

That a man that keeps a concubine is not oblig'd to dismiss her but only to promise that he will not sin with her any more, it being supposed he cannot enjoy himself, and must lead a melancholy life without her. *Sanctius, in Selectis Disp. disp. 10. n. 20. apud Dianam part. 5. Tract. 14. Resol. 108.*

XXXIII.

That the consideration of a temporal concernment may oblige the confessor to absolve a penitent that is in the *next occasion* of sinning, though he quit it not. *Bauny, Jes. Theol. Mor. Par. 1. tr. 4. de Pœnit. qu. 14. page 94.*

XXXIV.

That it is lawful for a confessor to absolve those that are in the *next occasions* even so *incest*, without obliging them to separate, when their relapses are not frequent and in a manner diurnal, but only once or twice a month. Nay, further, that a confessor is engaged, *toties quoties*, to absolve the young gentleman, that cannot forsake his father's house nor dismiss thence the servant-maid he ordinarily makes use of, though there be no likelihood he should forbear sinning with her, though he promise to do it. *Bauny, Jes. Som. des Pech. ch. 46. p. 1089. Edit. 6.*

XXXV.

That a confessor is obliged, *toties quoties*, to absolve those young people who grow *worse and worse*, and are guilty of frequent relapses into the same mortal sins, though they make it not in the least measure their business to reform their faults. *Bauny, Jes. Theol. Mor. Part. 1. tr. 4. de Pœnit. qu. 15. p. 96.*

XXXVI.

That a confessor is obliged not to defer or deny absolution to those who are fallen into an habitual custom of committing mortal sins, against the laws of God, nature, and the church, though they discover not the least hope of amendment. *Bauny, Jes. Theol. Mor. Part. 1. Tract. 4. de Pœnit. qu. 22. page 100.*

XXXVII.

That remorse for sin conceived out of a consideration of the temporal inconveniences ensuing thereupon, as the loss of a man's health or his money, is a sufficient qualification for his receiving the grace of absolution; if a man does but imagine that that inconvenience proceeds from the will of God. *Escobar, Jes. tr. 7. ex. 4. n. 91. Amicus, Jes. Tract. 8. disp. 3. n. 13.*

XXXVIII.

That we are not obliged by any commandment of charity, to do any act of love towards God, nor to observe any precept of his out of any motive proceeding from that love, and that we are not so much commanded to love God as not to hate him. *Ant. Sirmond. Jes. Deffense de la Vertu, tr. 2.*

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

RATIONALE OF ROMISH CONVERSIONS.

The Rev. Mr. Best's Conversion from the Church of England to Popery.

SOUTHEY has given us a curious test of the sincerity of Romish converts. He says, speaking of Dryden's renunciation of Protestantism,—“*The very weakness of the argument (by which he justified the step,) is proof of his sincerity, for in matters of criticism when he was reasoning against his own better judgment, that sort of ability was never wanting to him which makes the worse appear the better reason. He was too skilful and too sagacious ever to have advanced what was palpably fallacious, unless he had imposed upon himself first.*” The correctness of this test is abundantly proved in the case of the Duke of Brunswick;—no one who reads his 50th reason, where he says no Protestant minister was willing to do what the priests

offered, to take his sin upon themselves, in case it should be found he had erred in connecting himself with the church of Rome,—who can fail to be convinced at once of his stupid credulity and his perfect sincerity.

In examining the claims of the popish system, it is desirable to find a genuine convert—(one who believes it to be the religion of Christ, and who turns not to gain some ends, but because he really believes)—and to learn what reasons he has assigned as having influenced his mind. We think we have such an one in the Rev. Mr. Best, who about thirty years ago, left the church of England, and who within ten or twelve years gave an account of the reasons and the circumstances of his conversion, in a work intitled, *Four Years' Residence in France*. If Southey's test be true, the genuineness of his conversion is certain.

Mr Best tells us he did not publish an apology for returning to the religion of his fathers, because he felt that he could not throw any light on the popish controversy. In the book before us, he does not appear as a disputant; his reason for writing it was, that having suddenly lost his eldest son, he sought relief in preparing an account of him, particularly of his last days. The work begins with a sketch of his own parentage and early life, and nearly the first quarter is taken up with this and his laying aside his orders in the established church to become a lay-member of the church of Rome; nearly all the rest is occupied with details of his son, and the incidental expression of opinions on unimportant matters. He published also, "*Literary and Personal Recollections*," full of amusing anecdotes and sketches of distinguished men of his acquaintance.

Mr. B. was the only son of a clergyman who held a prebend in the cathedral of Lincoln; his mother was of a family which adhered to popery till her father or grand father became a Protestant. He gives us no hint that he received any thing worthy of the name of a religious education—though he was soon thoroughly familiarized to all the forms and ceremonies of the church service. He thinks his mother retained a strong predilection for the Romish church; she was much visited by persons of that persuasion, and he was greatly caressed by some elderly popish ladies, and his inbred (or rather, *inborn*) passion for ceremonial was much wrought upon by their fasts and other observances. After his father's death, when perhaps not fifteen, he found among his books a copy of the *Rhemish Testament*, with the notes he was delighted, and he seriously talked to his mother of turning Roman Catholic. She (good woman, prudent mother!) consulted his teacher on the propriety of his doing so, and he replied he would rather lose 500*l.* than that such a thing should be. Upon this, he gave up the intention, and neither his mother nor his teachers appear to have used any further caution or bestowed any such able instruction.

Soon after, he went to the University of Oxford, and his intimate companion there was a young man rather older than himself, of good family, and very high church notions; with him he strengthened his love of form and pomp. They debated much, which was the true church;—of their arguing, this is a specimen. "The secession of the church of England from the Roman See, is defended on the ground of the right of private judgment. But the right of private judgment is inconsistent with the authority of the church. You allow the church to decide what books constitute the canon, and you suppose her gifted with infallibility to do this, but you permit her to go no further, as if there her infallibility ceased; as if we were not in as much need of one to tell us what the Scripture teaches, as of one to tell us, what is Scripture. How were controversies determined before the settling of the canon, but by the church? And did not Augustin say, "I will not receive any thing as Scripture, unless the church declare it to be such?" "This right of private judgment is inconsistent with the promises of Christ. He promised to be with his church always, —certainly to be with her in teaching, for *the church is essentially a teaching society, and if it teach falsely, it has failed in the very end and purpose*

of its existence; if therefore the church had fallen into error, Christ had not fulfilled his promise; but the church of England assumes that the church of Christ had ceased to teach the truth, and that therefore she was justified in seceding."

With such views and "a little Hebrew," he left college, and after some time, he resolved to apply for orders. The account he gives of his reasons for so doing, furnishes melancholy proof of his ignorance of the first principles of Christ. "After a fit of sickness," says he, "when the mind was open to serious considerations, I began to reflect on the subject; *the feeling of piety had never been entirely renounced by me, and I now easily brought myself to entertain the hope, that by entering the church, I might be of some service.*"

Being admitted to the ministry, he went to reside as a fellow at Oxford, and he preached a sermon before the university, to prove that the power of absolving sin, belonged to the Christian ministry. He tells us, it was warmly applauded by many in high standing, who expressed *their conviction that the only reason why this right was not asserted and maintained, was because of the popular outcry that would be made against it.*

He married, and entered upon the duties of a parish minister, and performed them, he says, with exactness and diligence. While residing at Lincoln, a French refugee priest, M. de Beaumont inquired of him one day after dinner, "at what time the Catholic doctrine of the sacrament was introduced?" Or, in other words, "when the opinions now held by Protestants with respect to the Lord's supper ceased to be taught by the Catholic church?" Some conversation followed, and the priest recommended to his perusal, two French books on the subject, one of which was Bossuet's celebrated work. He read them, particularly Bossuet, together with Chrysostom, and he was soon convinced that transubstantiation had always been taught by the true church of Christ. He discovered that Beringarius was the first who broached the Protestant doctrine, and that he was universally condemned. He examined the church of Rome by the four marks laid down by Chrysostom, and *he felt satisfied, that God had not laid mankind under the necessity of judging of the true church by her doctrine, but had clothed her with such characteristics of unity, holiness and universality, that none might be in uncertainty which was the true church.*

This change of view happened while France was suffering from the results of the revolution; and as the high church party in England are always declaiming on the spoliation of church property at the time of the reformation, Best compared the outrages offered to the French clergy, with the proceedings of Henry viii, and his children towards the English clergy. He soon perceived that the established church had its foundation in wrong; that it was schismatical, and he resolved to quit its ministry and its communion. He accordingly visited London, made the acquaintance of the chief popish dignitary, received a confessor and was baptised, taking the new name of John; after St. Chrysostom. He placed his sons at the popish institution at Stonyhurst, and upon the pacification of Europe, he removed his family to the Continent.

His eldest son became the prey of what Best denominates *scruples*; he does not explain what they were, nor by what they were occasioned. He reasoned with him, but in vain, and the boy's confessor forbade him to think of them, saying that *scruples were as bad as sins*. He shook them off, but they afterwards returned. Much mystery hangs over this part of the narrative. What does the Romish church term *scruples*? Were they in this case the result of a wicked priest's suggestions, made to him while confessing? Or were they the strugglings of an honest unsophisticated mind, revolting at the dogmas and pretensions of a corrupt superstition?

This son died, and two instances of lamentable weakness, not to say puerile credulity, are recorded by the father of himself. A few nights after the decease, as his wife and himself lay waking in bed, they both heard a

low, gentle and unusual noise, in the room, and his wife saw a brilliant light upon the wall which remained some time and disappeared. They were convinced there was no mistake on their part, and that it was impossible it could have been any natural light or sound, and *as it happened within the period which the church specifies for the returning of the spirits of deceased friends to assure us of their happiness*, they delighted themselves with believing that it was a manifestation of the glorified spirit of their child. The other instance is more pitiably absurd. While at Lincoln, his children being quite young, Mr. Best dreamed that a figure habited like a monk, with a peculiarly serene and dignified expression appeared to him, and communicated to him by looks that he should institute a new religious order to be called *the Penitents of St. Clair*. The rule of the order was to be abstinence from wine, gaming and unchastity. The figure said "*non sub peccato*" intimating as he supposed that the rule was not to be observed as if indulgence in the things abstained from were sinful, but solely from expediency! As the figure disappeared, he saw a young man, who it was impressed on his mind was to be one of the first members of the order. After the death of his son, he regarded it as a revelation from heaven. He doubted not that the figure was the actual appearance of Christ in person, to intimate to him his will on this momentous subject. He was fully assured on this point by the fact that a picture which his son drew just before his last illness, of the Saviour, closely resembled the face of the figure. Besides he had not at the time of the dream, known that there was such a saint as St. Clair, and a further confirmation was, that when his eldest son died, his second was grown up, and had become in feature and form, the counter part of the young man in the vision.

That this man was sincere in his belief that the church of Rome was the true church, and that he was equally sincere in his belief of his visions and of their importance, cannot be doubted; but what weight should the sincerity of such a man give to his opinions? An utter lack of religious knowledge and Christian feeling, characterizes the book; he seems to have been totally destitute of any sense of his need of spiritual conversion. On the contrary, though he had been a clergyman, he spreads upon his pages obscene anecdotes, and admits his love of theatrical amusements. The show of the Romish ritual suited his taste; the church of England retained enough of glitter and pomp, to keep up, *without satisfying*, the relish for it; he saw the one modelled after the other, and he turned from the copy to the original. High church conceits, destitution of piety, and love of splendid and imposing forms, led him to popery. He had nothing in a pecuniary point of view to gain, but having wealth enough to indulge his fancy, he followed inclination and professed himself a papist; but he was a worldlyling while a Protestant, and his book shows that with his change of religion there was no *change of character*.

May we not safely conclude that if the predilection for pomp and gilded rites operate thus on a man of cultivated mind, many heedless, ignorant or enthusiastic persons will be inveigled into the profession of popery. The priests regard the eye and ear not as avenues to the mind, but as instruments by which they can play upon the weaknesses and take advantage of some natural bias. We venture to say that most of the converts to popery, are made by considerations similar to those which influenced Mr. Best. Enthusiasm, a fondness for ceremonial, a craving after excitement, these and not the love of the doctrines of Jesus Christ—these and not the desire of Scriptural holiness—these turn men from Protestants into Papists. The change of profession leaves them as they were, indifferent to divine truth, proudly relying on their own performance of external duties,—and unestranged from their devotedness to the world.

Mr. Best had *no early religious training*—he received none from his teachers, none at the University. He was never taught the truth, as it is in Jesus.—On the contrary, his *high-church* absurdities prepared him to be

a papist—they made him a papist at heart, while a Protestant in name.—The best preservative against popery, is the knowledge of the truth.—*That which is able to save the soul* is able also to protect against every wile of the Devil.

ADDRESS TO OUR PATRONS AND THE PUBLIC.

It is now going on to four years, since we were obliged, and we may say shut up, by the course of providence, to attempt the establishment of a *Protestant Press*, in the city of Baltimore.

The Papal sect throughout the earth, have made unusual efforts, to spread their superstition, since the restoration of the order of Jesuits about twenty-four years ago. In the United States especially,—they have left no effort untried. Their schools are multiplied,—their ecclesiastics increased,—their religious bodies of both sexes extended;—and while hundreds of thousands of their people are annually cast upon our shores,—and every indication establishes the fact of a foreign conspiracy against the religion of the country,—no expressions can exaggerate, the urgency of the means employed to win the public favour—and to give perfect homogeneity and efficiency to their organization amongst us. Amongst the most common, and alarming, as well as successful of their attempts—is that directed against the public press. Whether by bribery, by seduction, by intimidation, or by whatever fatal method besides the *press* of the United States was influenced, it is mournfully true that so far as it was *Political* and *Literary*, it was either totally and avowedly neutral—or openly favourable to the Papal superstition; whilst the *Religious* and *Theological* portion of it, was almost wholly silent.

This was the state of affairs when the **BALTIMORE LITERARY AND RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE**, was issued in January, 1835. Its location at the seat of the Archiepiscopal power of the Papacy in the United States—has given it peculiar facilities, and imposed upon it peculiar trials. How it has availed itself of the former, and how borne itself under the latter, its patrons will decide. What influence it may have had in rousing public attention, and quickening the popular apprehension of the dangers of our present posture—as well as in enlightening the public mind on the whole subject—it is not our part to determine. Thus far, the public may rely upon us—that as the great object we had in view in establishing this work, was to expose the designs, and resist the incroachments of the *Jesuits*, upon the liberty and the religion of the people, and the stability of our institutions, we shall spare no labour, no sacrifices, no risk to do our work so as God shall approve, and our fellow men be profited thereby.

As it was at first the want of freedom and independence of the public press, which absolutely begat the necessity for ours,—we of

all men—should be the last to commit similar offences against the rights of individuals, and the true interests of society. Of all rights none are more precious in themselves, more important to truth, and more invaluable to society at large, than the right to speak, to argue, and to publish freely. To this result all our feelings and all our principles alike conduct us. Our press has been, and shall continue eminently a free and independent press. Free, as to the subjects it discusses; free as to its method of treating them. Independent of all control—from all quarters;—yea even for its very existence, dependent only on the voluntary support, of an enlightened public. We are fully aware that such principles, are occasionally inconvenient in their application, in times of great public excitement. But what are truth and liberty worth—if we dare not risk something for them? Or what are reason and knowledge for,—if the most important interests of man, are to be withdrawn from their supervision?

We had never any purpose of confining our labours solely to the papal controversy. This is obvious from the very name of our journal—and has been constantly avowed. Indeed we are well convinced, that it is not generally desirable, if it were possible, to separate entirely all the great departments of human interest, and attempt to advocate each separately—sacrificing all successively, for a doubtful, and incomplete unity on the particular one. On the other hand, we have endeavoured to give as great variety as possible to our work; and have considered every thing that connected itself with the Literary or Religious condition of our times—fully within the scope of our plan. Our pages are devoted to the advancement of Knowledge, Liberty, and Religion; and if there be any other interest of man, not embraced in this brief summary,—we shall not esteem it beyond the pale of our sympathies, efforts, and prayers.

With these views, it was to have been expected, that in times like those through which we are passing—a multitude of subjects of intense interest would necessarily demand our attention. Amongst those we have been called on to discuss,—our readers are aware that some of the fundamental doctrines of the cross of Christ, and some of the great principles on which the church of God is founded, in her form and her action, have held a prominent place. Other discussions, second in importance only to these—have brought in review, the spirit and results of the turbulent fanaticism of our eventful era—and aimed to curb, if we could not crush an impulse which seeks to level all human institutions and threatens the existence of society itself. To these have been added, various articles on subjects more properly, literary, and political; and to them a series of papers, in relation to the actual condition and interests of several foreign countries. In relation to all these great subjects, our purpose is to go forward as we have commenced; labouring only to give increased interest to our work.

It is proper to observe further, that our design has been to furnish an annual volume, in monthly numbers—whose contents should be at once original, and of permanent value. Touching our success in the latter particular, we dare not venture to speak; only we will take leave to say, that from the very nature of the case, if our matter

possess any value at all—it is of a kind not apt to pass away, with the rapid flight of events; but rather perhaps to increase in interest as these times recede from us, and are reviewed by those who would preserve their memory. On the other point we speak with great confidence, after more than three years' experience, of our ability, with the valuable and increasing aid of our friends, to furnish a work decidedly original—so far as the current literature of our country, and our cotemporary periodical press is concerned. We think, there need be no fear, in subscribing for our Magazine, that the matter will be such as is otherwise accessible to the general reader; or such as will be of no value or interest to him after a single hasty perusal.

The object of these remarks, is to draw public attention more extensively to our undertaking—in the hope of enlarging a patronage which although it has increased from the beginning—is yet barely adequate, if all our subscribers were punctual, and is far below what the subject demands. We therefore earnestly solicit the patronage of all who approve our course—and throw ourselves on the friends of the great cause in which we are embarked, to aid us in obtaining a circulation which will augment our usefulness, at the same time that it relieves us of wasting anxieties and sacrifices sometimes hard to be borne.

It need only be said in conclusion, that our Magazine is published regularly, on the first day of each month, in the city of Baltimore; from whence it is punctually sent by mail, or otherwise, as directed, to every part of the country: and that each number contains forty eight pages, neatly printed, and handsomely covered and cut, making for the year a thick, well printed 8vo volume on good paper, of 576 pages—with an index and title page. The year of the Magazine begins and ends with the civil year;—it is therefore—best as well for the subscriber as the publishers—that the work should be taken, as far as possible, in the same way. The subscription price is \$2 50 per year, which may be discharged by \$2, if paid on receipt of the first number. Where five subscribers are obtained, and \$10 remitted—a sixth copy is given; and this arrangement will be continued from year to year. The most liberal terms will be given to local and travelling agents; and all remittances can be made by mail, at the risk of the proprietors;—to whom, or to any agent or friend of the work application can be made for it. The work from the beginning neatly bound, can be had through the book-sellers or from the proprietors.