

Dec 18
1837

S M Y L I E
ON
S L A V E R Y .

INTRODUCTION.

IN presenting the following Review to the public, the author was not entirely, or mainly, influenced by a desire or hope to correct the views of the Chillicothe Presbytery. He hoped the publication would be of essential service to others, as well as to the Presbytery.

From his intercourse with religious societies of all denominations, in Mississippi and Louisiana, he was aware that the abolition maxim, viz: *that slavery is in itself sinful*, had gained on, and entwined itself among the religious and conscientious scruples of many in the community, so far as not only to render them unhappy, but to draw off the attention from the great and important duty of a householder to his household. The eye of the mind, resting on slavery itself as a corrupt fountain, from which, of necessity, nothing but corrupt streams could flow, was incessantly employed in search of some plan, by which, with safety, the fountain could, in some future time, be entirely dried up; never reflecting, or dreaming, that slavery, in itself considered, was an innoxious relation, and that the whole error rested in the neglect of the relative duties of the relation.

If there be a consciousness of guilt, resting on the mind, it is all the same, as to the effect, whether the conscience is, or is not, right. Although the word of God alone ought to be the guide of conscience; yet, it is not always the case—Hence, conscientious scruples, sometimes, exist for neglecting to do that which the word of God condemns.

The Bornean who neglects to kill his father, and to eat him with his dates, when he has become old, is sorely tortured by the wringings of a guilty conscience, when his filial tenderness and sympathy have gained the ascendancy over his apprehended duty of killing his parent. In like manner, many a slaveholder, whose conscience is guided, not by the word of God, but by the doctrines of men, is often suffering the lashes of a guilty conscience, even when he renders to his slave "that which is just and equal," according to the scriptures, simply because he does not emancipate his slave, irrespective of the benefit or injury done by such an act.

"How beautiful upon the mountains," in the apprehension of the reviewer, "would be the feet of him that would bring" to the Bornean "the glad tidings" that his conduct, in sparing the life of his tender and affectionate parent, was no sin. It is

true, that the messenger would prostrate that part of the Bornean's religion, which required him to kill and eat his father, and which had "grown with his growth, and strengthened with his strength." It is, also, equally true, that the death of that part of his religion, would be the delightful life of his filial enjoyments. Instead of the painful and unnatural operation of suddenly, or gradually, cutting his parent's throat, in obedience to the commands of a misinformed conscience, he would cheerfully engage in the delightful exercise of those tender attentions and regards, which would help to smoothe the declining path, and brighten the evening of his revered parent's days.

Equally beautiful and delightful, does the reviewer trust, will it be, to an honest scrupulous and conscientious slaveholder, to learn, from the word of God, the glad tidings that slavery, itself, is not sinful—Released now from an ineubus that paralyzed his energies, in discharge of duty towards his slaves, he goes forth cheerfully to energetic action—It is not now as formerly, when he viewed slavery as in itself sinful—He can now pray, with the hope of being heard, that God will bless his exertions to train up his slaves "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord:" whereas, before, he was retarded by this consideration—"If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me."—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 its paths peace"—Distinguishing now between the real word of God, and what are only the doctrines and commandments of men, the mystery is solved, which was before insolvable, viz: "The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart."

Such, the author of the following review, hopes will be the beneficial tendency of the mass of scriptural evidence, which he has brought up in battle array, to demolish the grand and only pillar of the whole abolition and emancipating fabric.

It seems, to the reviewer, that no one can read the Review, without coming to the conviction, that the abolition maxim, of the sinfulness of slavery, is wholly, and utterly, unsupported by the word of God.

He is, however, not so sanguine, in his hope of this result, as he would have been twenty years ago, when he was ignorant of the immense weight of great names, and "flattering titles," to enlist the favor, and enslave the conscience of thousands—and when he was partially ignorant, how many nominally great, and really good men, there are, who, instead of thinking and examining for themselves, settle down on the maxims of men, forgetful "that great men are not always wise"—and forgetful, also, "that there is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death."

The writer has lived too long in the world, and watched the movements of men, not to be confirmed in the sad truth of Solomon's proverb, "Though thou shouldst bray a fool in a mortar, among wheat, with a pestle, yet will not his foolishness depart from him."

He has noticed, that where the mind has seized on a favorite maxim, and which has been long cherished and publicly defended, you may pestle that mind with the

palpable word of God—even "among the wheat" of religion, and among many christian graces, yet, strange and unaccountable as it may seem, it is, nevertheless, a stubborn fact, that there are such characters, as will wring, and twist, and explain away the word of God, rather than let their "foolishness depart from them."

Of such characters, he has but little hope, until the tide will turn, and they can perceive a goodly number of the nominally great and wise, with spread sail, riding on the top of the wave. There are, however, some who think for themselves, and who endeavor to distinguish between the commandments of God and those of men. He rejoices that there are such; and with such, and such only, would he desire his little review to keep company.—They, and they alone, can discern any substantial defects.—They, and they alone, can pass over any little warts or protuberances it may have, without at all shocking their mental nerves, provided they find it substantially in accordance with the word of God.

Reader, he will not detain you any longer—proceed on—read, and judge for yourself; and may the Spirit of Truth guide you, is the prayer of the

AUTHOR.

THE
CHILLICOTHE LETTER,
TO THE PRESBYTERY OF MISSISSIPPI.

DEAR BRETHREN, BELOVED IN THE LORD:

FEELING that the cause of Christ is a common cause, in which all the members of his body, the Church, wherever found, are more or less interested, we are induced to address you, on a subject deeply involving her purity and prosperity. So close and tender are the ties, which bind us together, as members of the same Church, and children of the same Spirit, that when one member rejoices or suffers, all the members rejoice and suffer with it. The present time is witness to the saddening truth, that vital godliness is greatly declining; division, in some degree, prevailing; alienation of feeling and affection towards the brethren, and but little success attending the means of grace, and the efforts of the Church for the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom.

For all this, there is verily a cause, and that cause exists in the Church. The Great Head of the Church, in all these things, is saying unto us, "There is an accursed thing, in the midst of thee, O Israel! Thou canst not stand before thine enemies, until ye take away the accursed thing from among you."

What, then, dear brethren, is our duty, in such a crisis as this? Is it not to inquire diligently after the cause, in order to its speedy removal, that the Divine presence and blessing may no longer be withheld from us? "Up, sanctify the people," is the command of God, to all the leaders in Israel: And feeling this to be incumbent, and believing the sin of SLAVERY, as it exists in the Church, is the "accursed thing," we, as a Presbytery, have been impelled, under these convictions, and a love to the souls of our fellow men, to adopt measures for its exclusion from the Churches under our care. The following resolutions, expressive of our views, as a Presbytery, touching this subject, we have adopted, and they

are hereby laid before you, that you may, as a Presbytery, consider them; and if you approve any, or all of them, that you adopt them, or something similar, which shall go to exclude, in due time, and in a proper manner, this crying sin from the Churches under your care—viz :

1. *Resolved*, That the buying, selling, or holding of a slave, for the sake of gain, is a heinous sin and scandal, requiring the cognizance of the judicatories of the Church.

2. *Resolved*, That giving, or bequeathing, slaves to children, or others, as property, is a great sin; and, when committed by a member of the Church, ought to subject him to church censure.

3. *Resolved*, That to sell a slave, his own liberty, except when the slave was purchased at his own request, and has failed to remunerate his master for the price paid, is a great injustice, and ought to be made a term of communion.

4. *Resolved*, That to offer a slave his freedom, only on the condition, that he will leave his country, and go into a foreign land, is unjust and cruel, and ought to subject a church member to censure.

5. *Resolved*, That when a slave is emancipated, whose services have been of much value to his master, refusing to give him a reasonable compensation for his labor, when his master is able to do it, or turning him out to the world, when he wishes to stay as a hireling, is a grievous sin, and when committed by a church member, ought to subject him to suspension, until he repent.

6. *Resolved*, That when a master advertises a reward, for a runaway slave, against whom no other crime is alleged, than escaping from his master, he is guilty of a scandalous sin, and forfeits his right to the sealing ordinances of God's house.

7. *Resolved*, That to apprehend a slave, who is endeavoring to escape from slavery, with a view to restore him to his master, is a direct violation of the Divine Law, and when committed by a member of the Church, ought to subject him to censure.

8. *Resolved*, That any member of our Church, who shall advocate, or speak in favor of such laws as have been, or may yet be enacted, for the purpose of keeping the slaves in ignorance, and preventing them from learning to read the word of God, is guilty of a great sin, and ought to be dealt with, as for other scandalous crimes.

9. *Resolved*, That should any member of our Church, be so wicked, as to manifest a desire, to exclude colored people from a seat in the house of God, or at the Lord's table, with white people, he ought, on conviction thereof, to be suspended from the Lord's table, until he repent.

Believing, as we do, that every Christian Church, or Union, or association of Churches, is entitled to declare the terms of admission into communion, and the qualifications of its ministers and members, as well as the whole system of its internal government, which Christ has appointed: we can see no good reason, why the Church, or any branch of it, should hesitate to exclude, in a regular way, this sin, merely because we find it involved in our political relations.

If any man chooses to hold slaves, under the constitution of any slave State, we, as a Church, infringe not on his constitutional rights. But has he a right to force a claim upon the grant of church communion, while chargeable with a sin, in itself peculiarly heinous in the sight of God?—Certainly not.

If our Government should establish and protect, by law, a system of the grossest idolatry, would it be the duty of the Church, on that account, to admit those who practice it, into communion? Certainly not. In such a case, while yielding obedience to God, we would only claim the exercise of our own rights, without infringing on any man's civil rights.—Every man, in such a case, would have his election; and, although he might be dissatisfied, yet, certainly he could have no just cause of complaint; especially, if the Church should be acting in a way consistent with the word of God, as we verily believe would be the case, while aiming at the speedy and entire removal of this sin from the Church.

Say not, the work is too great, nor this deadly enemy of our peace and prosperity, too powerful to be resisted. It is a sin that loves the darkness, and cannot endure the light. An enemy that is unable to stand before the sword of the spirit, and the remnant of God's people, girded with the panoply of Heaven, and trusting in the God of Zion for victory.

Prayer and consistent effort, in this matter, will bring to our aid the resources of OMNIPOTENCE.

Praying that the Great Head of the Church may, by his spirit, and his word, guide you in his own right way, we remain affectionately yours.

Signed, JNO. P. VANDYKE, S. Clerk.

By order of the Presbytery.

OHIO, November 28, 1835

Address—*“To the Stated Clerk of the Presbytery of Mississippi, Toler Office, Mi.”*

REVIEW, &C.

SECTION I.

Pine Grove, Mississippi, February 15, 1835.

REVEREND AND DEAR BROTHER VANDYKE :

Your letter, or rather the letter of the Presbytery of which you are Stated Clerk, was handed to me a few minutes ago, by the Postmaster. Being directed to the Stated Clerk of the Mississippi Presbytery, Toler Post Office, which is my address, and having been Stated Clerk of that Presbytery, since its first meeting at Pine Ridge, March, 1816, until its division; and supposing the letter contained matter for the whole original Mississippi Presbytery, I paid the postage and opened it, with a view to take a copy, if of a public nature, and lay it before the Amite Presbytery, whose Stated Sessions will take place previously to the time appointed for the Stated Sessions of the Mississippi Presbytery.

This I will do; and in the meantime transmit the original to Reverend Jeremiah Chamberlain, D. D., the present Stated Clerk of the Mississippi Presbytery. In the confidence, that while the Mississippi Presbytery will not disapprove the liberty I have taken, your Presbytery will be pleased to hear that your circular will be laid before the Amite Presbytery, by one of its members.

What the action of either of those Presbyteries will be, or whether any, on your letter, I cannot, with any absolute certainty, divine. I cannot for a moment doubt, however, but that both Presbyteries will give you full credit for your zeal, and be far from questioning the sincerity of your motives. But whether either or both of them will conclude that your zeal is according to knowledge, or that your plan for ameliorating the condition of slaves—for "preventing the decline of vital godliness"—"the prevalence of division, and the existence of alienation of feeling and affection, towards the brethren," is worthy of your sincerity, is to me problematical.

From the knowledge I have of all the members of both the Mississippi and Amite Presbyteries, I can say, without the risk of contradiction or offence, that to a man, we would ardently, cheerfully, and laboriously unite and co-operate with our brethren, not of our own church only, but of other denominations, in *any, and all, plainly scriptural* schemes, to ameliorate the condition of the colored race.

The ameliorating their condition, is a subject which has long lain near our hearts. It is still with us a subject of much solicitude—As an evidence of it, most of our ministers, devote part of their time, to preaching the Gospel to them; and one member of the Presbytery, to which I belong, (in point of piety and intellectual endowment, inferior to none,) devotes his whole time, to the spiritual improvement of the colored people in his neighborhood.

I can assure you, that it is no small grief to us, that our northern and western brethren, of our own and other denominations, cannot, and, we fear, in some instances, *will* not see the subject of slavery with us in the same light.

It is doubtful, with me, whether there be, in the Amite or Mississippi Presbyteries, an individual member, who is fully convinced, that to abolish the relation of master and slave, is the scriptural mode of removing the evils of slavery. I can speak for one—I *am not*; nor do I expect or desire to be convinced, otherwise than *by the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments*. When the scriptures teach me, or when any one will shew me that the scriptures do teach, that slavery, or the relation of master and slave, is sinful, then, as a minister, and as a christian, I am pledged to forsake it.

When I see a building well joined together, well arched, well proportioned, and commanding the admiration of thousands of the aged and the good, and, on close examination, find it "founded on a rock." I join in the admiration; and, according to my ability, contribute towards extending and ornamenting the building. But if it be "founded on the sand," or on a foundation of doubtful solidity, and, more especially, if withal, it is loosely joined, and ill proportioned, instead of joining in admiring plaudits, however numerous, great, old, and good, the men may be, who are employed in rearing the structure, I am constrained to conclude, with the Buzite of old, that "great men are not always wise, neither do the aged understand judgment."

Permit me now, my dear brother, in the confidence of the love which you, as the organ of the Chillicothe Presbytery, express towards the members of the Mississippi Presbytery, as "beloved in the Lord," to state to you some of the defects, which will hinder me, and, perchance, all the members of our southwestern Presbyteries, from co-operating with the Chillicothe Presbytery, in rearing, extending, or maintaining, your abolition fabric.

What our Presbyteries will, or will not do, is yet for the future to develop; but what I, as an individual member, will strive to do, you will be able to conjecture, by the time you have finished reading this epistle,

which I send you. If it answers no other purpose, it may operate as a chymical drop to still any possible fermentation which might arise from a difference of OPINION, (not *belief*,) on the subject of slavery.

If I mistake not, the whole fabric rests on the BELIEF that *slavery is a SIN*;—a *sin of no ordinary magnitude*. *Belief* and *opinion* are distinct. *Belief*, is predicated, not on *probabilities*, but upon *testimony*—*Opinion*, is predicated upon the higher *probabilities alone*, and not on *testimony*.—When the witness is fallible, liable to be mistaken, or deceived, as all human testimony is, to a greater or less extent, then a *belief*, resting on *human testimony*, has, in part *opinion* for its foundation. But when God is the witness, we know that his testimony is true.—To call in question his testimony is rank infidelity—To ascribe to him testimony, which he does not give, or by ingeniously making it plausible, that he intends teaching a doctrine, as accordant with his will, which condemns his own beloved Son, and makes his apostles liars, is, undeniably, *presumption*. It is unequivocally condemned by himself.—“*Add thou not unto his words lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.*”—Prov. xxx, 6. “*Whatsoever thing I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it.*”—Deut. xii, 32. “*For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book; if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things that are written in this book.*”—Rev. xxi, 18 and 19.

God testifies that “sin is the transgression of the Law,” and, that “he that sinneth is of the devil.” The *Law*, to which he alludes, is undoubtedly his own Law, revealed in his own word, and not the presumptuous vagaries of the prophets of Israel, mentioned by Ezekiel, “who prophesy out of their own hearts, foolish prophets that follow their own spirit, and have seen nothing!”—Ezek. xiii, 23. If slavery be a sin, as you say, and if “advertising and apprehending slaves, with a view to restore them to their master, is a direct violation of the Divine Law”—also, “that the buying, selling, or holding, a slave, for the sake of gain, is a heinous sin and scandal,” then, verily, three fourths of all the Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians, in eleven States of the Union, “are of the devil.” They “hold,” if they do not “buy and sell” slaves; and with few exceptions, they hesitate not “to apprehend and restore” runaway slaves, when in their power. To question, whether “slave holders, or slave buyers,” “are of the devil,” seems to me like calling in question, whether God is, or is not, a true witness. That is, provided it is God’s testimony, and not merely the testimony of the Chillicothe Presbytery, that it is “a heinous sin and scandal,” “to buy, sell, or hold slaves.”

If the testimony of men, alone, be sufficient, to establish the *belief*, that slavery is a sin, then the Chillicothe Presbytery has the *testimony*, not of “two or three witnesses,” alone, but the testimony of hundreds, (I might perhaps say thousands,) of men, much above, the ordinary ranks of intel-

ligence. Among whom might be ranked such divines as Edwards, Wesley, Porteus, and I might add, the General Assembly of 1818: such philosophers and politicians as Wilberforce, Johnson, Burke, &c.* It is upon such testimony, then, I presume, that the Chillicothe Presbytery found their *belief*, that slavery is a sin—not upon any express declaration of scripture.

But, my dear brother, whatever may be my regard for the learning and abilities, of those divines and philosophers, and whatever high respect I may have for the Chillicothe Presbytery, I cannot lay aside the good old Berean custom, of “searching the scriptures,” of the Old and New Testaments, to ascertain the truth. While I hold *them* as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and the only authentic manifestation of the Divine Law, I cannot recognize any *man*, or any *body of men*, as the legitimate and exclusive interpreters of God’s will.

I know that so many great and good men have adopted the maxim, that slavery is a sin, that to them it appears axiomatic; and hence, the calling in question the axiom, places, even *an inquirer*, in the attitude of a man of loose morals, or an INFIDEL,† or a skeptic. Hence, as I am not entirely uninfluenced by the idea of the good opinion of my fellow christians, and especially of ministers of my own and other denominations, in the north and west, and perhaps some, even in the south; I can but feel, as I have always felt, a reluctance to call publicly in question the maxim. Respect, however, to you, to myself, and to my fellow laborers in the ministry, and the Church, who hold slaves, seem to require some answer to your letter.

The “*saxiter in modo*,” of the beginning of your letter, tempts me strongly to conceal from myself and others, the entire destitution of the *fortiter in re*. My mind, however, may be affected with some ophthalmic disease, of which I do not feel conscious, and thus blind me to the discovery of the strength of your positions. Your excellent prayer, in the close of your letter, that we “may be guided by *his Spirit and his word*,” is an encouragement to me to hope, that the light reflected, by *God’s testimony*, will not be rejected, if it should, in the course of the investigation, even appear, “that great men are not always wise.”

In the beginning of this investigation, there are two things I wish your Presbytery to bear in mind—viz:

1. That the calling in question the truth of the maxim, that slavery, slave holding, slave buying, and slave selling, is sin, does not remove the *laboring oar* out of the hands of those who adopt the *affirmative*, or bind me to take the oar and prove the *negative*.

2. That truth, and not victory, is what we are interested to obtain; and that the scriptures are to be our only infallible guide; giving, however, to human testimony all due weight, in elucidating the scriptures, but reject-

*See *W. Jay’s inquiry*.

†See *Reeves’ Letters (Introduction) to Hon. Wm. Jay*.

ing, however respectable, any testimony of man, which is at variance with the word of God.

Without, at present, touching your nine resolutions, the following is a fair synopsis of the preamble to your resolutions—viz: That slavery is a sin of no ordinary magnitude—that it is the accursed thing, which is, verily, the cause of the decline of vital godliness—of divisions—of alienation of feelings and affections towards the brethren—of the little success attending the means of grace, and the efforts of the Church for the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom.

The above you express as your conviction. Now, brethren, I unhesitatingly say, that if such evils always have, now do, and ever will continue to be, the legitimate consequences of slavery, it is a most appalling consideration. If true, there can be no dispute, but that every man, as well as minister, ought not to hesitate a moment, but to unite cordially, with heart and hand, to "make a long pull—a strong pull, and a pull altogether," to tear it, not only from the Church, but, also, from the whole world. With this conviction, it would be a matter of surprise, if the Chillicothe Presbytery would cease to "cry aloud, or spare to shew God's people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their *sin*." With such a conviction, I am not at all surprised, that you should view slavery, as you say, as "*an enemy*, that is unable to stand before the sword of the spirit, and the remnant of God's people, girded with the panoply of heaven, and trusting in the God of Zion for victory:" nor am I surprised, while under that conviction, at your expressed aim—viz: "the speedy and entire removal of this sin from the Church."

But, after all, may you not be mistaken? May it not possibly be, that something else, than slavery, is the "accursed thing?" May not the "divisions, the alienation of feelings and affections, towards the brethren," &c., be traced to some other cause—especially, when it is notorious, that where slavery exists, christian brethren of all denominations, seem to maintain the "unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace?" I can testify that it has been so, in Mississippi and Louisiana, for thirty years past.

May it not possibly arise and continue, among you, from the fact, that you export, to the south, so much of your christian regards, especially, and almost exclusively, to the negroes, that you have nothing, or but very little, left for home consumption? May not your having the care of the slave holding Churches, resting on your shoulders, be too heavy a burden? In the first page of your letter, you express this sentiment, when you say, "we are impelled from a love to the souls of our fellow men, to exclude slavery from the Churches under our care"—for there are no slaves in Ohio, if I mistake not, in your Churches.

In searching out the cause of "divisions, alienation of feelings," &c., among you, I have spent much thought.

I have, years ago, entered seriously on the investigation of the question, *is slavery in itself sinful?*—and, on examination of the scriptures, and facts, as brought to light by history, I have arrived at a different conclu-

sion from you. I have arrived at the conviction, that slavery, *itself*, is *not sinful*. That the evils of slavery, like the evils of matrimony, may be traced to the neglect of the duties incumbent upon the individuals sustaining the relation; and, hence, I have come to the conviction, that, as in the Apostolic day, erroneous principles, reduced to practice, are the fruitful sources of the evils of which you complain in the Churches.—Ancient abolitionists, to get free from the evils of matrimony, were always “forbidding to marry,” which course, Paul tells Timothy, is “a departure from the faith, and giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils.”

If you will bear with me, I will, in the confidence of christian friendship, state to you some of the facts, which arrested my attention, and produced my present conviction; and I do sincerely pray, reciprocating the excellent language, and, I trust, the spirit of the prayer, in the close of your letter, “that the Great Head of the Church may, by his spirit and his word, guide you in his own right way.

SECTION II.

In this section, I will examine the Old testament, and there it appears, from Genesis ix, 25, 26, and 27, that when there was but one family on the face of the earth, a part of that family was doomed, by the father, Noah, to become slaves to the others. That part was the posterity of Ham, from whom, it is supposed, sprung the Africans. “Cursed be Canaan, a *servant of servants* shall he be to his brethren; and he said, blessed be the Lord God of Shem, and *Canaan* shall be his *servant*. God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem, and *Canaan* shall be his *servant*.”

How many slaves Abraham, the father of the faithful, had, I have no means of ascertaining; but this fact can be collected from his history, Genesis xiv, 14, that when he went out to rescue his nephew, Lot, “he armed three hundred and eighteen of his trained servants, *born in his house*.” That these were not hired servants, but *slaves*, appears probable from the language of the covenant of circumcision. Genesis xvii, 12—“And he that is eight days old among you, every man child in your generations; he that is born in the house, or *bought with money of any stranger*, which is not of thy seed.” The 13th verse is to the same import. In the 23d and 27th verses, of the same chapter, we find Abraham obeying, by circumcising “all the men of his house, born in the house, and *bought with money of the stranger*.” It does not appear, that when Abraham *bought with his money*, slaves, he thought it a “heinous sin and scandal.” The Chillicothe Presbytery, according to the tenor of their first resolution, would have told him that he ought to be censured.

Although it might seem, that Abraham had as many slaves, as any of our southern planters could desire, for he had three hundred and eighteen men soldiers, born in his house, besides women and children, and those he "*bought with his money,*" perhaps nineteen hundred in all, supposing the number bought to have been equal to three hundred and eighteen, and one third of the whole to have been soldiers; yet, afterwards, his stock of slaves was greatly increased. At the time he dwelt between Kadesh and Shur, and feigned to Abimeleck that Sarah was his sister, instead of his wife, under the mistaken idea, that "the fear of God was not in Gerar," was the time when Abimeleck, the Monarch of Gerar, besides sheep and oxen, and 1000 pieces of silver, (near \$140,*) gave Abraham "*men servants and women servants.*"—Genesis xx, 14—16—thus adding to the number of his slaves.

Abraham, no doubt, treated his slaves well, as all good masters do.—But the question is not about the treatment of slaves, but whether slavery, itself, is a sin and a curse. The further history of Abraham will throw some light on the subject. About the time he was one hundred and forty years of age, he sent his principal servant, a pious man, and who, no doubt, imbibed the religious principles of his old master, to get a wife for Isaac, his young master. He went to Mesopotamia, to the house of Bethuel, the nephew of Abraham, who had an interesting daughter, named Rebekah. Bethuel very hospitably placed meat before him; but the servant would not eat until he had told his errand. When his host told him to speak on, he commenced with the following introductory remarks: "And the Lord hath blessed my master greatly; and he is become great; and he hath given him flocks, and herds, and silver, and gold, and *men servants, and maid servants,* and camels, and asses."—Gen. xxiv, 35. Here note, that the pious servant, himself, recognized the "*men servants, and maid servants,*" not only as his master's *property*, but as the Lord's gift to his master. "He (the Lord) hath given" them—not as a curse, and a great affliction to his master; but, as he says, *a blessing—nay, a great blessing—"The Lord hath blessed my master greatly."*

It seems to me, to be offering violence to scripture language, to say, that Abraham's servants, were *hired servants*, when they were either *bought with his money, of any stranger, or born in his house*; and, some of them, received as a *present*, from his royal friend, Abimeleck. Who ever heard of *buying hired servants*, or making a *present* of a *hired servant*? The divine regulations, respecting hired servants, absolutely required payment of their wages, at night, for the labors of the day. Lev. xix, 13—"The wages of him that is hired shall not abide with thee all night until the morning." Deut. xxiv, 14, 15—"Thou shalt not oppress a hired servant, that is poor and needy, whether he be of thy brethren, or

*According to the price at which Joseph was sold, one hundred and forty dollars would buy nearly fifty seven young slaves; but it is probable slaves sold higher in Joseph's time.

of thy strangers, that are in thy land, within thy gates : at this day, thou shalt give him his hire, neither shall the sun go down upon it, for he is poor and setteth his heart upon it," &c.

That Abraham's servants were not hired, but slaves, constituting part of his family, will appear from the fact, already alluded to, viz : that "he circumcised all that he bought with his money," &c., and, also, from the fact, that under the Mosaic Law, servants, whether bought or raised, partook of the passover, or, at least, it was their privilege ; while "a foreigner, and an *hired servant*, shall not eat thereof."—Exod. xii, 45. It is true, that although circumcision was instituted in the days of Abraham, and the passover not ; nevertheless it is presumable, if not certain, that a difference was made, among the descendants of Abraham, between their *own servants and their hired servants*.

It was the privilege of the servant or slave to partake of God's ordinances, while hired servants were excluded.

Where now, my dear brother, is the philanthropy of reducing slaves to the excluded condition of *hired servants*? Gen. xxvi, 5—"Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws." How could this be true of Abraham, "*holding*," as he did, until he was an old man, more slaves than any man in Mississippi or Louisiana? Does not the Chillicothe Presbytery resolve, that "*holding*," as well as "buying and selling slaves," is a heinous sin and scandal? How can it be consistent, if slavery itself is a very great sin, that he "kept God's Laws?"

In process of time, Isaac, we are told, went to Gerar, "and sowed in that land, and received, in the same year, an hundred fold ; and the *Lord* blessed him ; and the man waxed great, and went forward, and grew, until he became *very great* : for he had possession of flocks, and possession of herds, and *great store of servants*."—Gen. xxvi, 12, 13, 14. From the above history of Isaac, one of two facts is incontrovertable. His *great store of servants*, he must either have had bequeathed to him by his father, Abraham, or he must, from the proceeds of his agricultural pursuits, and of his flocks, have purchased them. In either case, he is at variance with the first resolution of the Chillicothe Presbytery. If they were "bequeathed" to him, by Abraham, or "given" to him, then Abraham, according to the second resolution of the Chillicothe Presbytery, was "guilty of a great sin," "and ought," being "a member of the Church, to" be "subject to church censure." Isaac, holding the slaves "*bequeathed*" or "*given*" to him by his father, was also "guilty of a heinous sin and scandal." Even if he bought them, he is still, in the opinion of the Chillicothe Presbytery, in the same dilemma. The history says—"And the *Lord* blessed him," [Isaac] and then follows an account of the manner in which "the *Lord* blessed him." "And," the close of the account mentions, "*great store of servants*." Gen. xxv, 5—"And Abraham gave all that he had unto Isaac." Let the Chillicothe Presbytery attend to these portions of scripture, which so plainly shew slavery to be approved by Divine Wisdom, and explain them.

Jacob, the son of Isaac, was no less "heinous and scandalous" in his life, than were his father and grand father, on the subject of slavery. In obedience to his father's command, he went to see his uncle Laban, with whom he lived about twenty years. In Genesis xxx, 43, it is recorded of him, that "the man increased exceedingly, and had much cattle, and *maid servants, and men servants, and camels, and asses.*" The men servants and maid servants he must have purchased: for it does not appear from the history, that his father gave him any. That his father-in-law gave him none, except Zilpah and Bilhah, the handmaids of Leah and Rachel, appears from the language of Leah and Rachel, recorded in the 14th, 15th, and 16th verses of the xxxi chapter, of Genesis. In the xxxii, which gives an account of the preparations of Jacob, to meet his brother Esau, and of his meeting with the "angel of God," at Mahanaim, in the 5th verse, we have recorded this part of the message he sent to his brother, viz—"and I have oxen, and asses, flocks, and *men servants, and women servants,*" all under his absolute control.

The history of the sale of Joseph, the great grand son of Abraham, and the grand nephew of Ishmael, whose descendants were the purchasers of Joseph, and who sold him to Potiphar, in Egypt, is a presumptive evidence, that the buying and selling of slaves, was a matter of very common occurrence, with all classes of people, both the good and the bad.

The sale of Joseph to the Ishmaelites, is not spoken of as proceeding from a cruel, but from a kind purpose, on the part of Judah; Gen. xxxvii, 26, 27—"And Judah said unto his brethren, what profit is it if we slay our brother, and conceal his blood? Come, and let us sell him to the Ishmaelites, and let not our hands be upon him; for he is our brother and our flesh: and his brethren were content."

They effected the sale at twenty pieces of silver, or \$2,75, to Joseph's own relations. As they were all the descendents of Abraham, and no doubt accustomed to the sale and purchase of slaves, it will account for the ready expedient of Judah, to propose the sale, and the want of hesitation on the part of his kinsfolk, to agree to the purchase. That the idea of slavery was familiar to the Ishmaelites, we may learn from the fact, that these same brethren of Joseph proposed, to the messenger sent, to examine their sacks, for the money and the silver cup, that the one of them with whom the cup should be found, should be put to death, and the rest remain as "*bond men.*" Gen. xlv, 9—"And we will also be my lord's bond men."

That slavery was familiar to the Egyptians, at the same time, is apparent, from the proposition made by them, during the famine, to Joseph. Gen. xlvii, 19—"Buy us and our land for bread, and we and our land will be *servants* unto Pharaoh."

I have called your attention, above, to the facts, which came under my observation, from the days of Noah, until the famine in Egypt, a period of something more than one thousand years; and I think you must, unless exceedingly prejudiced, conclude, with me, that the higher probability is, that slavery existed during that period, and especially, with but very

little reason to doubt, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were large slave holders; probably larger than any one slave holder in the United States, and that without any expressed disapprobation of heaven, or any tenable ground for the inference, that slavery, or the holding of slaves, was, in itself, *sinful*.

During the period that the Israelites were in Egypt, their own experience taught them, what it was to be bond men and bond women. That their condition was that of the most abject bondage or slavery, there can be no doubt. That we may have a correct idea of the language used in the Mosaic economy, when bondage is spoken of, I cannot conceive that we go astray, in applying the terms of bond men and bond maids, as we would naturally suppose the Israelites, themselves, understood them.—The bond men and bond maids, as distinct from the Jews that were sold or bought in servitude, were those whose term of service was for life; who were not allowed to have a will of their own, at variance with the will of their master; and of whom more service was required, and whose hope of ever obtaining freedom, depended entirely on the sovereign will of their master.

In this inquiry, I have not allowed myself, for once, to engage, as a philosopher, or a legislator, in the inquiry, whether this, or that law, would have a good or bad tendency. My simple object is, and has been, to ascertain what the laws have been, and what were the facts. Of this fact, however, I am certain, that God never enacted a bad law, nor ever gave countenance, by written permission, to that which is in itself sinful; however frequently, in his adorable mercy, he may have winked at sin, or passed it over unpunished.

There is this, also, I have long been warring against, viz, seizing on isolated texts of scripture, to prove a favorite position. Such a method, in my estimation, is only calculated to bewilder the mind, and make the sacred scriptures, appear to be little more than a farrago of inconsistencies.

I was particularly struck with the force of the above remark, when a friend of mine, a warm advocate of the abolition of slavery, quoted, as proof positive, to his purpose, Lev. xxv, 10—“And ye shall ballow the fiftieth year, and *proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof*, it shall be a jubilee unto you, and ye shall return every man unto his *possession*, and ye shall return every man unto his family.” My friend had forgotten, that among the Israelites, the *bond men* had no *possessions* to return to; and that they were not recognized as the *inhabitants of the land*. I was sorry to see him manifestly displeased, because he found that God had, in the 44th, 45th, and 46th verses of the same chapter, made, *bond men and bond maids*, an exception to the general rule.

The “buying, selling, or holding slaves,” he admitted, was not inconsistent with the Divine Law; it was slavery for life, he objected to.

The regulations, under the Mosaic economy, were such as, not only to recognize perpetual slavery, but, also, to recognize slaves as property,

as much so as money. In the book of Exodus, xxi, 5, 6, the perpetual slavery of even a Hebrew, is recognized. When the master gave to a Hebrew servant a wife, should the servant, at the end of seven years, be disposed to go free, according to the general law of the jubilee, he was at liberty to go, but his wife and children, belonged to the master.—Should he, nevertheless, be attached to his master, and to his wife and children, and say, that “he was unwilling to go out free;” then, after being brought before the Judge, and his ear bored through with an awl, then “*he shall serve him [his master] forever.*” In the 20th and 21st verses of the same chapter, there is a recognition of servants as property. The case is, where the master smites his servant, and the servant should live “a day or two,” after he is smitten; should he afterwards die, the master is not to be punished; and the reason is assigned, in the latter part of the 21st verse—“*For he is his money*”—evidently recognizing a servant as property.

If Language can convey a clear and definite meaning, at all, I know not how it can, more unequivocally, or more plainly, present to the mind any thought or idea, than the xxv chapter of Leviticus, clearly, and unequivocally, establishes the fact, that slavery, or bondage, was sanctioned by God himself; and, that “buying, selling, holding, and bequeathing” slaves, as property, are regulations which were established by himself.—Examine the chapter from the beginning of the 39th verse, to the end of the 46th. The first five of these verses contain the special provision that is made for Hebrew servants, when in bondage, or when sold by another. The provision is, that they shall not be *treated like bond men*, but as hired men. They shall not continue in perpetual bondage; but they, and their children shall be free, in the year of jubilee.

Widely different are the regulations for slaves. Neither they, nor their children, are to go out at the jubilee: but “they shall be your bond men forever.” Read the 44th, 45th, and 46th verses—“Both thy bond men and thy bond maids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you; of them *shall ye buy* bond men and bond women. Moreover, of the children of strangers, that do sojourn among you; of them *shall ye buy*, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land, and *they shall be your possession*. And ye shall take them as an *inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession: They shall be your bond men forever*; but over your brethren, the children of Israel, ye shall not rule, one over another, with rigor.”

What language can more explicitly shew, not that God winked at slavery, merely, but that, to say the least, he gave a *written permit* to the Hebrews, then the best people in the world, to *buy, hold, and bequeath, men and women*, to perpetual servitude? What, now, becomes of the position of the Chillicothe Presbytery, that “slavery is the accursed thing, which causes division, alienation of feeling and affection, and prevents the extension of the Redeemer’s kingdom”? Is it, indeed, a fact, that God once gave a written permission, to his own dear people, [*ye shall*

buy,"] to do that which is in itself sinful? Nay, to do that which the Chillicothe Presbytery says, "is a heinous sin and scandal"? "And they shall be your possession," certainly means "*holding*" them. "And ye shall take them as an *inheritance* for your children after you," looks so much like, not a permit, but an injunction on parents, not to neglect "*giving*," or "*bequeathing*," the bond men and bond maids, to their "children after them," not while the parents are living, but, "*after them*"—after they are dead, that I do, indeed, marvel, upon what authority, the Presbytery founded their first and second resolutions.

God resolves, that his own children may, or rather, "*shall*" "*buy, possess, and hold*," bond men and bond women, in bondage, forever. But, the Chillicothe Presbytery resolves, that "*buying, selling, or holding slaves, for the sake of gain, is a heinous sin and scandal;*" and, "to give or bequeath" them, ought to subject a church member to church censure: while God says, "*ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you,*" "*to inherit them for a possession.*"

The regulations, among the Hebrews, may, perhaps, be said to have been instituted, not to continue, but to be abrogated, when all the ceremonial rites of the Jews were abolished. If this should even be admitted, one position is yet clear, that there was a time, when slavery was not "a heinous sin and scandal."

The decalogue, not like other laws, which were published in the ordinary way, was, to signify its permanency, *engraven*, not written, on two tables of stone. There is, evidently, allusion made to slavery, in the 4th and 10th commandments. [See Exodus xx, 10.] The 4th recognizes the authority of the master over the servant, in the same manner that it recognizes the authority of the parent over the child. "In it [the Sabbath] thou shalt do no work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man servant, nor thy maid servant." The tenth commandment, [17th verse] recognizes servants as the *property* of their masters, and prohibits coveting that property. "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man servant, nor his maid servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbor's."

I remark, on these two commandments, if God foresaw, or intended, that servitude should expire with the Mosaic ritual, the authority of masters would, probably, not be recognized in a law, intended to be perpetual; nor would there have been, as is the fact, a recognition made of servants, as property; because one of the objects of covetousnesses would cease to exist.

The ten commandments, in contradistinction from the other laws of the Hebrews, were called "**THE LAW**," and thus we understand our Saviour, when he says, "I came not to destroy **THE LAW**, but to fulfil." That is, he did not intend to abolish "one jot or tittle" of **THE LAW**, or render it any less binding, on the lives and consciences, of the children of men.

Indeed, some of the very blessings or favors promised to the faithful, are the stations of masters. The Psalmist, in his contrast,

of the condition of the believer and the ungodly, says, Psalm xlix., 14—"And the upright shall have *dominion* over him in the morning."—John, in the Apócalypse, says, ii, 18—"Thus saith the son of God," &c. verses 25th and 26th—"Hold fast till I come. And he that *overcometh*, and *keepeth my works*, unto the end, to him will I give *POWER* over the nations."

From 1490 years before Christ, the time when the ten commandments were given, down to the period when the Jews returned from Babylon, to rebuild the city and temple, there are occasional or incidental references made to servitude. Such as I Samuel, ix, 3, where Saul is sent, by his father Kish, to search for the asses that had strayed. "Take now *one of the servants* with thee, and arise, go, seek the asses." What Saul afterwards possessed, when he became king, we learn from what God told Samuel that Saul would do, in the viii, 10—16, besides taking the sons of his subjects, for his charioteers, and to run before his chariots, he would take them by thousands, and make them, under overseers, reap his harvest. He would give the best his people had "to his *servants*"—and besides giving the tenth of what seed they had, to his servants, and officers, "he will" even "take your *men servants*, and your *maid servants*, and your goodliest young men, and your asses, and put them to his *work*."

Passing over David, whose great hospitality required an immense number of servants, to Solomon his son, whose servants were so numerous, that the queen of Sheba, who came to visit him, "with a very great train," lost her spirit, and exclaimed, on seeing the treatment of the servants, and the wisdom and splendor of their master, "behold, the half was not told me. Happy are thy men, and happy are these thy *servants*, which stand continually before thee."—I Kings, x, 7, 8.

Nehemiah, under whose direction the city and temple were rebuilt, refers, in the v, 10, to his "brethren" and his "*servants*." In the iv, 19, speaking to the "nobles," the "rulers," and the "*rest of the people*," he tells the latter, viz: "the people," in the 22d verse, "Let every one, with his *servant*, lodge within Jerusalem."

It appears from vii, 67, that they had, about the time they finished building the wall, 7337 *servants*, or *slaves*. That these 7337 slaves, were brought by them from Babylon, is probable, when it is compared to the prediction of Isaiah, made nearly three hundred years before. Isa. xiv, 1, 2—"And the Lord shall have mercy on Jacob, and will yet choose Israel, and set them in their own land; and the stranger shall join with them, and they shall cleave to the house of Jacob. And they shall *take them and bring them to their place*; and the house of Israel shall *possess* them, in the land of the Lord, for *servants and hand maids*: and they shall take them captives, whose captives they were; and they shall *rule over their oppressors*."

The fulfilment of the above prediction, instead of being a curse, entailed on the house of Jacob, is recognized, by Isaiah, as a blessing.—"And the Lord shall have *mercy* on Jacob." Israel shall "hold," &c.

“possess” the Babylonians, for “servants and hand maids;” nay, “they shall take them and bring them to their place.” Does this look like a “heinous sin and scandal?”

I have now, in the preceding part of this section, referred you to some passages in the Old Testament, which, with others that I have not quoted, prove, to my mind, incontrovertably, that, under the Old Testament dispensation, and with the full and clear sanction of Jehovah, his own people, without “sin or scandal,” might “buy, sell, hold, and bequeath” slaves. I say slaves, because there is no difference between the real original meaning of the words slave and servant. The origin of the one is German, and the other Roman or Latin. It was the conquest of the Germans, over the Slavonians, in the reign of Charlemagne, that gave origin to the word SLAVE. The Slavonians, that were not massacred, but preserved for servitude, by the Germans, were called SLAVES. So among the Romans, those of the conquered nation, who were preserved for agricultural service, especially the *Servetians*, were called SERVI, or SERVANTS, from the Latin word *servare*, to save.

I have stated the origin of the two words, SLAVERY, and SERVITUDE, that there may be no confusion of ideas, arising from the use of these words, in examining the New Testament on the subject.

I will also mention, in this place, that throughout the New Testament, which was written in Greek, the word *δουλος*, is used for the Greek servant, unless a domestic servant is spoken of, then the word *οικητης* is used. *ΟΙΚΗΤΗΣ*, however, is used, by Peter, to mean all servants, except hired servants; and *μισθιος*, is the term used for a hired servant, by Luke. [See Luke xv, 17, 19.] “Make me as one of thine hired servants,” &c. See, also, Adam Clarke,* the correctness of whose definition cannot be questioned; being, himself, so violently opposed to slavery.

SECTION III.

Previously to entering on the New Testament, I will note something of the state of slavery among the Jews, Greeks, and Romans, for some time before the birth of Christ, until the death of the Evangelist John, so far as I have been able to collect it from ancient history. A reasonable knowledge of this, will enable us to comprehend, more clearly, the meaning of Christ and his Apostles, in the passages to which I shall allude. It will, at least, shew us this much: whether it existed to such an extent, and in such a form, as we might reasonably expect, would call

*See Appendix, Note A.

forth, from Christ and his Apostles, expressions of disapprobation of it, if it was, in itself, sinful. If slavery did exist to as great, or to a greater extent, both before, and during the time, that Christ and his Apostles were upon the earth—if the power of masters was as unlimited, or more so—if the treatment of slaves was as bad, or worse—if the moral condition of slaves was as bad—and, if the character of masters was as bad, or worse, than they are at present in the United States—and if Christ and his Apostles shewed no solicitude to rid the world of slavery, but contented themselves, with, merely, inculcating the duties suspended on the relation, without seeking to abolish the relation itself, or inculcating it on the future Apostles of the Church, to endeavor, with all diligence, to free the world from it, as an “accursed thing;” or, as Adam Clarke says, “a CRIME, for which perdition has scarcely an adequate punishment,” I do conceive, that whatever their conduct was, should be the conduct of Christ’s ministers now, whether *for* or *against* slavery. And I do further conceive, that to endeavor to outstrip Christ, on this, or any other subject, is to be, which Solomon forbids, “*righteous overmuch.*”

Some Abolition writers say, that slavery did not exist among the Jews, in the Apostolic day. What authority they have for that declaration, I know not. But by reference to the Universal History, printed in London, in the year 1747, Vol. X, page 665, it will be seen, that, about the time of Nero’s death, when Vespasian’s army was at Cesarea, 26 miles west of Jerusalem, Simon, the son of Gorias, to increase his party, against John and Eleazer, in Jerusalem, “promised *liberty to all the slaves,*” who would come over to him. “This stratagem had the desired effect; and he saw his party, in a very little time, swelled into a considerable army.” Tacitus says, about 20,000 slaves.

The above shews, that slavery existed among the Jews, in the Apostolic day, and, probably, had existed ever since the days of Nehemiah, 445 years before Christ.

According to the same history, Vol. VI, page 324, in the days of Demetrius, the Phalerian, who is called the kind Governor of Athens, so prevalent was slavery, that, while there were in Athens but 21,000 free citizens, there were, at the same time, 400,000 slaves; more than nineteen to one free person. “They were absolutely the property of their masters, and, as such, were used as they thought fit. They were forbidden to wear clothes, to cut their hair like their masters. They were debarred from anointing or perfuming themselves, and from worshipping certain Deities. They were not allowed to be called by honorable names, and, in most other respects, were used like dogs. They branded them with letters on the forehead and elsewhere. Thereus’ Temple was allowed them as a sanctuary,” &c. “In this, and many other respects, the Athenian slaves were in a much better condition than those throughout the rest of Greece.”

As the Lacedemonians, according to the laws of Lycurgus, could neither sell nor emancipate their slaves; consequently, “they became prodigiously numerous, which sometimes alarmed the Spartans, and made

them devise the Cryptian law. Aristotle expressly affirms, that it was devised by Licurgus." The law was for lessening the number of slaves, when they grew dangerous to the State. It was commonly executed by the Spartan youth, while the slaves were at work. See Vol. VII, 22, 23—"They were marked out for slaves in their dress, their gesture, and, in short, every thing. They wore dogskin bonnets, sheepskin vests. They were forbidden to learn any liberal art, or to perform any act worthy of their master. When their lords were so disposed, they were obliged to drink themselves drunk, that the free born Spartans might see the beastliness of that vice, in their behavior. Once a day they received a certain number of stripes, for fear they should forget they were slaves. And to crown all, they were liable to this Cryptia, which was sure to be executed on all such as spoke, looked, or walked like freemen."

The proportion of slaves, to those who were free, in Lacedemonia, and all over Greece, was greater than at Athens.*

So numerous were the slaves in Italy and Sicily, that, in an insurrection, headed by Athenio and Salvius, the former commanded in his division, 40,000 slaves. With this army, he met Lucullus, the Roman prætor, to whom he gave battle. After this, Athenio's army increased, until it was found necessary to send the main body of the Roman army, under M. Aquilius, to conquer the slaves. A battle ensued, and "both parties maintained it with equal vigor, till the two Generals met." Aquilius, being large and robust, killed Athenio; and "thus put an end to a rebellion which lasted four years, and cost the Republic near a million of slaves."—See Vol. XIII, page 20, 21, Universal History.

Such, also, was the condition of the slaves, previous to this insurrection, that, according to Columella, [Lib. I, Cap. 6,] 60,000 of them, in Sicily and Italy, were chained and confined to work in dungeons. These were released by Eunuus and Athenio, at the time of the insurrection.—Ergastula, or work shops, in which slaves were chained to their work, are spoken of by Livi, as well as by Columella, as being very common all over Sicily and Italy.

Tacitus, [Vol. I, B. III, Sec. 53, Murphy,] states, that Tiberius, the contemporary of Christ, writing to the Senate, on the subject of the growing luxuries, says, "Must I retrench the number of slaves, so great, at present, that every family seems a nation in itself?" Vol. II, B. IV, Sec. 27—"At that time, the slaves greatly outnumbered the freeborn citizens."

Claudius, the contemporary of the Apostles, according to Gibbon. [Vol. I,] took the most accurate census of the Roman Empire, that ever was taken; and, according to that census, there were twenty millions of free citizens, forty millions of provincials, and sixty millions of slaves;

* See Milford's Greece.

that is, three slaves to one free person, and twenty four slaves to one now in the United States; estimating the present slave population, at two and a half millions.

In the reign of Tiberius, one Caius Cæcilius Isidorus died, leaving to his heirs four thousand, one hundred and sixteen slaves.—Universal History, Vol. XIII, page 535.

Athenus, the author of the *Deipnosophista*, who lived in the reign of the Emperor Commodus, towards the close of the second century, [U. Hist. Vol. XV, page 374,] says, that many of the Romans had 5,000, some 10,000, and some 20,000 slaves.

So numerous were the slaves of Demetrius Pompeius, that a daily return, as in an army, was made to him. Pliny complained of the legions of bond men in men's houses, and of being obliged to use a nomenclator for a person's slaves. Adam, in his *Antiquities*, attest, that in Rome, there was a continual market for slaves, and that the slaves were commonly exposed for sale *naked*. John, in the *Apocalypse*, speaks of the *Apocalyptic Babylon*, as having part of her merchandize to consist of "slaves."—Chap. xxiii, 13.

Thus we see, that slavery existed to a much greater extent, before, at the time, and some years after the Apostles' day, than it now exists in the United States.

Besides the treatment already mentioned, be it remembered, that according to Plutarch, Cato, who was highly estimated for his superior virtues, would support neither his slaves, dogs, nor horses, after they grew old and unable to support themselves, but turned them away, and let them starve to death. The repeal of the law, subjecting the life of the slave to the will of the master, and which was not repealed till the reign of Adrian, shews its existence in the Apostolic day.

In the reign of Nero, [Tacitus Lib. XIII, Sec. 32, An.] a decree passed the Senate, that all domestic slaves, &c. whether guilty or innocent, should suffer death, if their master was found murdered. Under this decree, four hundred of the innocent slaves of Pedaneus Secundus, the Roman Prætor, were executed, because their master was found murdered.

The following, from the *New York Observer*, whole number 653, quoted from Juvenal, will throw light on the treatment of slaves. "An impious angry woman, calls out to her husband, and says, "Have a cross fixed for that slave." But her husband remonstrates—"What crime has he committed, to deserve it? What witness is there against him? Who is his accuser? Let him have a hearing—no delay can be too long, where the life of a man is concerned:" But the mistress rejoins—"Fool, is a slave then a man? Suppose he has done nothing—let it be so. It is my will, it is my order, that he go to the cross; let that be for a reason."—Vide 218—222. Slaves, when capitally punished in Rome, were usually crucified, till the time of Constantine." The following are given from Juvenal, as occurrences in Roman families. "If her husband has neglected her, [the mistress,] the house keeper is undone; the tire-woman

is obliged to strip; the chairman is forced to suffer for another's fault. On one the ferules are broken; another is red with the lash, another with the thong. While the lashing goes on, she [the mistress] daubs her face, listens to her friends, or examines the gold of an embroidered garment. The beating continues while she reads over the transactions of a large journal. It continues till those are tired who inflict it. Then she thunders out, "GO—your examination is finished." Vide 474—484. Her hair is dressed by an unhappy slave. "Why is this curl so high?" The lash immediately punishes this abominable crime, about a curled lock."—Vide 389—492.

"It was customary," says Galen, "to punish the member that had offended. If the slave was a glutton, his belly must suffer; if a tell tale, his tongue must be cut out. The slaves were generally stigmatized, or branded with a hot iron, and ink poured into the furrows, that the inscription might be more conspicuous." Quoting also from Plautus—"When slaves were beaten, they were to be hung up with weights tied to their feet, that they might not move them."

In short, the masters having unlimited power over the slaves, we might, if history was silent about the treatment, without any danger of mistake, infer, from the character of the Romans, that the treatment the slaves received, was without a parallel, in point of cruelty, among the worst masters in the United States.

The character of the Romans, and of all heathen nations, can be learned, with the greatest certainty, from Paul, in his epistle to the Romans, Chap. i, 28—31—"And even as they [the Romans] did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things that are not convenient; being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful."

Thus we learn that the character of masters, in the Apostolic day, was of the very worst kind.

That the moral condition of slaves was extremely bad, in the absence of other evidence, we might infer from the particularity of Paul to Titus, Bishop of Crete. He enjoins it on Titus to teach slaves "to be obedient to their own masters," &c. "not answering again, not purloining, but shewing good fidelity."—Titus ii, 9, 10. Slaves were so exceedingly thievish, that *fur*, the Latin term for thief, was synonymous with *servus*, the Latin term for slave.*

Virgil, the Roman poet, says, "Quid domini facient, audent cum talia *furce*." Plautus says, speaking of slaves—"Fures estis ambo," you are

* See Servius' note on Virgil, *Ecl.* III, line 16. See also Ainsworth's Dictionary.

both slaves. Terrence calls slaves "*manipulus furum*," a bundle of slaves. Plautus says, "tunc trium literarum homo?" art not thou a man of three letters? viz: *fur*, a servant or slave.

From all the above references to the existence—the extent—the treatment—the moral condition of slaves, and the character Paul gives of the masters, the following facts are evident, viz :

1. That slavery did exist, not for a short time, only, but for a long duration.

2. That there were, at the time Christ and his Apostles were on earth, in Rome, twenty four slaves, to where there is one now in the United States.

3. That the moral condition of Roman slaves was worse than that of the slaves in the United States.

4. That the power of the master over the slave, was more unlimited then than it is now.

5. That the exercise of that power was extended to such cruelties, as to be unparalleled in the United States.

6. That the character of the masters, was such as to insure the most unheard of cruelties.

If, then, such are the facts, of which there can be no doubt, at the very time that Christ, Peter, James, and John were preaching among the Jews, and Paul among the Gentiles—And if slavery, as in the belief of Adam Clarke, "is an enormity and crime, for which perdition has scarcely an adequate state of punishment"—If it be, as the Chillicothe Presbytery say, "*A sin that loves the darkness, and cannot endure the light; the accursed thing, that causes the decline of vital godliness—divisions—alienation of feelings and affection towards the brethren, and the little success attending the means of grace;*" nay—"a heinous sin and scandal"—then, surely then, it will not be presuming too much to expect, at least, very strong expressions of disapprobation, from Christ and his Apostles on the subject. Shall we find them silent on a subject that is "a heinous sin and scandal?" Shall we find them bearing no direct testimony against that which will "prevent the success of the means of grace?" That is, that which will render unsuccessful their own preaching? Shall they, who particularized so far as expressly to condemn "foolish talking and jesting which are not convenient," omit their testimony against "a sin that loves the darkness, and causes the decline of vital godliness?" Will an eminent Apostle record, that he has "not shunned to declare all the counsel of God," and yet not declare that to be a "crime, for which perdition has scarcely an adequate state of punishment?"—Surely, it is not presumable, that they would be silent on the subject, leaving it to be inferred, merely, from the general laws of the gospel kingdom.

If, however, on the examination of what Christ and his Apostles have said on the subject, it will appear, that they never intermeddled with the relation of master and slave, farther than to inculcate the duties of both; and, if it will appear, that it is not inculcated on the master to abolish slavery, then, methinks, the language of the Chillicothe Presbytery may

be more appropriately applied to *abolition* than to *slavery*—"This deadly enemy of our peace and prosperity—It is a sin that loves the darkness and cannot bear the light—An enemy that is unable to stand before the sword of the spirit, and the remnant of God's people, girded with the panoply of heaven, and trusting in the God of Zion for victory."

SECTION IV.

I will now endeavor to set before you some of those portions of the New Testament which brought my mind to its present conviction. I shall, in this section, confine myself to what Christ and Peter say, and shall begin with a passage, recorded by the Evangelist Luke, where the Centurion is said to have had a sick *doulos* or slave. The Centurion, hearing of Jesus, sent the Elders of the Jews unto him, "beseeching him that he would come and heal his [*doulos*] servant." The Elders went and testified to the worth of the Centurion, "saying, that he was *worthy*," &c. "Then Jesus went with them." "And when he was now not far from the house, the Centurion sent *friends* to him, saying unto him, Lord trouble not thyself, for I am not worthy that thou should enter under my roof; wherefore, neither thought I myself worthy to come unto thee: but say in a word, and my" *doulos*, slave, or "servant shall be healed. For I also am a man set under authority, having under me soldiers: and I say unto one go, and he goeth, and to another come, and he cometh, and to my [*doulos*] *servant* do this, and he doeth it."—Luke vii, 2—8. In the above history, furnished by Luke, Jesus is sent for to cure a slave. The messengers sent, were the "Elders of the Jews" Instead of reproaching the Centurion with the sin of having slaves, they said, "*he is worthy*," as if slavery was a matter of so common occurrence, that even the Elders of the Church took no notice of it, as an exceptionable matter. The message borne to Jesus, from the Centurion, by the "friends," besides an acknowledgement of his unworthiness, and his being a military officer, is a plain, palpable acknowledgement, that he was a *slave holder*—"and to my *doulos* do this and he doeth it." This is evidently told in a manner that shews, and did shew to all the company, that his conscience was entirely at ease on the subject of *slave holding*.

His humble and teachable frame of mind, would certainly have borne more than a mere hint, from Jesus, on the subject; and certainly, according to the Chillicothe views, Jesus would have given him *more* than a hint. As a Divine Teacher, he would, at least, guard against leaving, on the minds of the Elders and friends, and the other company present, the impression, that slave holding was not inconsistent with the character of a BELIEVER. Did the Saviour tell the company, that however humble and penitent, and worthy, in other respects, the Centurion was,

he was yet guilty of a *crime* "that ought to be made a term of communion?" What testimony should we expect him to have Luke record, that he himself gave of a man, guilty, by his own confession, of living daily in the commission of that which was a "heinous sin and scandal?" We are not left to conjecture as to the testimony which Jesus left, or might leave of the slave holder. Luke records the following, as the views which Christ had of the slave holder—verse 9.—"When Jesus heard these things, he marvelled at him, and turned him about, and said unto the people that followed him, I say unto you, *I have not found so great faith, no not in Israel.*"

Here it is remarkable, that, among those who followed him, (and it appears that Luke was one,) the slave holder's faith was the greatest.

Such a character, does not appear to me, consistent with the idea of slavery being what your Presbytery say it is. It has not been Christ's usual method, to leave his followers ignorant of their duty.—It is *not* presumable that he would leave so *humble a man* as the Centurion, and whose habits of education had accustomed him to view slavery as no crime, ignorant of his duty, if abolition was approved by Christ. Nor does it seem to me probable, that on other occasions, as well as the above, where he makes use of the word slaves, (*douloi*, not *misthoi*.) he would leave his followers in danger of concluding, that slavery was no sin. His high approbation of the Centurion, was certainly calculated to leave the impression, that slave holding and christianity, were not inconsistent with each other.

The language of Christ, on the above occasion, as on all others, shews to me, clearly, that it is not the province of christianity, nor at all consistent with its spirit, to interfere with any of the existing relations of life, for which, and to regulate which, either Christ or his Apostles, have prescribed regulations. The duties between ruler and subjects, parents and children, husband and wife, (not *wives*.) masters and slaves, are clearly prescribed. There are no prescribed regulations for polygamy.—A Bishop must not be a polygamist—he must be the husband of *one wife*, not *two, three, or twenty*. Paul or Christ does not, (like John Wesley,*) make slave holding inconsistent with the office of a Bishop, or any other office in his Church.

It is the province of christianity, to press home on all men, in their respective stations and relations, the duties belonging to those stations.—Thus it provides for removing the evils, not by destroying the existence of the relations, in order to get clear of the evils, but by attending to the duties of the relations.

Owing to our frailties, evils are incident to every relation of life; but it is neither christianity, nor sound philosophy, to destroy the relation, in order to be free from the evils. The relation is not properly chargeable with the evils. Marriage is not chargeable with adultery, notwith-

*See Appendix, Note B.

standing adultery cannot exist without marriage. Disobedience to parents, cannot exist, if you abolish the relation of parent and child. Masters cannot, according to the command of Christ, "render to their douloi or slaves that which is just and equal," if you abolish the relation, for then they will cease to be masters. Abolish any of the relations, for which regulations are provided in the New Testament, and, in effect, you abolish some of the laws of Christ.

The total and entire silence of James and John, on the relation of master and slave, is a presumptive evidence, that the spirit did not teach them that slavery was a sin—nor abolition a duty.

The entire silence of Peter on the subject, on the occasion of the Italian Centurian, cannot be accounted for, on the principle of the Chilli-cothe Presbytery, that slave holding is a heinous sin and scandal.

Examine the passage, and one of two convictions must, as I conceive, rest on the mind, and that inevitably—viz: That either the emancipation of slaves, is not a christian duty, or the Angel who spake to Cornelius, (speaking with reverence,) told a palpable lie. The passage you will find in the Acts of the Apostles, xi, 1—8—"There was a man in Cesarea called Cornelius, a Centurion of the band, called the Italian band, a devout man, and one that feared God, with all his house, which gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God alway. He saw, in a vision, evidently, about the ninth hour of the day, an ANGEL OF GOD coming in to him, and saying unto him, Cornelius; and when he looked on him he was afraid, and said, what is it Lord? And he said unto him, thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God. Now send men to Joppa, and call for one Simon, whose surname is PETER: he lodgeth with one Simon, a tanner, whose house is by the sea side, **HE SHALL TELL THEE WHAT THOU OUGHT TO DO.** And when the Angel which spake unto Cornelius was departed, **HE CALLED TWO OF HIS HOUSEHOLD SERVANTS,** and a devout soldier of them that waited on him continually; and when he had declared all these things unto them, he sent them to Joppa." That Peter was to omit nothing that was commanded of God, we learn from the 33d verse. Cornelius, on the commencement of his interview with Peter, says, "Now, therefore, are we all here present before God, to hear **ALL THINGS THAT ARE COMMANDED THEE OF GOD.**"

Now notice, the messengers, whom Cornelius sent, were, two of them, oiketes, domestic slaves, (not misthoi, hired servants.) They were really slaves. Hence, it is manifest that Cornelius was, at the time, a slave holder. Sending two slaves after Peter, the Apostle thereby became acquainted with the fact, that he was a slave holder. The Angel had previously told Cornelius, that "*he [Peter] shall tell thee what thou ought to do.*" That Cornelius expected to hear from Peter, the truth and the whole truth, without any important omission, we learn from his expression, that he, as well as the others present, were met "*to hear ALL THINGS that are commanded thee of God.*" Not some things, but "**ALL THINGS.**" Bear in mind, that probably Peter was not ignorant

that Italy and Sicily were the most celebrated slave markets, then in the world—celebrated for working many of the slaves in chains, so numerous that at one time Eunus and Athenio released 60,000 from their chains. Bear in mind also the treatment usually given to slaves, of which Peter was not ignorant. Bearing these things in your mind, read the remainder of the chapter, and attend closely to what Peter told Cornelius, and you will find he never mentioned to him emancipation, much less abolition. He passed over the subject in silence, and left the Italian, to go back to slave holding Italy, as ignorant that slavery was a heinous sin and scandal, as he was before his interview with this special messenger of God, who was to tell him all his duty.

Peter did tell him what he ought to do; but, the presumption is, that God did not instruct Peter to tell Cornelius, to do a thing which would render null and void some of his own commandments. He did not instruct him to be an emancipator or abolitionist. If ever slavery required measures to be adopted to abolish it, this was the very time. If the number and sufferings of two and a half millions of slaves in the United States, with all the influence which christianity has over the minds of the masters, imperiously demand that the present Apostles of the Church, should raise their warning voice to abolish it—surely—surely—when there were sixty millions, (twenty four to one now in the United States,) under masters uninfluenced by christianity, and as Paul says, “without natural affection, *implacable, unmerciful*”—it behooved Peter not to neglect to testify in favor of abolition, when so favorable an opportunity offered, as was presented in the case of the humble and teachable Italian.

The omission of Peter to teach the doctrine of emancipation or abolition, on this occasion, looks as if the spirit did not view such doctrines to be the “doctrines of our Lord Jesus Christ, nor according to Godliness.” That this is not a forced inference, will appear, if you consult his first circular, or general epistle, which is addressed “to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithymia,” a region where slavery prevailed to that extent, with the knowledge of the Apostle, that he does not omit to address them separately, ii, 18—“Servants [oiketes] be subject to your masters, with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward.” The slaves, in many instances, having froward masters, would as he records, probably be called “to endure grief, suffering wrongfully, for conscience toward God;” nevertheless, they must “take it patiently,” being the behavior “that is acceptable with God;” “for,” says he, “even hereunto were ye called.” The whole epistle, (in which the Apostle couples the relation of man and his brother, man and his God, subject and king, servant and master, wife and husband,) is evidently intended to be a “means of grace,” especially in the slave holding regions to which it is addressed. Now, if the Apostle knew, what the Chillicothe Presbytery say *they believe*, viz: that slavery in the United States, with all the mild influence which christianity exercises over the community, will, nevertheless, “cause the decline of

vital godliness—divisions—alienation of feelings and affection towards the brethren,” and cause the “*means of grace and the efforts of the Church for the extension of the Redeemer’s kingdom,*” to have “*but little success*”—I say, if the Apostle knew all this, why, instead of placing it in company with the other honorable relations, did he not, at once, lay the axe at the root of the tree? Why, when he touched upon the subject at all, did he not put his plain, palpable veto upon it, instead of writing seven verses of his epistle, regulating its duties? Why did he write his epistle at all, when he knew that slavery would cause it to have “*but little success, as a means of grace,*” unless he had taken care first to veto slavery? The probability, to me, is, that if Peter had taken up his pen to write to “*the strangers scattered through Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia,*” &c. and to teach them that “*aiming at the speedy and entire removal of this sin from the Church,*” was verily consistent with the word of God, the spirit of inspiration would have checked him and told him, in the language of one who spoke as never man spake, “*In vain do ye teach for doctrines the commandments of men;*” and would have told him, also, as he told Paul, on the same subject, that he who would teach such doctrine was “*proud, knowing nothing, but debating about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railing, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds and destitute of truth.*”

SECTION V.

Having set before you, in the last section, the convictions produced on my mind, by the preaching of Christ and Peter, I will next refer you to Paul.

As Paul was the Apostle to the Gentiles, his field of labor and travels was more extensive; he had an opportunity of becoming more intimately acquainted with the real state of slaves and slavery, as it existed in his day, than any of the other Apostles. His residence, for a time, at Corinth, in the family of Aquila and Priscilla, who were driven by Claudius from Rome, [Acts xviii, 2,] shews that he was the Contemporary of Claudius. This Claudius, as Gibbon states in his first volume, as already mentioned in section III, ascertained, that in the Roman Empire, there were sixty millions of slaves. Paul, no doubt, knew the number of slaves—he knew that they trebled the number of free citizens—He must have seen them at Rome exposed for sale, daily, in a naked condition.

He probably knew of “*the subterranean dungeons in Sicily and Italy, where thousands and thousands of slaves were chained together and compelled to wear out life in hopeless toil and suffering.*” Travelling as much as he did, he probably saw hundreds on that “*doleful island, at the*

mouth of the Tiber," of old worn-out slaves, sent there by their masters, after they were of no service, and left to perish.

He probably saw many "suspended by the arms, with a weight hanging to their feet, while the thong was applied to them." He could not have failed of seeing, "all over Italy, crosses erected, and slaves nailed to them, oftentimes, for no crime, but merely to gratify the will of the capricious masters and mistresses." He, no doubt, saw them "tortured or broken on the wheel, to compel them to confess crimes, of which they were not guilty."

He might have seen them, "not daring to walk, talk, look, or act, like freemen—branded, pinched, starved, beaten, mutilated, tormented, torn by wild beasts, and murdered, without appeal, trial, or any possibility of redress"—but in the possession, and under the entire, irresponsible control of masters, who, according to his own shewing, were "full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity, whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, implacable unmerciful."

Thus we see, that if any man was acquainted with the *evils of slavery*, Paul was—If any man had a feeling heart, he had. With such a knowledge of the number of sufferers—with such a knowledge, (not by hearsay,) of the amount and extent of cruelty,—with such a knowledge of the character of the masters—and with such a feeling heart as "to weep with those that wept," can it be possible that such a man, would, or could, disregarding this wretched condition of three-fourths of the inhabitants of the world, call to witness, the Elders and members of the Church at Ephesus, that he had not shunned to declare unto them *ALL the counsel of God*, and yet omit to declare unto them, plainly and distinctly, in the language of the Chillicothe Presbytery, or in language still more clear, that "*aining at the speedy and entire removal of this sin from the Church,*" or the world, *is verily consistent with the word of God?* Did Paul shun to make the above declaration, or any other to that purport?—He certainly did. And why did he? Evidently, because he knew that it was not the counsel of God, to abolish a relation, in order to get rid of the evils incident to that relation. Paul says, that "the spirit speaketh expressly," (about abolition,) "that in the latter times, some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils: speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron, *forbidding to marry,*" &c.

Weishop, of Germany, Robespere, Muratt, and all the illuminati of France, taught, and succeeded in reducing to practice, the abolition doctrine, being, in their estimation, the only legitimate mode of effectually removing the evils of Government. The result showed, that they "gave heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils." The licentiousness of the female character, in France, for many years, is a true test of the effects of the Rights of Women, written by Godwin, one of the High Priests of the abolition of marriage.

However great the evils of Government, in the days of the Apostle, *vander Nero*, it was not the teachings of the spirit to abolish Government, to get rid of the evils. However numerous and grievous the sufferings of children, whose parents were "without natural affection," "implacable, unmerciful," the spirit did not teach, that children should be emancipated from the control of their parents, in order to relieve them from the cruelties of "unmerciful" parents. - However frequently wives, in sorrow and in silence, suffered from the wormwood, gall, bitterness, moroseness, and ill nature of husbands, yet, "forbidding to marry," in order to be relieved from the evils of marriage, the "spirit expressly" says is a "doctrine of devils." So, in like manner, although the Apostle, in his day, saw slaves frequently suffer the most unparalleled cruelties, yet it seems that the spirit did not expressly, or even indirectly, say to him, that it was verily consistent with the word of God, to aim at the speedy and entire removal of slavery. If we examine the teachings of the spirit, through Paul, on this subject, if we do not find that abolitionists have departed from the faith—if they have not given heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils—if the spirit, by Paul, does not say, that they are "men of corrupt minds, and destitute of truth," "supposing that gain is godliness," or, as Gill explains it, "gaining a *point* is godliness," I am greatly mistaken.

I will now more particularly call your attention to all the passages in the writings of Paul, which, so far as I have been able to find, have reference to the subject. I will take them up in the order in which I find them in the New Testament—those to the Corinthians and Ephesians for the present.

The first I find is in his epistle to the Corinthians, vii, 20, 21. In the 17th verse, the Apostle discourages a disposition to change. His aim, indeed, appears to be so far above little mortal quibblings, about our circumstances on earth, that he endeavors to raise the minds of the Corinthians above them. Their time was so short upon earth, that so much solicitude about their own, or the earthly circumstances of others, was far beneath the high aim of christians.—"For this I say, brethren, the time is short, it remaineth that both they that have wives, be as though they had none; and they that weep, as though they wept not; and they that rejoice, as though they rejoiced not; and they that buy, as though they possessed not; and they that use this world as not abusing it; for the fashion of this world passeth away."—29—31. Hence in the 17th verse, he says, "But as God hath distributed to every man, as the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk. And so ordain I in all the Churches."—Then in the 20th verse, he says, "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called." That is, be not over solicitous to change your circumstances—I am no stranger to the situation and circumstances of slaves—I know the cruelty of masters—I know, by experience, what it is to be beaten—nevertheless, let your aim be higher than to let any of these things move you. 21—"Art thou called, being a [*doulos*] servant? care not for it; but if thou mayst be made free, use

it rather." That is, if, while you are a slave, you are called of God, give yourself no uneasiness, on account of your slavery. Be not solicitous about it; but, however, while you or I should not be solicitous about emancipation, or make it a prominent aim, nevertheless, a state of freedom, on the whole is the best; so that "if thou mayst be made free, use it rather." Take it in preference to being under the absolute control of a man, who may hinder you from hearing the word. Give yourself no uneasiness about it, however—and why? Because—22—"He that is called in the Lord, being a [doulos] servant, is the Lord's free man—Likewise, also, he that is called, being free, is Christ's [doulos] servant." We are both in happy circumstances; we are both under the absolute control of a good master—being his douloi, or slaves; we are, in that sense, in a state of equality. Let us serve him joyfully. It is his to command and ours to obey. Let us not torment our minds, with the whim, that we ought to have our own way, or that it is a sore evil under the sun, to be under the absolute control of another, unless it is the devil. Let us not calculate on a freedom from the obligations of the Laws of Christ—Why? "Because you are bought with a price." "Be not ye the servants of men."—23. Christ purchased you with his own blood, when ye were the slaves of the devil, and when, by "receiving for doctrines the commandments of men," ye were in your principles and religious notions the douloi or slaves of men. "Be ye not therefore the douloi, or servants of men." Let therefore no man, or body of men have absolute dominion over your principles. Be not their slaves; but be in your principles the slaves or servants of Christ. If your bodies are in slavery to men, let your minds not be. Let your principles bow to him alone, who is the wisdom of God, and who has revealed his will in the holy scriptures. Take the scriptures as your only infallible rule of faith and practice; and if you find that men "speak not according to them, there is no truth in them." But as to your civil situation—24—"Brethren, let every man wherein he is called, therein abide with God." That is, let every man live to God, in whatever situation he is placed by Providence. Your secular condition is not changed. If you are a slave, your condition is not changed, for you are still bound by the law of Christ, to "be subject to your masters, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward."—Pet. ii, 18.

"It is very likely," (Adam Clarke very justly remarks,) "that some of the slaves at Corinth, who had been converted to christianity, had been led to think, that their christian privileges, absolved them from the necessity of continuing slaves; or at least brought them on a level with their christian masters. It was, therefore, a very proper subject for the Apostle to interfere in; and to his authority, the persons concerned, would, doubtlessly, respectfully bow."

The subject of slavery, is nowhere, that I have observed, touched by the Apostle, as a subject, except in this that I have been examining.—who now, upon a candid examination of the whole passage, can find, from it, any support for the doctrine of abolition? That I have given

the whole passage its plain simple meaning, I have no doubt. Scott's view of the Apostle's direction to slaves—"if thou mayst be made free, use it rather"—is, that "as it was a common case that converted" slaves "generally had heathen masters, who would frequently deprive them of religious advantages, especially meeting with their brethren on the Lord's day," &c. therefore, "if they had a fair opportunity of obtaining their freedom, they would do well to embrace it."

The Apostle speaks on the subject of slavery, as if its being a blessing or curse depended on the character of the master. If the devil is the master, he is so bad a master, that the poor slave has no alternative left, but to look to Jesus Christ to buy him. Jesus buys him, and he is now the property of another master; "ye are not your own, ye are bought with a price." He approves of the relation itself, when it exists between a good master and a faithful slave. Bad masters make the situation of their slaves, a subject of commiseration. Hence Paul puts forth his energies, not in sundering the relation of master and slave, but in making the Gospel exercise its benign influence on both; but especially, on the master.

In a word, as I understand the Apostle, he teaches that the Gospel plan, on this subject, is, first let your aim be to make the master good, and then his commands to his servants will be good. Let the commands be good, and, I confess, I cannot, for my soul, discover how it is oppressive to obey.

The Apostle saw more of the evils arising from the wickedness of masters, (or if you choose the evils of slavery,) than any of us have seen; but the Apostle knew that it was as bad philosophy as it was bad christianity, to murder the relation in order to get rid of the evils. It was killing the goose to get possession at once of the golden eggs.—Hence he did not interfere with the subject of the relation, but in the subsequent part of his epistle, pressed home on masters and slaves their relative duties, with the same earnestness that he pressed home the relative duties of parent and child, husband and wife; and, which is peculiarly striking, without manifesting, scarcely, any more dislike to the one relation than to the others. He at least placed, on all occasions, slavery, or the relation of master and slave, in very respectable company.

The Apostle incidentally refers to *doulos*, or servant, in xii, 13—"Whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be [*doulos*] bond or free." And in Gallatians, iii, 28—"There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither [*doulos*] bond nor free." In these passages, the Greek word, translated bond, is the same word that is used by Paul, where it is translated servant, not *misthos*, the hired servant. Paul never used the Greek word *andrapodon*, so far as I recollect, except in I Timothy, i, 10—and there it is translated *men-stealers*, against which the Jewish laws, which admitted of slavery, are clear and explicit. So also are the laws of the slave holding States.

Leaving now the only passage in which Paul touched directly on slavery, I will direct your attention to the special regulations he records

on the subject, and first examine his epistle to the Ephesians. This epistle was written when Nero was Emperor, A. D. 61, and when slavery prevailed all over the Roman Empire. It was written by Paul while at Rome, and daily witnessing the slave market, and familiar with all the circumstances of slavery. It was sent by the hand of Tychicus, who was accompanied by the slave Onesimus, to the Church at Ephesus, the then metropolis of Asia Minor. The members of the Church, he says, "were in time part Gentiles." They were composed of freemen and slaves. He did not deem it sufficient to inculcate the general law of Christ—viz: "Do unto others as you would they should do unto you"—and leave them to infer from that, what was right and what was wrong. He seems, from the manner in which he particularizes, to aim at turning their attention to the sins which prevailed in Ephesus, and to which, they in time past, were addicted. He aims, iv, 14—"That henceforth they should be no more children, tossed to and fro, with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness."

He tells them "Put away lying—speak every man truth with his neighbor."—"Be ye angry and sin not."—"Let him that stole steal no more."—"Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth."—"Grieve not the spirit."—"Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamor, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice." "Be kind, tender hearted, and forgiving."—"Walk in love."—"But fornication and all uncleanness, let it not be once named among you—neither filthiness nor foolish talking, nor jesting which are not convenient." (Gill and Dwight say obscene jesting.)—"Let no man deceive you, with vain words—walk as children of light. Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them. See that ye walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise, redeeming the time because the days are evil. Be ye not unwise but understanding what the will of the Lord is. Be not drunk with wine, but be filled with the spirit—speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs—Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God. Wives submit yourselves to your own husbands, as unto the Lord. Husbands love your wives, as Christ loved the Church. Let every one in particular so love his wife even as himself, and the wife see that she reverence her husband. Children obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right. And ye fathers provoke not your children to wrath, but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Servants [doulos] be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ, not with eye service as men pleasers, but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from your heart; *with good will doing service*, as to the Lord and not to men; knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be [doulos] *bond or free*. And ye masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening; knowing that *your* master also is in heaven, neither is there respect of persons with him. Finally, brethren, be strong in the Lord and in the power of his might. Put on the whole armor of

God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. Stand, therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breast plate of righteousness, and your feet shod with the preparation of the Gospel of peace. Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked—and take the helmet of salvation and the sword of the spirit, which is *the word of God*. Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance, and supplication for all saints."

The above is a synopsis of what Paul taught the Ephesian Church.—And where can we find a more particular account of the sins to be shunned—the duties to be performed, and the manner of performing them, than in that Epistle? Let Acts xx, 17—20, also 26, 27, be placed in juxtaposition with the above—viz: "And from Miletus he [Paul] sent to Ephesus, and called the Elders of the Church, and when they were come to him, he said unto them, ye know, from the first day that I came into Asia, after what manner I have been with you at all seasons; and how *I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have shewed you, and have taught you publicly, and from house to house.*" 26, 27—"Wherefore I take you to record this day, *that I am pure from the blood of all men; for I have not shunned to declare unto you ALL THE COUNSEL OF GOD.*"—I say, place in your mind these last facts recorded by Luke, (while you notice that the *servants* Paul addresses were *slaves*, for he says, "whether he be *bond or free,*") recollecting that he [Paul] was then at Rome, in the reign of Nero, with the execution of 400 innocent slaves of the Roman Prætor, fresh in his memory—The slave market, where the slaves were sold naked, before his eyes—Having, also, a knowledge, that in all nations and countries, there prevails a disposition to imitate the great—and that Rome was then the residence of the great and renowned, and consequently the metropolis of fashion:—Taking into consideration all these circumstances, in connection with the long catalogue of sins and duties, not even omitting *jesting*, and finding it a fact, that he *DID shun to declare that slavery was a sin*, how can you, what reason have you to conclude that it is a sin? If, indeed, as you say, it is a *heinous sin*, it is, to me, a most unaccountable and unjustifiable omission.

That, while he taught the masters and slaves their relative duties, he should, to such intelligent men as the Elders, declare—"Ye know how *I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have shewed you, and taught you publicly, and from house to house,*" and yet, neglect to condemn that which was so pernicious; and speak of the duties of slavery in close connection with the duties of two honorable and approved relations, without *shewing or teaching* that there was any difference, and leaving them to conclude that it was not "*profitable unto them*" to make a distinction between that which is "*a sin and scandal,*" and that which "*is honorable in all,*" is a mystery too deep for me to fathom.

Why does he not point out to the *thief* the duties of *stealing*? For, if we take Adam Clarke, and many other eminent divines, for our guides,

holding slaves is a crime of much greater magnitude than stealing. I forget—Paul does give directions, he does inculcate a duty on the thief—“LET HIM THAT STOLE, STEAL NO MORE.” Why not make as short work of slavery, if it is a heinous sin, and a deadly enemy to the peace and prosperity of Christ’s Church, to prune and build up which it was Paul’s sole duty?

I cannot leave this subject without expressing my utter astonishment, that, without once mentioning abolition or emancipation, as a remedy for the evils of slavery, the Apostle, with as much self complacency, as a man conscious that he had “kept back nothing that was profitable,” should appeal to the Elders of the Church as witnesses, that he was “pure from the blood of all men,” for he had “not shunned to declare unto them, *all the counsel of God,*” if he knew slavery, which, as a relation, he never, in any manner whatever, condemned, to be a heinous sin and scandal.—It appears to me, that a man who can believe, that the Apostle viewed the relation of master and slave, as an “accursed thing”—“an enormity and crime, for which perdition has scarcely an adequate state of punishment”—and that “aiming at the speedy and entire removal of this sin from the Church, was verily consistent with the word of God”—And yet, with such views, maintain entire silence on the subject—I say, a man who can believe this, can believe—more than is necessary to make him a christian.

Can it be possible, that the silence of the Apostle, was owing to an apprehension, that if he then condemned slavery as it existed among the Romans, who used the Greek word *doulos* to signify one of their slaves, it would, in some future day, produce confusion in Kentucky,* even to the very *Centre College*, and that confusion, perhaps, extend north of the Ohio? Did it occur to the Apostle, that because there was not an “*exact and precise*” similarity between slavery in his day and slavery in 1836—therefore it was the “counsel of God,” that he should be silent on the subject, and that the Church at Ephesus—while they saw *douloi* of their own color “Thrown to Mullets and Carps”—while they saw that “there was no species of misery which the system of Greek and Roman slavery did not inflict upon its unhappy victims”*—should content themselves with no more effort for emancipation, than merely inculcating on *douloi* or slaves, to be obedient unto their own masters “*as unto Christ,*” lest for the want of *exact precision* in language, some might wickedly conclude, in 1836, when slavery would exist in a much milder form, (and with a difference of complexion between the master and slave,) that it was not the counsel of God, to them, to become abolitionists or emancipators?

* See Appendix, Note C.

According to my apprehension of the subject, the Apostle knew that it was not the counsel of God, that he, or any of the Apostles of the Church, in any age, should interfere with a civil relation, to regulate which, the Holy Spirit has laid down specific rules.

SECTION VI.

You will, perhaps, be led to the same opinion, which I expressed in the last section, if you consult further, Paul's epistle to the Colossians, written the year following, and sent from the same place, and by the same persons who were the bearers of the epistle we have been examining, and one of them, Onesimus, whose master resided at Colosse, and to whom his slave, Onesimus, bore a private letter from Paul, and which I shall notice in contrast with your sixth and seventh resolutions.

It is sufficient to mention, that in this epistle, Paul pursues the same course, with the Colossians, that he did with the Ephesians. After specifying virtues which they should aim to obtain, and vices which they should avoid, he pursues the same plan of coupling the relations of wives and husbands, children and parents, servants [doulos] and masters, as in his epistle to the Ephesians.

Chapter iii, 11—Whatever disparity there might be between them, as to their civil circumstances, the Apostle shews one point in which they are placed on an equality, and that is, "where there is neither Greek nor Jew; circumcision or uncircumcision, Barbarian, Sythian, *bond* [doulos] nor free, but Christ is all, and in all." Here we find *bond* is the sense in which the Apostle uses the word *doulos*. It will lead to the understanding of the same word in the verses I am about to quote—viz: 17—25, and 1 of chap. iv—"Wives submit yourselves to your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord. Husbands, love your wives, and be not bitter against them. Children, obey your parents in all things, for this is well pleasing unto the Lord. Fathers, provoke not your children to anger, lest they be discouraged. Servants, [doulos] obey in all things your masters according to the flesh, not with eye service, as men pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing God. And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord and not to men, knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance, for ye serve the Lord Christ. But he that doeth wrong, shall receive for the wrong which he hath done, and there is no respect of persons. Masters give unto your [doulos] servants that which is *just and equal*; knowing that ye also have a master in heaven."

Adam Clark, whose authority, on the subject of slavery, cannot be questioned by an abolitionist, being himself an emancipator, says, that "according to the flesh" means "your masters in secular things." His

paraphrase on "the reward of the inheritance," is—"Here you have neither *lands* nor *property*; ye are *servants* or *slaves*, be not discouraged, ye have an inheritance in store, be faithful unto God and your employers, and Christ will give you an heavenly inheritance."

His paraphrase on the words "*just and equal*," is—"As it is *bondmen* or *slaves*, of whom the Apostle speaks, we may at once see, with what propriety this exhortation is given. The condition of *slaves* among the Greeks and Romans, was wretched in the extreme; they could appeal to no law, and they could expect neither justice nor equity. The Apostle, therefore, informs these proprietors of *these slaves*, that they should act towards them, both according to justice and equity, &c. Justice and equity required that they should have *proper food, proper raiment, due rest, and no more than moderate work.*"

In the above, we perceive Clarke's idea of what is *just and equal*.—And where there is a mind unwarped by prejudice towards the support of a favorite system, I have no doubt but that mind will perceive that he has given the mind of the spirit.

If then the above be the mind of the spirit, of which I have little doubt, then, the fact, that the planters of Mississippi and Louisiana, even while they have to pay from 20 to 25 dollars per barrel for pork, the present season, afford to their slaves from three to four and a half pounds per week, does not show that they are neglectful in rendering to their slaves that which is *just and equal*—especially when it is a known fact, also, that less labor, by one third, is required of them, than is required of their white servants by the benevolent inhabitants of Ohio. And as to raiment, during their daily labor, they will vie with servants of any country, and on the Sabbath, would put one fourth of the ladies in Ohio in the back ground. "I speak what I know, and testify what I have seen."

But, to return to my subject. What is there, in all that the Apostle has written, which goes to shew that it is a "heinous sin and scandal" to *hold slaves*?

To get clear of the force of such testimony as arises from the silence of the Apostles on the subject, some have resorted to the most pitiful subterfuges. Such is the following—it is almost too ridiculous and too presumptuous to be noticed. But as a minister once made it to me, I will repeat it. It is as follows:

The reason why the Apostles gave no direct testimony against slavery, was, that a direct testimony against slavery, in the Roman Government, in the Apostolic day, would be highly imprudent; because, besides jeopardizing their own lives, it would have no other tendency than to thwart the purpose for which they were sent: and hence it would have been bad policy!!!

Did the Apostles, indeed, receive their doctrine of men, or were they taught it by men, and not "by the revelation of Jesus Christ?" What! men who counted not their lives dear to them! Men, who, in obedience to the command of Christ, would "GO," (instead of *sending*, like the apostles of abolition,) "into *all the world* and preach" what they were

taught "by the revelation of Jesus Christ," even where tortures, racks, and death in the most horrific forms, awaited them! Such men afraid to preach the truth, lest they should jeopardize their lives! Such men influenced by low groveling policy! Has it indeed come to this, that the glorious Gospel of truth, which is the power of God unto salvation, is nothing more than the mere spawn of earthly policy? Heaven arrest such blasphemy! But I will be calm and answer the *weak*.

Suppose, for instance, Paul was under such unworthy motives, (a supposition which makes me shudder,) still, it is not supposable, that an honest teacher of didactic theology, would conceal from his students, what were his views, as to the best mode of ameliorating the condition of sixty millions of his fellow creatures, who were daily suffering, and daily exposed to suffer, all the cruelties that a people,—who, according to the Apostle's own shewing, were "full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity, whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, implacable unmerciful,"—chose to inflict on them.

Sixty millions under the absolute, irresponsible, control of masters of such characters! Sixty millions of people, wretched people, in the horizon of whose prospects, there was not discoverable one cheering ray of hope. A people, over whose doom, neither themselves nor others, could discover any thing less than one unbroken cloud of despair. Sixty millions in whose bosoms had expired the hope, that they could ever obtain either a trial, appeal, or redress. Surely, their doleful condition would, and did, command the attention of the Apostle.

And as surely as his heart was not callous to their condition, or indifferent as to the best mode of ameliorating that condition, equally as sure, it appears to me, that—if the dread of secular power prevented him from publishing to the Churches, that either rapid or slow movements towards emancipating those unhappy people, must, and ought to be the deliberate aim of every one naming the name of Christ—he would be so far from concealing it from his students, that he would remove from their minds all uncertainty on the subject. But, influenced by the cunning, cautious, policy of his would be followers of our day, Paul would probably direct his students, Timothy and Titus, to pursue a course like the following:

'Timothy, my son, take notice, that as you are about to take charge of the Church at Ephesus, among a people, where, you know, slavery exists under the sanction of the Government—and where, you also know, it is popular, and consequently an interference with it, at present, would weaken your influence—where the least whisper of disapprobation, from you, would break a hornet's nest upon you, therefore be extremely cautious about this matter. You know the people you have to deal with—The most of them are Greeks; but there are some Jews among them; and you are happily qualified to go among such a people, being yourself the

son of a Jewess and a Greek.—(Acts xvi, 1.) To the subject of slavery, will the attention of all serious persons, in a great degree, be directed; it cannot be otherwise. No christian that has a feeling heart, and that every true christian has, can possibly witness, unmoved, what you have, and will witness in Ephesus and elsewhere. No one can, without a thrill of horror, see his fellow men, as you and I have seen them, and no doubt will again see them, with their hands nailed to a cross bar, fastened to the top of an upright post, and thus left suspended, for days, without even a drink of water; and all this merely to gratify the caprice, of "malignant, proud, haters of God." We cannot, without the deepest pangs of sorrow, hear many of our neighbors, in a pompous proud manner, boast what fine large mullet and carp, they have in their fish ponds, and what delicious flavor they give them, by feeding them with human flesh—the flesh of their slaves, who happened to displease them. With all the sympathies with which the Gospel has inspired us, we cannot behold, from day to day, such sights, and innumerable others, equally, if not more appalling, without studying out some way, by which to ameliorate their condition. You are young, and your natural ardor, strongly prompted by the uncommon portion of sympathy which you possess, will, doubtless, unless guarded by the utmost prudence, betray you into measures, which will, as I intimated before, involve you in difficulties. You will have a greater need of caution, as you will find men in Ephesus "without understanding"—men, notwithstanding they belong to the Church, and wear a good exterior, who have more sympathy than Christianity, more zeal than prudence, and more sail than ballast. Be cautious, therefore, and do not let your youthful feelings lead you to make a public declaration of your sentiments, however great your love for abolition may be.

The brethren of Lystra and Iconium have spoken well of you, and I have on their recommendation, taken you to instruct you, and I find I am not disappointed in your character. I therefore put all confidence in you. I will now tell you, and you alone, my private sentiments, on the subject of slavery; but you must keep them a profound secret; for, if you do not, I shall be in a sad dilemma. I am not afraid of any place but Ephesus. At Corinth, I treated the subject of slavery, itself, as a matter about which they need not give themselves much concern. I set the minds of masters at rest, by telling the slaves, in the letter I wrote to them all, "art thou called being a [doulos] servant, care not for it; but if thou mayst be made free, use it rather." So that I have left the masters and slaves both under the impression, that they stand in a family relation towards each other; and that the Gospel would direct them how they ought mutually to conduct. I intend, by coupling the relation of master and slave, with the known honorable relations of wife and husband, child and parent, to leave the same impression wherever I go. And I intend, also, to convey the same idea, in all my public writings, and private communications, except, where I have confidence in a man, as I have in you, that he will not betray me.

I again enjoin on you, as you are about going to Ephesus, that you do not let my private sentiments be known, at *that place particularly*. It is a great place. Indeed you will find it the greatest place in Asia Minor. Many of the most respectable people there, are your own people, by your father's side, and some very respectable by your mother's side. You know they all despise pious frauds—and a man professing so much openness and candor as I have done, and really as I generally feel, to be detected in one, would ruin me forever. So you must be on your guard.—I intend that Titus, also, shall know my private sentiments: he is a trusty fellow—I can put all confidence in him. As I am going to send him to Crete, where the people, as you know “are all liars, evil beasts, and slow belles.” His long associations with the people, will affect his mind so as, perhaps, to blunt, in some degree, that nervous excitement which he now feels, when a minister tells any thing that even *looks like a falsehood*.

Now, my dear son Timothy, I will tell you—but first, I must again put you on your guard—You recollect the time we were at Miletus, on our way to Jerusalem, when I sent for the Elders of Ephesus—Dont you recollect what a feeling time we had in parting? Dont you recollect how the dear old souls wept, when I told them they “would see my face no more?” Dont you remember, with what sincerity I told them, that “I have not shunned to declare unto you *all* the counsel of God?” All this, you no doubt recollect. But perhaps you have not noticed, that I, unfortunately, made use of the word ALL, and the good old souls will remember it, and if they do not, Luke will be sure to record it, for you know he is very particular. So now, my son, you perceive, that if it should be found out at Ephesus, that it was not simply the bad conduct of Masters I condemned, but something beyond that, my situation would be an exceedingly awkward one, especially if they got hold of my letter to the Church at Corinth.

Now, Timothy, after having given you all necessary caution, and hoping that you will not betray your old preceptor, I make to you this candid statement:

SLAVERY—I do not mean the cruelties that are exercised, nor the suffering endured; these I have openly condemned—and you need never keep your disapprobation of them a secret—nay, you are at liberty to proclaim such to be my views; for I have done nothing that is at variance with that sentiment—*Slavery*, as I was about to tell you, is the relation between the master and his servant, or slave—(there is no danger of my using the term slave as synonymous with servant, both meaning the same thing, seeing our present conversation is to be *inter nos*)—but let me caution you, my son, I foresee, that at some future day, a YOUNG man in Kentucky, will, by some legerdemain or other, find out some of these my private sentiments, and will publish them—Now I caution you to use the word *servant* instead of *slave*, so that that YOUNG man may not be hindered from gaining his point, for he is very *precise and exact*. Pardou this digression, my son, for I wish to be very cautious; my situation is a

delicate one. Be it known unto you, then, and to you only, that *slavery* is "a sin in itself peculiarly heinous in the sight of God." It is such an "accursed thing that the Church cannot stand before her enemies, until they take away the accursed thing from among them." It is so accursed that it will cause "a great decline of vital godliness." It will cause "divisions." It will cause "the means of grace to have but little success."—And it will "cause the efforts of the Church for the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom to prove abortive."

Thus, my dear Timothy, I have told you candidly, what my private sentiments are, and you can now perceive in what an awkward predicament I should be placed, before the Elders of Ephesus, good old souls, if they should, by any means, find out that these are my sentiments, and that I knew they were "the counsel of God," when, with a solemnity similar to an oath, I protested to them, that "I have not shunned to declare unto you, *ALL* the counsel of God."

My son, I will open my mind to you still farther, but you must not publish it; I never shall; yet, in some mysterious manner, they will get hold of it in Ohio—that "aiming at the speedy and entire removal of slavery from the Church," and the world, "is verily consistent with the word of God."

This sentiment will not be known in Kentucky. They are *YOUNG* folks there, yet. As they are *YOUNG*, they will be satisfied with telling their folks, that in all cases they may go on sinning for six years, and in some cases twenty five. If, however, some of their people will be afraid, that they may die themselves in their awful sins, before the probation is ended, the same ingenuity by which my private sentiments were discovered, will discover some cateplasm to heal the wounded conscience. Indeed, a *YOUNG* man will discover it, and apply it very adroitly, showing, withal, that it is a safe balsam. He will prove, that to live in the habit of doing wrong, is right, provided a record is made in court by the sinner, that he intends quitting his sins in a period between six and twenty five years. The weapons, however, which he will use to drive the conviction, of the efficacy of his balsam, home to the conscience, "will be so delicately pointed, that you," Timothy, "could scarcely discern their point, or be absolutely certain whether they had any point at all."

I have thus, my son, stated to you my private views. I have been induced to do so, from the perfect confidence I have in you, and because without this private explanation, I know you would be in danger of being led into the most egregious error, as to my views, on this subject, when you would peruse my first letter to you, after you were settled as Bishop of Ephesus.

To be serious, I have thus, in familiar language, given a specimen of worldly policy. I have, in this familiar manner, put the sentiments, and,

almost verbatim the language, of the Chillicothe Presbytery into the mouth of Paul to Timothy, his student.

I am now prepared to pursue with you, in the next section, Paul's first letter to the young Bishop of Ephesus.

SECTION VII.

In this epistle, Paul commences by telling Timothy, to "charge some, that they *teach no other doctrine.*" - That is, than he had, heretofore, been "taught by his mother Eunice and his grand mother Louis," and by himself, his old preceptor, who was sent to teach him and others, "by the commandment of God and the Lord Jesus Christ." (Louis and Eunice had only the Old Testament, the New not having been written at the time.) He tells him, that in Ephesus, "some having swerved from charity, a good conscience, and faith unfeigned, have turned aside to vain jangling, desiring to be teachers of the law, understanding not what they say, nor whereof they affirm," &c. He then exhorts Timothy, that "first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men: for kings, and for all that are in authority; (as you have kindly done for slave holders, in the latter part of your letter.) He teaches that *men*, and not *women*, should take the lead in "prayers and intercessions"—such, for instance, as northern ladies *interceding Congress, and praying them to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia*—Paul, after stating to Timothy thus, Tim. ii, 1—"I speak the truth in Christ, and lie not," makes the following regulation: verse 12—"I suffer not a *woman* to teach, nor usurp authority over men, but be in *silence.*" From teaching how women ought to behave, he proceeds to give the following positive and negative qualities of a Bishop. In general, "he must be blameless." He then proceeds to particularize; and seeing that polygamy was a prevalent practice in Ephesus, he guards against appointing any man a Bishop, who lives in such a practice. (By the way, let us notice, whether the Apostle was as guarded, that no slave holder should be appointed a Bishop, as that great and good man, John Wesley was, in forming the Constitution of his Church.) Let us, then, go on with his character of a Bishop—iii, 2—7—"A Bishop then, must be blameless, the husband of *one wife*, vigilant, sober, *given to hospitality*, apt to teach; not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre, but patient; not a brawler, not covetous; one that ruleth well *his own house*; having his Children in subjection with all gravity: (for if a man know not how to rule well *his own house*, how shall he take care of the Church of God?) not a novice; moreover, he must have a good report of them which are without." Such then, the Apostle says, a Bishop

should be, and should not be; and the like character should a Deacon possess. Yet, in all this, there is no caution against either being a slave holder. Indeed, it seems, when compared with the Old Testament, that, besides children, the Apostle anticipated that Bishops would probably have slaves—because, besides governing his children, he mentions the government of *his house*. A correspondent expression is made by the two Angels who appeared to Abraham. Gen. xviii, 19—"For I know him, [Abraham, who had slaves as well as children,] that he will command *his children, AND his household after him.*" It was not his children or his household, but his children AND *his household*, clearly shewing that more was intended by *house*, or *household*, than merely his children.

As Timothy was taught the Old Testament, being the only scriptures extant, at the time he was taught by his mother and grand mother, it is probable, that the expression, *his house*, would be understood by Timothy to mean the servants, and not the children the Bishop might have. As there were scarcely any other servants in Ephesus, but such as we have described the Roman servants to be, he would, probably, understand Paul to mean that a Bishop must "*rule his own*" slaves. Be this as it may, one thing is certain, there is no caution left to guard the Bishop's office from being exercised by a *slave holder*.

After remarking on the offices of Bishop and Deacon, he then cautions Timothy, a second time, against false teachers.

The Greeks were a philosophising people. "The Greeks seek after wisdom." I Cor. i, 22.—We preach Christ crucified—to the Greeks foolishness,—23—but to the called," of the Greeks, "Christ the *wisdom of God.*" The Apostle knowing the propensity of the Greeks, like many of our American Divines, to receive nothing as truth, unless they could comprehend its philosophy—knowing, also, that the plain commandments of God, had not as much force to sway their minds, in deciding what was right and what was wrong, as that which appeared philosophical—and that they would easily glide into error, even to the prohibition of those things which God made lawful, cautions Timothy, in the iv chapter. In a philosophical manner they would thus reason: That, in as much as any common observer, could not fail of seeing what innumerable sufferings wives were subjected to, in consequence of marriage, being thereby bound to obey their husbands—seeing, also, that the horrible crime of adultery, could not exist without one of the parties were married—therefore, the relation out of which so many, and such great evils grow, cannot but be sinful. Add to this, a relation which places a man or a woman in that situation, that he or she is thereby in danger of committing a sin, which is abhorrent to God and all virtuous beings, cannot be otherwise than a sin.

Again, seeing excessive eating of some kinds of meats, and excessive drinking of wine, were the cause, as among the Corinthians, "that many

were sick and weakly among them, and many slept," or died—Hence, that which causes so much sickness, weakness, sleep, or death, cannot be otherwise than sinful in the sight of God.

In a word, any relation which may lead to great and sore evils, or the indulgence of any appetite, which may lead to intemperance, cannot but be highly abhorrent in the sight of Heaven. This is philosophy. And this, says the philosopher, is verily in accordance with the word of God.

Let us now put it to the test, and see whether it is verily in accordance with the word of God, or whether it is only in accordance with the doctrines and commandments of men.

Take the iv, 1—6—"Now the spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times, some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils: speaking lies in hypocrisy; having¹ their consciences seared with a hot iron—*forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving*, of them which believe and know the truth. For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused if it be received with thanksgiving. For it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer."

To reconcile Paul's christianity, above quoted, with the philosophy of our day, would require the same ingenuity as it would to reconcile things utterly irreconcilable. Every experiment which will be made to reconcile them, will prove as abortive, as those, heretofore made, to amalgamate vinegar and oil.

The Apostle calls such philosophy, "profane, and old wives fables," and guards Timothy against such maxims, and tells him in the 6th verse—"If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Christ."

I will pass over the v chapter, which contains directions to old and young, widows and young women; to Elders, and to Timothy himself, in relation to his health. He says to him, verse 23—"Drink no longer water, but use a *little wine* for thy stomach's sake, and thine often infirmities."

Regardless of the philosophy of those teachers, whose minds would be under the influence of the seducing spirits, of which he had spoken, and who would interfere, no doubt, with masters and their servants, and thereby, instead of doing good, would cause the name of God and his doctrine to be blasphemed, he tells Timothy to *go ahead*; and, as in the vi chapter, verse 1, say—"Let as many [doulos] servants as are under the yoke, count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine, be not blasphemed." "And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren, but rather do them service; because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit. *These things teach and exhort.*"

I need not here repeat, what has already been proven, in a former section—viz: that at Ephesus, as in all other parts of the Roman Government, the servants were, for life, under the absolute control of their

masters; and, in this respect, were not *precisely, and exactly*, like our Mississippi slaves, for our laws limit the master's control. I do not suppose that the Ephesian servants, as to the color of their skin, the projection of their nose, the size of their lips, and the texture of the hair, were *precisely and exactly* like our slaves, nor were they treated half as well.—They were precisely and exactly like ours, under the control of their masters *during life*.

Paul directs Timothy to teach and exhort servants "to count their own masters worthy of all honor." How? Was Timothy, in order to enable servants to count their masters worthy of all honor, to take unusual pains to expatiate on the characters of masters—calling them "heinous and scandalous sinners"—robbers—tyrants—thieves—oppressors—monsters—two leged wolves—atrillious blasphemers? This conduct would have been more in keeping with the conduct of those, whom "the spirit says will, in the latter day, give heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils—speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their consciences seared with a hot iron."

"And they that have *believing masters*." Who can unite the idea of heinous, sinful, scandalous, to a believer?—Atrillious, blasphemous, believing masters! An abolitionist who can incorporate these ideas, must have his "conscience seared with a hot iron;" and his abolition heat may, perchance, be so intense as to incorporate the iron and clay in Nebuchadnezzar's image.

However confident any man, or body of men, may be, that epithets, in their own nature calculated to alienate the affections of servants from their masters, and to irritate the masters, are verily consistent with the word of God, they must have understood, in a way that is strange to me, the passage by which Paul explains to Timothy the nature of the doctrines which he is to teach the Ephesian servants—viz: "do them service because they are *faithful, and beloved partakers of the benefit*." To teach, that, in virtue of masters holding slaves, they are thereby guilty of a heinous and scandalous sin, is but too plainly "teaching otherwise" than Paul taught Timothy to "*teach and exhort*."

There is no possible doubt, but that Timothy was to teach the Ephesian slaves, to esteem their masters, and to serve them, not involuntarily, (as their services are universally represented to be, by all modern abolitionists,) "*but with good will doing service, as unto the Lord*." The same instruction that is given to children, "Honor your father and your mother"—"Children obey your parents in the Lord." So servants, be obedient unto your own masters and please them well—count them worthy of all honor. Ministers who would be crusading against the exercise of parental government—against holding children in subjection, as being verily a sin and scandal, would, certainly, be teaching otherwise than the Holy Spirit taught. So likewise of servants.

That the above views are not a perversion, nor even a strained construction of God's word, any candid mind will readily perceive. By examining the 3d verse of the same chapter, you will find, that "counting

masters *worthy of all honor*," are called by the spirit, "*wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the doctrine that is according to godliness.*"

Pause now, my dear brother, and let your Presbytery consider well.—The question is not, whether your action on the subject of slavery, will be in accordance with the philanthropy of the day; but whether it will be in accordance with "*the words of our Lord Jesus Christ.*" Be not like Scribes and Pharisees, who had, for ages, received and adopted "*the traditions of their fathers,*" until they became so engrafted in their very nature—until "growing with their growth, and strengthening with their strength," that it appeared little short of blasphemy to be told, "*In vain do ye teach for doctrines the commandments of men.*" Be not like the honest, humble devotees of a certain Church, who have, time immemorial, thought it, and still think it, "*verily consistent with the word of God,*" to pray to, and bow down before the image of the Virgin Mary, until the following words, engraven by the finger of God himself, appears to them bordering on blasphemy, viz: "*Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth.—Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them nor serve them.*"—Ex. xx, 4, 5.

Because that, for more than a century past, Bishops and teachers of didactic theology—politicians, legislators, and jurists of eminence and piety, with the whole fry of their yelping followers, have laid down the maxim, and harped upon it with the fiery eloquence of the orator, and the sombre, loud, lumbering strains of the poet, that "*slavery is in itself sinful,*" until it looks almost like blasphemy, for any one to have the temerity to call in question the truth of the maxim—the chartered privilege is not yet taken away from the citizens of Zion, like the good old Bereans, to "*search the scriptures,*" and see whether the maxim be, or be not in accordance with the words of HIM, "*who spake as never man spoke.*"

If men, however great, high, eminent, numerous, and devoted they may be, speak not what the Apostle calls the "*words of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and the doctrine that is according to godliness,*" it is because "*there is no truth in them.*" Their eminence and piety may shield them before men, while preaching doctrines, calculated in their own nature to produce, in families, insubordination—but nothing among Angels or men, will shield them from the following standing, which is imputed to them by the Holy Spirit, in the sequel of the passage we have been considering. Tim. iv, 4, 5—"*He is proud, knowing n thing, but doating about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railing, evil surmisings; perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness*"—or, as Dr. Gill says, "*gaining a point, is godliness.*"

The instructions of Paul to Timothy, in the last clause of the 5th verse, is, I confess, a painful duty to be put in practice—viz: "*From such withdraw thyself.*" But however painful it may be, however it may

expose to the obloquy and reproach of men, whose principles and conduct, in other respects, we approve, yet, if these men will persevere, in endeavoring to occupy a ground, on which Angels dare not tread, there is no alternative left, but to gird on our knapsack, and having our feet shod with the preparation of the Gospel of peace, holding in our hands, unsheathed, the furbished sword of the spirit, which is *the word of God*, obey the command of him who sits upon the throne—"From such withdraw yourselves."

With all the hindrances and obstacles, which the anti-christian doctrines of emancipators and abolitionists—(there is no difference, except that one proposes a potion that is accompanied with immediate death, while the potion of the other is more insinuating, and will only, by piece meal, take away life. The object is the same; an object, predicated on the anti-scriptural maxim, that slavery is a sin)—have thrown in our way, let us, as masters, not be hindered from rendering to our slaves, that which is just and equal. They are "our households." Let each master, amidst all our opposing difficulties, so conduct, that it may, indeed and in truth, be said of each of us, as was said of Abraham, by the High and Holy One, who appeared to him in the plains of Mamre, "I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord to do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him."

Ye christian masters, who, in view of the ravages and ruin, that abolition and emancipating doctrines have been producing, within your borders, hang down your heads like bulrushes—who, because you see that these doctrines have barred you from the privilege of teaching your households to read, are hanging your harps upon the willows, take courage—lift up your heads—attune your harps. For, although abolition is the "accursed thing" which the "spirit spoke expressly would come in the latter day;" yet be not dismayed—"say not that the work is too great, nor this deadly enemy of our peace and prosperity, too powerful to be resisted. *It is a sin that loves the darkness and cannot endure the light*—An enemy that is unable to stand before the sword of the spirit, and the REMNANT of God's people, girded with the panoply of heaven, and trusting in the God of Zion for victory.

"Prayer and consistent effort in this matter, will bring to our aid the resources of OMNIPOTENCE."

SECTION VIII.

Brother Vandyke, if you will excuse me for my digression, in the last section, I will, in this, proceed with you, to examine Paul's instructions, on the same subject to Titus, another of his students, and whom

he appointed Bishop of Crete. I will be brief; because the instructions to Titus do not vary, in substance, from those given to Timothy.

On examination, you will find, in stating the sine qua non to a Bishop's office, that, being a slaveholder, is not mentioned as one. You will find Titus particularly cautioned, in the 1st chapter, against a most untoward sett of people, which he would find in Crete. The Apostle tells him, "there are many unruly and vain talkers, and deceivers, especially they of the circumcision." Here note, that they of the circumcision were reckoned, by themselves and others, the most religious, and best acquainted with theology, of any people in the world. This shews us, that, however prominent the religious character of any men may be, holding, like those of the circumcision, in their hands the oracles of God, yet we are to turn ourselves from them, after "*rebuking them sharply*," whenever they commence preaching doctrines calculated to "*subvert*" the domestic relations. The Apostle continues—"Whose mouths must be stopped—who *subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not*, for filthy lucre's sake. One of themselves, *even a prophet* of their own, said the Creteans are always liars—evil beasts—slow bellies. This witness is true. Wherefore, *rebuke them sharply*, that they may be sound in the faith.—Not giving heed to Jewish fables, and *commandments of men*, that turn from the truth." Gaining the sanction of the mind to the commandments of men, even when those commandments turn from the truth, is not new school. It is as old as Paul—Gaining the sanction of the minds of many, even so far as "to subvert whole houses," is not "a new thing under the sun." Nor is it a new thing, even where the holy scriptures are accessible, to find "unruly and vain talkers."

Titus, however, was to "*rebuke them sharply*," not for the purpose of shewing how smart he was, or how *sharp* he could be, nor yet to gratify any unholy indignation he might feel, towards these "unruly and vain talkers"—but *expressly*, "that they may be sound in the faith."—To bring them to soundness in the faith, then, should be his exclusive object, as it should be the exclusive object of all persons, especially ministers.

From the language of the Apostle, immediately preceding the instructions he gave Titus, about servants, it would seem, that he had reference to those doctrines which tended to disturb the domestic relations. He tells Titus, that such should be his example, that it would make an impression wherever he went. "In doctrine shewing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity, sound speech that cannot be condemned, that he that is of the contrary part may be ashamed, having no evil to say of you." Wherever there was a great number of slaves, Paul never omitted to notice them—and hence, after directing Titus about his own example and doctrine, he directs him to "exhort [*douloi*] servants to be obedient to their own masters, and to please them in all things, not answering again, not purloining, but shewing all good fidelity; that they may adorn the doctrine of God our saviour, in all things."

Servants were to please their masters in all things, "not purloining, but shewing all good fidelity." Sent by their master to market, either to buy or sell, they were to use "good fidelity"—"not purloining"—not keeping back a part of the amount of sales, nor pretending that articles cost more than was actually paid for them. In all this, Titus is not instructed to interfere with the relation of masters and their slaves. If he had, with all his influence, he no doubt would have subverted, not only "*whole houses*," but the whole island of Crete. Just as Muratt, Robespierre, Godwin, and the whole tribe of French and English Abolitionists, subverted the Island of St. Domingo—nay, subverted the whole Government of France—so might, in all probability, Titus have done, had he listened to "vain talkers," and "seducing spirits," instead of receiving the council of God, by the mouth of Paul.

I have now but one more reference to make to the writings of Paul, before I close this exhibit of the different portions of scripture, which brought my mind to its present conviction, so radically different from your views.

How your Presbytery could pass its sixth and seventh resolutions, with the knowledge you had of Paul's epistle to Philemon, is to me inexplicable. Let us examine the resolutions and the epistle, and see whether the doctrines contained in the resolutions, are verily consistent with the word of God, as contained in the epistle.

You resolve, "6th. That when a master advertises a reward for a runaway slave, against whom no other crime is alleged than escaping from his master, he is guilty of a scandalous sin, and forfeits his right to the sealing ordinances of God's house."

"7th Resolved, That to apprehend a slave who is endeavoring to escape from slavery, with a view to restore him to his master, is a *direct* violation of the Divine Law, and when committed by a member of the Church, ought to subject him to censure."

The epistle to Philemon was written by Paul, while a prisoner at Rome. As Philemon was converted under the ministry of Paul, who had a church in his house, it is probable that Philemon's slaves were acquainted with Paul. This acquaintance might have been the reason why Onesimus, the slave of Philemon, after he run away from his master at Colosse, and now in Rome among strangers, called, as was natural, to see an old acquaintance. Be this as it may, one thing is certain, he was converted under the ministry of Paul—and, for some time after his conversion, served Paul. The Apostle, however, *sent him home*, with this very letter, which we are considering, *to his master*, with an urgent request, on the part of Paul, to Philemon, that he would not treat his slave harshly, but receive him in the two fold capacity of a slave and a brother—both in the flesh and in the Lord.

This is the substance of the whole letter. That Onesimus was a slave—that Paul recognized him as the lawful property of his master, Philemon, I refer you to Scott, Clarke, and McKnight—the two former thorough-going emancipators. In the epistle, we find Onesimus adver-

tised, as a runaway from his master's service. Paul advertises that he will pay Onesimus' debts, whether they were for goods stolen and wasted, before his conversion, or whether the debt accrued for the loss of the time he was absent, or both. It is not stated how he became in debt, but Paul promises he will pay what Onesimus owed.

It is not stated, whether Philemon ever advertised a reward for apprehending Onesimus, but it is evident, from the letter, that Paul expected to be rewarded with the gratitude of Philemon, for *sending back* to him *his slave*; especially as he had reason, from what he had learned from Paul's letter, to believe that his slave would now be more profitable to him, than he was before his conversion.

Here, then, we have an Apostle, "with a view of restoring him to his master," sending back a runaway slave. Here we have, in Philemon, an eminent christian, holding his fellow beings in slavery. Here, also, we have Onesimus, verily, now, bearing the image of Jesus, sent home as a slave, by Paul, the aged. Paul, then, on a trial before the Chillicothe Presbytery, on the charge of advertising and restoring to his master, the slave Onesimus, against whom *no crime* was alleged, would, under the 6th and 7th resolutions, be found guilty of a scandalous sin, and a direct violation of the Divine Law—consequently, the penalty specified in the resolutions, would be executed on him, and he would, therefore, be subjected to censure, and excluded from the sealing ordinances of God's house.

The advertising and apprehending a runaway slave, against whom *no crime* is alleged, is not the full extent of Paul's iniquity. But he, professing to have the mind of the spirit, is guilty of the most unpardonable omission. He knew that Philemon lived at Colosse, and that he would, of course, see the letter he wrote to the Collossians, at the same time that he wrote to him a private letter. In the letter to the Collossians, he directs masters to "give unto your servants that which is *just and equal*," without mentioning whether it was intended by "just and equal," that their masters were bound to emancipate them. Philemon would look at the private letter he sent to himself, to learn from it his duty, as now he had, in the person of Onesimus, a slave, whom Paul owns as a "brother beloved." And there, instead of emancipation being required, he finds Paul comforting him with the hope, that Onesimus would quit his old tricks, and never run away again, "for," says Paul, "perhaps he therefore departed for a season, that thou shouldst receive him *forever*." If he had not run away, and, in the providence of God been converted, he, perhaps, would have been of no service to you, but now, being converted, he will never run away from you again, but serve you "*forever*," "not with eye service," as formerly, "but, in singleness of heart, fearing God." You will find now, that whatever service you require of him, he will "do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men." So that now, "you receive him" back, purged by the Holy Spirit, of the abolition principles he had adopted, and which caused him to run away, and which caused him, even when he staid at home, to do his work reluctantly, and in a

slavish manner, "with eye service." But now, he is under the influence of holy principles, so that you may now receive him, "not as a slave, but as a brother beloved, specially to me," who have for some time enjoyed his services. Although I have not the additional circumstance of his being my property, to increase my attachment to him, yet I do love him as a brother. If then, his christian principles, and the short service he has rendered to me, makes him stand so high in my estimation, "in the Lord," how much more would I esteem him, if he was mine "in the flesh." That is, if he was my property, and constituted a part of my household, as he does yours.

So then you can receive him above a servant, a brother beloved, "specially to me, but how much more to thee, both in the flesh and in the Lord."

In the above, Paul conveys to Philemon the idea, that he calculates that christianity will bind the slave and his master together "with a double chord that is not easily broken," instead of separating them, as is, not the mere tendency, but the avowed purpose of abolition and emancipating doctrines.

In view of the whole subject, who can avoid seeing, that the 6th and 7th resolutions of the Chillicothe Presbytery, would place the venerable Apostle much in the vocative. Perhaps, in view of his incessant labors—his extensive travels—his superior information—his high standing, and his grey hairs, he might, on his trial before the Presbytery of Chillicothe, produce a pause; and although his doctrines were palpably opposed to the resolutions of the Presbytery, yet, as it was manifest, that he wielded a great influence, upon the whole it was better to sacrifice the *purity* of the doctrines of the Presbytery, than the *great numbers* that his influence and character, would lead away from the Church. But if, however, there should happen to belong to the Presbytery, such *powerful hard headed, uncompromising, obstinate* Wilsons and Junkins, that they would not sacrifice the *purity* of the Church, on any consideration, then, verily, to shew that his doctrines were not at variance, *at all* with the Chillicothe Presbytery, would require an adroitness at twisting and turning, shifting and dodging, and explaining explanations, on the part of the Apostle, to shew that the high climacteric which belonged to 1835, had taken place at another period—to enable him to escape from "censure and exclusion from the scaling ordinances of God's house!"

I have now, according to promise, presented to your view and consideration, some portions of the Old and New Testaments, accompanied with a small synopsis of the history of slavery among the Jews, Greeks, and Romans, which influenced my mind to call in question the truth of the maxim, that slavery is in itself sinful; which you, and many others have adopted, and on which is erected a fabric of such awful and majestic grandeur, that it has not failed to elicit the homage and respect of many of the wise and aged, throughout Europe and America. It is a fabric of such awful dome, that few of the intellectual or spiritual Sampsons of the age, have had the temerity to seize hold of its main and

only pillar. It is, indeed, a Goliath, whose brawny muscles, gigantic stature, and terrific mien, has hitherto, so far as I know, "set at defiance the armies of the living God." You perceive, however, that one in obsecrity, and, as it were, "from the sheep folds," clad not with a quiver full of keen, shrewd, metaphysical weapons, but "with the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God," has attacked the giant in his front, and has struck the main pillar of his temple.

SECTION IX.

In the whole of the preceding remarks, you will perceive that I have not interfered with the subject of slavery; as it has a bearing on our political relations. I have never made politics scarcely any part of my study, farther than to endeavor to discriminate between what was strictly political, and what religious. Nevertheless, as you have, in your 8th resolution, and in the remarks subsequent to your resolutions, united the Church and State, (a union I never approved,) you will bear with me, if, after noticing, in the present section, the resolutions which I have not already disposed of, I take up your 8th resolution and examine its merits—It shall be my last.

Your 1st, 2d, 6th, and 7th resolutions, have been shewn to be defective, in the body of the remarks, which I have already made; I will therefore pass them all over, except the 2d—and as you request the Mississippi Presbytery to pass that, with the others, I will just mention an objection, which, in Mississippi and Louisiana, would be considered serious, unless we could lay aside our present prejudices and notions. Your 2d resolution is as follows, viz:

"Resolved, That *giving or bequeathing slaves to children or others, as property, is a great sin, and when committed by a member of the Church, ought to subject him to church censure.*"

I will now proceed to state a difficulty that would arise from this fact: in Mississippi and Louisiana, we all are under the impression, that "where a testament is made, there must, also, of necessity, be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead; otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth." Hence a bequest made, is not of any strength, until the testator is dead. Generally speaking, the testator seals his will, and how he has bequeathed his property, is not known until after his death. Besides, you know, that according to the constitution of our Church, the accused must have ten days' previous notice; and, besides being served with a citation to answer to the charge tabled against him, he must be furnished with a copy of the charge, and the names of the witnesses, that are to substantiate the charge.

Now, as Presbyteries have no control over any but their own body, they ought to see that their own resolutions could be carried out. Our Presbyteries anticipate a difficulty that would arise, from a want of sufficient nerve among any of our ministers or elders, to go and serve the citation in the above case—because, "*faciles decessus averno, sed revocar gradum hoc opus, hic labor est.*"* Provided that difficul-

* The following translation is given for the benefit of those who do not understand Latin: "It is easy to go to the D——l, but the D——l to get back again."

ly was gotten over, others would arise on the day of trial. The idea of sitting in judgment on a ghost, might render the members of the Presbytery so *skittish*, as to make it difficult, at times, to form a quorum. Here again are the witnesses, with the pupils of their eyes enlarged, and crying "wo worth the day" that we ever witnessed the will and proved it in court. Waiving all these difficulties, a quorum is formed; the moderator and clerk are chosen, and now the body is prepared for business. While the witnesses and some of the members are looking hither and thither, ready to start at the shaking of a leaf, the accused appears, clothed—not in robes of white, for according to the Presbytery, "he is *guilty of a great sin*"—but in blue black, livid, wan flames, giving the witnesses a torvous glance, which will perchance scatter them like mice. He approaches the moderator, who bids him, with a polite, trembling, wave of the hand, to keep a respectful distance, and fixes on him a glaring look. By this time all the members begin to smell the brimstone, and what now? I guess the clerk, if he has not already made tracks, would record, without motion or second, a *noli prosequi*, and the court would adjourn without waiting for ceremonies—*nemine contra dicente*. I shall oppose the passage of your 2d resolution.

To be serious, I do not wonder, that a Presbytery which would pass your 2d resolution, would attach a saving clause to your 3d, through which Dr. Ely could creep out. I rejoice that you have put in that clause; for, with all his excentricities, I love him; and there is no doubt with me, that, if it be a true characteristic of a Bishop, to be "*given to hospitality*," he has it. And it is much to be regretted, that his departure to Missouri, has left ——— and ——— so exceedingly denuded of that article among the Bishops.

To the spirit of your 5th resolution, I have no objection. Its great defect would be, the almost utter impossibility, of bringing it to bear upon the delinquent.

I have still less objection to the spirit of your 9th resolution, provided the doctrine of amalgamation is not intended by it.

If by the pride and wickedness mentioned in the resolution, you mean that pitiful and contemptible disposition, which would scowl at the idea of sitting in the same church, at the same table, or in the same stage coach, with a member of the body of Christ, merely because the person belonged to the colored race—then, there is no doubt with me, but that our Presbyteries would go heart in hand with you in estimating such an one "*a heathen man and a publican.*"

It is, however, doubtful with me, whether any of our Presbyteries would pass your 9th resolution. Besides deeming it superfluous, I should be afraid to pass it, as it would be an indirect slander on our community. I can speak for myself, and can with truth say, that during 31 years' residence, I have never known in Mississippi or Louisiana, a professor of religion, of any denomination, either so wicked or so proud, as to refuse a seat in the house of God, or at the Lord's table, to any person on account of his color when there was room. Nay, I can say more—I have never known a southern man whether pious or not, that was recognized as a gentleman, or any part of a gentleman, refuse to take his seat in the same stage coach with a man of color, on account of his color. Your 9th resolution has always been, and I hope will ever continue to be adopted by common consent, not by religious societies alone, but by the great mass of the community. And hence, a formal adoption, as it would imply the existence of a contrary spirit, would be viewed as slanderous, and an insult to the good sense of the community.

Your 4th resolution requires a comment; I have therefore reserved it, until I could have briefly disposed of the 3d, 5th, and 9th. Having done so, I will now approach your 4th, viz.:

"Resolved, That to offer a slave his freedom, only on condition that he will leave his country, and go into a foreign land, is unjust and cruel, and ought to subject a church member to censure."

To this resolution I have a most serious objection. Besides, I am utterly astonished, that such a resolution, on the score of consistency, should, at this late period, originate, and be recommended to be adopted by the benevolent and sapient people of Ohio.

I object to the resolution *toto cœlo*. It is evidently a thrust aimed at the American Colonization Society.

I admire the constitution of that Society, although I cannot approve of the conduct and sentiments of some of its officers. I love it, because I find it so perfectly in accordance with the precepts and example of Jesus Christ, and his Apostles. It looks at men, and acts towards them, just as it finds them. It does not stop action, until it finds them actually, what, theoretically, they ought to be. It finds a number of men and women, in the United States, nominally and theoretically free; but it sees, that in reality, they are not free. It finds the fact, that a flat nose, a curled head, and a black skin, has heretofore, and is likely ever hereafter, to keep them in bondage. It is fully aware, that they can never, or, at least, for several generations, hope to obtain that standing in society, that could encourage them to offer as candidates for a seat in the Legislature, for the Bench, or for the Executive Department—however towering their genius—however solid their understanding—however moral their deportment—however prudent, amiable, and humble their conduct—however extensive their fortune—however accomplished their manners—however polished their education—or, however kind their dispositions—yet, the very circumstance, that the African blood flows through their veins, rests like an incubus upon them—pressing them down to the dust—forbidding them to lift the eye of hope, higher than the mere footstool of honor, and imperatively saying unto them, “hitherto shall ye go, and no farther.”

The Colonization Society observing the fact, does not foolishly, and stupidly, and inefficiently, spend its energies, in theorizing on the subject; vainly hoping by ingenious and unwarrantable arguments, to control the boisterous winds and proud waves of prejudice. NO—But like a kind deliverer, it reaches a helping hand, to transport all that are willing, and all to whom is offered the alternative of *freedom* or slavery, to a land where the African can lift up his head, and raise up his eye, and shake himself of the dust—To a land where no insuperable obstacle prevents him from climbing up the steep of honor, and taking his seat calmly in the most honorable and responsible chair in his country.

Your resolution objects to his leaving his country, and going into a foreign land. Do you mean, by *his country*, the place where he was born and raised? Or do you mean the whole of the United States to be comprised in the term, *his country*? and Africa the *foreign land*? If you mean, by his country, the place where he was offered his freedom, it is my impression, that our Presbyteries will decline adopting the resolution, on the ground, that we would be unwilling to throw any obstacle in the way of any of our members, emancipating their slaves, if they were so disposed, and were satisfied that they would ameliorate their condition, by so doing; and as personal security is required of the emancipated for their good behavior, and as masters who know slaves, are generally too cautious to risk becoming security for their good behavior, the adoption of your resolution, by us, would, indeed, be a very serious impediment, to slaves obtaining their freedom at all. This backwardness to become security, although it may appear, to the ignorant and inexperienced, to result from a want of tender feeling; we know, and are confident, by observation and experience, that it is the result of genuine prudence.

I expressed my astonishment, that you, in Ohio, should originate such a resolution. Charity, however, which “believeth all things,” ought, perhaps, to do away my astonishment, at your manufacturing the resolution. The same charity, which “hopeth all things,” would incline me to hope, that a very—very great change had taken place in public feeling, in favor of the people of color, in Ohio. I for one rejoice in the hope. But still, I must confess, that I, and many of our people here, have not obtained that perfection of charity, which “endureth all things.” Hence,

we could not *endure* to emancipate any of our slaves, with a view to send them to Ohio, unless we desired to punish them, as malefactors. For, with all the hope that your resolution may be calculated to inspire, and all the deep interest, indicated by your whole letter, in behalf of colored people, we would not *endure* to emancipate our slaves, for whose happiness we feel a deep interest, with a view to go among your philanthropic people, until the fact was blotted from our memory, and buried, to us, in the tomb of forgetfulness, of your State's forcing and driving, into the cold, bleak, inhospitable climate of Canada, so many poor, defenceless, houseless, homeless, people of color, to endure the merciless blasts of the winter storms. We would prefer the *heinous, sinful, and scandalous* situation, of keeping them plentifully fed, warmly clad, and comfortably housed, even if they were obliged to put up with the horrible thought, of being, for life, under the control of SINNERS and MONSTERS, who, notwithstanding, would never fail to provide for them such comforts.

Or, we would prefer to send them, as a condition of emancipation, to a genial climate, where winter storms, drifting snows, and pelting hail, would not compel them to give up the ghost—to the land of their ancestors, where they could live to a good old age, and at last descend in peace into the tombs of their fathers.

I stated, that I admire the Colonization Society, but do not approve of the sentiments and conduct, of some of its officers. I love consistency, however scarce that article may be with myself. If a man professes to be a Presbyterian, an Episcopalian, a Methodist, &c., I dislike to hear from him sentiments, and to see in his actions which are at variance with the constitution of the society to which he belongs, or in whose service he has voluntarily engaged.

The II article of the constitution of the American Colonization Society, says—“The object to which its attention is to be *exclusively* directed, is to promote and execute a plan, for colonizing, (with their consent,) the free people of color,” &c.

Here we find the object is, “to promote and execute a plan”—for what? To continue slavery? No—To abolish it gradually or immediately? No—To influence the minds of masters, never to emancipate? No—To persuade them to do it? No—For what, then? Simply, for “colonizing the free people of color”—Without their consent? No—but, “with their consent.” May not the society have other objects, besides that of colonizing? No—because we see that colonizing is to be “**EXCLUSIVELY**” the object. The constitution excludes all other objects. It does not say, it shall be, (indefinitely,) *an* object, but, (definitely,) *the* object. Hence, the constitution confines the members and officers of the society, (inasmuch as the members and officers are the society,) to the simple plain object of colonizing. As men, and as members of other societies, they are free to act, and to have emancipation, or abolition, or the reverse of both, as their objects; but, as members of the Colonization Society, they are limited to one object, *to the exclusion of all other objects.*

Men never engage in an enterprise, without motives. A number of men may engage, unitedly, in the same enterprize, with very different motives. I am not, like Judge Jay, for discouraging people from doing good, for fear they may not have the same motives, for doing good, that I have. One may be a member of the Colonization Society, because he thinks it will abolish slavery, and cut the throats of the southern *two legged wolves*—Another, because he thinks it will gradually abolish slavery, and save the throats of slaveholders, but reduce them to poverty—Another will be a member, because he thinks it will help him to tyrannize over his slaves, by removing the example of the free people of color—And another, (and I hope that his company will be the largest,) will be a member, simply, because it enables the nominally, but not really, free man of color, “with his own consent,” to become in reality free.

My objection to some of the members and officers of the society, is, that they harp on a motive, while acting as officers, that is likely to be offensive to some of its members.

The Abolition Society, whose object is to abolish slavery, charges on the Colonization Society, that *its* object is to continue slavery. To this charge, an officer of the latter society, to purge it of the charge, says, speaking to abolitionists—"Our object is the same"—that is, to *abolish slavery*; but, differing, simply, as to the mode. Thus, I have observed, that the burden of many of the publications, in the African Repository, is, how much the society has done, and is doing, towards the grand object of emancipation. It is so much filled with such stuff, that a stranger would be persuaded, in the absence of the constitution, that the society was an emancipating society, rather than a colonizing one.

If this be the society, let the constitution avow it; but, if it be, as the constitution says it is, exclusively colonizing, as to its object, let not the Repository slander it, by inadvertently, or designedly, giving it the aspect, of having the joint object of emancipation and colonization.

The object of Christ and his Apostles is one—viz: ameliorating the condition of the whole human family. They keep this one object in view, without turning aside to enslave or emancipate, except from the bondage of Satan, who, Christ knew, would never make a good master. But as man was capable of being wrought upon for good, man might be made good as a master—consequently, where man was the master, instead of an effort to rescue from him his slaves, the effort was, to make the master good, and then slavery was of too little consequence to be noticed; because, generally, instead of being a curse, it would prove to be a blessing.

The object of colonization is one. It is an effort, by which, it is hoped, the condition of the free colored people of the United States, will be ameliorated. Let the society, after the example of Christ and his Apostles, not turn aside from the *one object*, and then we will hope, that "Prayer and consistent effort, will bring to its aid the resources of *Omnipotence*."

From what I have remarked on your 4th resolution, you, no doubt, will readily perceive, that I shall be very far from voting for its passage, in the Amite Presbytery.

SECTION X.

I will now, according to promise, take up your 8th resolution, which reads as follows:

"Resolved, That any member of our Church, who shall advocate or speak in favor of such laws as have been, or may yet be enacted, for the purpose of keeping the slaves in ignorance, and preventing them from learning to read the word of God, is guilty of a great sin, and ought to be dealt with as for other scandalous crimes."

Your object for passing the above resolution, on your part, I cannot comprehend. I see no necessity for it, as I presume you have, in Ohio, neither slaves nor laws, such as are referred to in the resolution, unless you have, among you, "busy bodies in other men's matters." I take it, therefore, to be intended for persons and laws in slaveholding States, and proposed for our approbation.

If the object of the resolution is, to disapprove of laws passed, with the avowed, or the intended purpose, of fostering ignorance of the word of God, among any part of the community, I might remark about this resolution, as about your 9th, that it would imply a slander, as it respects the mass of community. I will not vouch for such a law, as preventing to read the word of God, by the Catholic laity, not being

passed by the Pope, and administered by the Priests. But I can vouch for the Legislatures of Mississippi and Louisiana, so far as I have ever learned, that such a *scandalous law was never passed, nor proposed to be passed.*

There are, however, laws existing in both States, accompanied with heavy penal sanctions, prohibiting the teaching of slaves to read, and meeting the approbation of the religious part of the reflecting community; but, passed, as I presume, from motives very different from those implied in the resolution—passed to meet the exigency of the case, and which, no doubt, would be unanimously repealed, to the great joy of all, as it would render the religious instructions of slaves, less laborious—provided the causes of their passage were removed.

The passage of those laws, however hard their bearing on slaves, are a necessary effect, produced, as might have been foreseen, from an adequate cause. Causes, you know, will produce their effects, and these effects produce other effects, so that the first effect, becomes the immediate cause of the second, while the first cause becomes a step remote from the second effect. “The cause of the cause, is the cause of the thing caused.”

The laws preventing slaves from learning to read, are a fruitful source of much ignorance and immorality among slaves. The printing, publishing, and circulating, abolition and emancipating principles in those States, were the cause of the passage of the laws. The ignorance and immorality, occasioned by the laws, must, legitimately, be saddled on the laws, as the effect must be saddled on the cause.—But the laws themselves are an *effect!* Where, then, must *they* be saddled, with all the accumulated weight of guilt, but upon the cause?—even upon the back of abolitionists and emancipators. Upon whom, now, will they saddle *them*, legitimately? If you will allow me to answer this question, I will answer by saying, upon such great and good men as John Wesley, Jonathan Edwards, Bishop Porteus, Pauley, Horsley, Scott, Clarke, Wilberforce, Sharp, Clarkson, Fox, Johnson, Burke, and, (I will not, like Judge Jay, disgrace the list, by adding Daniel O’Connell, a pensioned slanderer,) a host of as good, if not equally great men of later date—say some of the aged in the Chillicothe Presbytery—who, without carefully examining the word of God, have concluded, that it is a true maxim, that “*slavery is in itself sinful.*” Others, without observing or remembering, that “great men are not always wise,” never examined the scriptures for themselves, but followed in the wake, being the smoothest sailing—until, at last, men in our day, have become, what the Apostle cautions them not to be, “the servants of men,” and ready, and willing to receive and teach “the commandments of men,” their masters. Men, then, who will thus act, must not complain, when they are obliged, legitimately, to place the saddle on their own folly, in being the slaves of men. Pardon me, for shewing this to be the disposition of an abolitionist. In the meantime, let the primary cause be removed, and the repeal of the offensive laws will follow, and then will arise a cheering prospect, when the effects of the laws will cease.

So astonishingly hard are men, fettered down, without their own consciousness, with the chains of mental slavery, that it often requires years to file them off, and sometimes they are never broken. I ought to say, hammer them—for it is the word of God alone, that can break their chains in pieces.

You would condemn a christian, according to the spirit of your resolution, who would approve of the laws of the slaveholding States, in relation to teaching slaves to read. You would, nevertheless, approve of laws, which would foster ignorance of transactions in brothel houses—ignorance of Paines Age of Reason—of Godwins Rights of Women, and ignorance of all books and tracts, that turned the word of God and his ordinances into ridicule. This kind of ignorance, you would encourage among the charge committed to your trust.

Suppose I possessed a godly portion of talents and influence, and a high share, by nature, of the tender sympathies, and these heightened by grace; and my residence should, perchance, happen to be, where I frequently saw parents, so devoid of natural affection, that they exercised on their children, the most horrid cruelties,

turning them with a bleeding heart, to other families; and should witness a repetition of similar cruelties, until I found, that with scarcely an exception, "destruction was in all their border;" suppose then I should conclude, and very properly too, that the God of heaven could never sanction such cruelties, and that there ought to be a change. This is all very correct. But a suggestion would be made to my mind, addressed to my sympathetic feelings, that the condition of children would be greatly ameliorated, by being separated from their parents; and this suggestion, I would be very far from supposing to be made by a seducing spirit.

I would be naturally disposed to act on the suggestion; but, being alone, I would converse with a few choice spirits. They would become enlisted, and, in their turn, would enlist others; and these, enlisting a third, until I was able to form a respectable society. Before this society each member would produce a statistical account of the cruelties of parents, that would, in reality shock the whole meeting, until every feeling was excited to the highest pitch.

In this situation, it would be suggested, to one of the old and influential men, that the laws, by which the parents were vested with absolute control over their children, were exceedingly oppressive, and a heinous sin and scandal; and, in confirmation of this suggestion, the statistical accounts of the cruelties, already read, would be presented.

I can conceive of the father rising from his seat, with the briny water running down his furrowed cheeks, and, in consequence of the rush through his whole system, which his blood made, in obedience to his feelings, he felt and assumed the erectness and vigor of youth, and said:

"My friends, I verily perceive, that abolishing the control of parents over their children, would be doing God service; for, besides what you have heard, you know, that according to the existing state of things, if the parents choose, they can prevent them from being taught to read the word of God—from attending the sanctuary—from respecting the Sabbath—and from hearing the word preached. In a word, they are subject to their arbitrary will, and despotic sway—And, besides, they have no chance for trial, appeal, or redress, for 21 years; and that, the most precious, sweet, and interesting time of life—the very time, when the whole character of the man is mainly formed—This time, when the balance of their days, is to be joyful or sorrowful, according to the foundation laid, during this interesting period. And shall we, unfeelingly, and without action, look on, and not come to the rescue?—Forbid it, heaven! Put forth your energies; write, speak, preach, publish, and proclaim your testimony against it. What does the Lord say, by his Prophet? "Is not this the feast that I have chosen? to loose the bonds of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and to break every yoke?" Of what avail is it, that the oppressed go free, the balance of their lives, when they are ruined by the arbitrary control of their parents, in the previous period of life? It is this wretched tyranny, that ruins our peace. It is like an incubus upon the poor suffering youth. The Church cannot prosper, while this Achan is in the camp. Do parents like to be under arbitrary government? Do they like to be under the absolute control of any? Are not all "men born equally free?"—Are they, in the first instance, doing unto their children, as they would that other people should do unto them? When all men are born equally free, what right have they to deprive them of their freedom, for 21 years?—Arise in the majesty of your strength, gird on your armor—cease not to "undo the heavy burden" of parental authority, until you "let the oppressed go free"—stay not your hand, until you "break every yoke."—If you meet opposition from parents, you may be sure that they are monsters, tyrants, robbers—robbing their children, without their consent, of that freedom wherewith they were born.—I say, again come to the rescue; and remember, that whosoever holdeth back, will meet with a curse—nay, remember, also, that he who cometh, must come speedily—must come heartily, for "cursed is he that doeth the work of the Lord deceitfully, and cursed is he that withholdeth his hand from shedding blood."

Under a speech, of which the above is hardly a synopsis, you can conceive of the excitement of the meeting.

Under this excitement, resolutions are formed. The flame spreads. It is nourished by the tenderest sympathies of the heart. It becomes popular—The youth and the aged join to cherish the flame. Here and there, however, a few cool heads will, now and then, venture to say, that it is the constitution of Heaven, that parents should have the control of their children. They are immediately answered—It is blasphemy—Does God sanction tyranny, cruelty, and oppression? It is again replied, that God commands children, as he does [doulou] slaves, to obey. It is answered—True, and so do we at present, and never intended otherwise; but, is it, from this fact, to be inferred, that God sanctions a situation, where a being created in his own image, shall not, for 21 years of the most interesting part of his life, have the privilege of a trial, appeal, or redress?—With such arguments, is the objector put down, and his name cast out as evil.

Suppose that this state of feeling should exist for more than a century, until it had obtained the written sanction of many of the aged, the great, and the good.—Suppose, for its support, societies were multiplied—Suppose an American Society was formed, for the express purpose of abolishing parental authority, to which the others were auxiliary. Suppose, that, at first, these societies aimed only at gradually emancipating children from the control of their parents—going on with an insinuating progress, until many of the parents that had children, were, some half, and some wholly persuaded, that it was, in itself sinful, to control their children.—Still from the knowledge they had of their children, they could see, that to send them adrift into the world, would ruin them; and, not to send them away, or free them, was a very great sin.

Suppose, now, that a legion of Monks, as numerous as Gog and Magog, who never had, never expected to have, and owing, perhaps, to some physical necessity, never *could* have children, were to march forth in the enterprize of doing away parental authority—Suppose they had got enlisted, in the enterprise, editors and papers bearing the name of *religious*—Suppose that they had acquired such weight of influence, among all religious editors, that if they did not publish for them, they would occupy neutral ground—Suppose they had gotten editors, indeed all religious editors, in the United States, to occupy with them the one common ground or maxim, that parental authority, was sinful, and ought to be abolished; but some of them differing, simply, as to the mode of doing it away.

Suppose, now, they could prevail on Presbyteries, Conferences, Associations, and General Assemblies, on the same *maxim*, to pass resolutions, to exclude, as speedily as might be prudent, the crying sin of parental authority from the bosom of the Church.—Suppose, also, they should call on the councils of the nation, by petition after petition, to abolish it in the District where the council sat.

Suppose, withal, they should send a host of young preachers, into whose minds they had infused their principles, among people or parents, who had children under their absolute control; and these young preachers would happen to find it very convenient to have children under their own controul also; not, however, without a great deal of wriggling, and twisting, and turning, and compromising, with their conscience, on the subject—Sometimes braving the clamors of conscience—Sometimes compromising with it—Sometimes pleading necessity for the insults—Sometimes, while conscience would tell them, that they were exercising parental authority, whether it was done by themselves, or by the overseers they placed over their children, they would commence, and come down on conscience, with fine spun threads of metaphysics, putting them like cob-webs, over his eyes, and stuffing his mouth, until he could be prevailed upon to depart, but not in peace, nor half satisfied. After a little pause, till he had rubbed the metaphysical film from his eyes, and unstopped his mouth, he would return, and say, "He that sinneth is of the Devil"—"Thou art the man"—Thou knowest, that thou art daily in the practice of that which is in itself sinful.—Thus, he is tormented by day and by night. He

prays then, most heartily, and lulls conscience, but clings to sin. Still he will not consent to send his children adrift.

Leaving these—who are identified with the community of parents, but who, nevertheless, by their whining, lugubrious ditties, over the sinfulness of parental authority, are troubling their own and the minds of other parents; and children, catching the spirit, begin to be restive—they proceed to send out those true to the faith. They circulate their pamphlets, and preach their doctrines, regardless whether children hear them or not. And why should they be afraid to preach the truth before children? “Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel unto every creature.” Why not preach it to children? Are not all parents who do not send their children adrift, thieves, robbers, tyrants, monsters, oppressors, and sinners, because they do not emancipate their children?

In this situation parents become restless, and children are catching the flame.—They are becoming more and more disobedient. The reins of government have to be tightened—A more absolute control has to be used—oftentimes severe corrections. We, and our whole legion, are more and more at work. We send spies among the unsuspecting parents. They bring, or send us statistics, not of the insubordination and rebellion of children, caused by our doctrines, but of the cruelties of parents—some true, and some untrue. We publish those accounts, and send them among the parents, hoping that the children, will, by some means, get hold of them.

Suppose, now, that parents saw, what, unless mentally blind, they could not help seeing, that their children would be ruined, for time and eternity, if they had access to our publications and imbibed our gospel, as it was calculated to close and forever bar the door of usefulness, against parents. It is not surprising, then, if they should meet and consult what must be done, in the present crisis. The conclusion is, to refer the subject to men chosen by themselves, who, they believed, had the spirit of wisdom and prudence.

These meet, and they take the subject seriously and solemnly into consideration. On the one hand, they perceive, that if their children had access to our doctrines, they were ruined forever—to let them have access to them was unavoidable, if they taught them to read. To prevent their being taught to read, was cruel, and would prevent them from obtaining as much knowledge of the laws of heaven, as otherwise they might enjoy. In this sad dilemma, sitting and consulting, in a legislative capacity, they must, of two evils, choose the least. With indignant feelings towards us, who, under the influence of “seducing spirits,” had sent, and were sending among them “doctrines of devils,” but with aching hearts towards their children, they resolved that their children should not be taught to read, until the storm should be overblown; hoping that Satan’s being let loose, will be but for a little season. And during this season, they will have to teach them orally, and thereby guard against their being contaminated by our wicked doctrines.

Suppose, now, on learning that such preventive laws had been passed, that we, still filled with the incurable conceit, that we, who had no children, knew better than their own parents, what regulations to make for the advantage, honor, and happiness of children and parents; and, withal, conceited with a notion, equally incurable, that we loved other people’s children, better than their own parents loved them. Now, if we could prevail on Presbyteries, (as I have supposed above,) composed of such Monks as ourselves, to conceit that parents could have no higher nor better motive, in the passage of the preventive laws, than the wanton purpose of fostering ignorance, it would not then be difficult to prevail on these same Presbyteries, so constituted, to pass, however ridiculous, the two following resolutions, viz:

6. Resolved, That when a *parent* advertises a reward for his *child* that has run-away from him, against whom no other crime is alleged than escaping from his *father*, he [the father] “is guilty of a scandalous sin, and forfeits his right to the sealing ordinances of God’s house.”

7. Resolved, That to apprehend a child, who is endeavoring to escape from subjection to his *father*, with a view to restore him to his *parents*, "is a direct violation of the Divine Law; and when committed by a member of the Church, ought to subject him to censure."

Suppose, then, that, besides adopting it ourselves, we should recommend to Presbyteries, composed of fathers, whose legislative wisdom had adopted the preventive laws, to adopt, most prayerfully the following resolution, viz:

8. Resolved, "That any member of the Church, who shall advocate or speak in favor of such laws as have been, or may yet be enacted, for the purpose of keeping their children in ignorance, and preventing them from reading the word of God, is guilty of a great sin, and ought to be dealt with as for other scandalous crimes."

Is it now probable that the parents, who knew their own motives, and who felt that they were most painfully, and reluctantly driven, by us, to the direful necessity of passing the preventive laws mentioned, would now consent most prayerfully, to pass a resolution, ascribing to themselves motives of the basest kind, merely, because a Monkish sett, the authors of all their troubles, and the fruitful source of all their own, and the calamities of their children, seemed to be sincerely persuaded, that parental authority was a curse, and that to remove it, the "resources of Omnipotence would be called to aid." To calmly calculate that parents, whom we consider to be thieves, robbers, and monsters, will hope, that the proposed resolutions for their adoption, is short of adding insult to injury, is calmly to calculate, that thieves, robbers, and monsters—nay, scandalous sinners, have that perfection of charity, "which endureth all things, is not easily provoked, and thinketh no evil." These parents cannot comprehend, how these Monks exercise that charity "which rejoices not in iniquity, but rejoices in the truth," when we call on them, as in the last resolution to resolve a lie. For the 8th resolution recognizes no other motive for passing the preventive laws, but a sheer wanton love of ignorance of the word of God.

Should it be insinuated, that the Legislatures of Mississippi and Louisiana, enacted laws to fester ignorance, or to keep any human being ignorant of the word of God, I, who have lived in these States upwards of thirty years, would risk nothing in unhesitatingly pronouncing it a *base slander*.

These Legislatures, however, in view of the "WEEPING, AND WAILING, AND GNASHING OF TEETH," of northern abolitionists, and in view of the *anti-scriptural doctrines*, which they were publishing and circulating, with a zeal worthy of a better cause, have enacted laws, with heavy penal sanctions, for the purpose, not, as basely represented, for keeping the slaves in ignorance of the word of God, but for keeping them ignorant of *anti-scriptural doctrines*—Doctrines, which, however dressed and decorated with the garb of ecclesiastical sanctity, and plausible, but spurious sympathy, are, nevertheless, like the blasting mildew, withering and blighting every growing and flourishing vine, in our beloved country.

The same motives, which would lead the Chillicothe Presbytery to pass laws, to ward off, by ignorance, from the chaste and stainless females committed to their pastoral care, the defiling influence of Godwin's Rights of Women, have led the Legislatures of the Southern States, as faithful pastors, to adopt preventive measures, to ward off the kindred and no less deleterious effects of abolition and emancipating doctrines. I say, *abolition and emancipating*—for, as Dr. Proudfit, Secretary of the New York Colonization Society, very justly remarks, "they are one in object," differing, merely, in the mode of accomplishing that object.

Abolitionists are aiming, with one swoop, to destroy their prey, while *emancipators*, more insinuating, prefer to cut its throat gradually. The object of neither emancipators nor abolitionists, is to make the masters better, by getting the Gospel to bear upon them, and thus ameliorate the condition of slaves, like Christ and his

Apostles, but to run beyond them, and, if possible double distance them, on the field of christian improvement.

As a Presbyterian minister, I have another, and a very important objection, to your 8th resolution. It is, in my estimation, as *anti-Presbyterian*, as your maxim is *anti-scriptural*.

From the words of the resolution itself, it is not easy to see its political bearing; but when taken, and placed in juxta-position, with the remarks of your Presbyterian, on our political relations, in the latter part of your letter, and your two suppositions, made as explanatory of your views, it is clear, that you intend to hold forth the idea, that the constitutions and laws of the southern States, which admit of the existence of slavery, are anti-scriptural, and notoriously wicked: for you make the supposition, of government protecting, by law, the grossest idolatry, &c.; and that southern ministers and christians, are not bound to respect them.

It is a very just remark, in your letter, that "slavery is involved in our political relations," meaning either the south, or the whole of the United States. The guarantee of the right which a master has to his slave, as his property, is made and secured to him, not by ecclesiastical, but by political bodies. The latter bodies, alone, have the power, and it is in their province, alone, to interfere, or meddle with that right.

Ecclesiastical and political bodies, are recognized, by the excellent constitution of the Presbyterian Church, in the United States, as two distinct bodies, each operating within its own sphere, attending to all the business falling naturally within their respective limits. It is a rule, recognized by our constitution, that it is disorderly to be "busy bodies in other men's matters"—equally applicable to civil and religious bodies, as to private individuals. Civil bodies are of this world—that is, it is their province, to make regulations for the different relations of this world. It is the province of ecclesiastical bodies, to attend to Christ's kingdom, which is not of this world—To carry out the regulations, Christ has prepared to their hand. In a word, to render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's.

Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies, are ecclesiastical bodies in the Presbyterian Church. As slavery is a civil relation, I lay it down as a position, That an interference or intermeddling with that relation, by any of those bodies, is a sin against *Presbyterianism*. Having taken the affirmative, the burden of proof then, falls on me.

I will not shrink from the task, by requiring you to prove the negative. This would be as unfair, as it would be for you, who would lay down the position that slavery is a sin, to require me to prove the negative, or that slavery is not a sin.

I will make one more remark, and then seize the oar. It is this: that I will not rest my proof on what different Assemblies, Synods, or Presbyteries have done, nor on the authority of great names, nor on the philosophy of the subject; nor on inferences drawn from the reasonableness, or unreasonableness of it. If I were obliged to filtrate the truth of my position from such sources, I should be as backward to say, that intermeddling with slavery, by ecclesiastical bodies, is a sin against Presbyterianism, as I think you ought to be, to say that slavery is a sin, when you have to filter it from the general law of doing unto others as we would that they should do unto us, in such a manner as to require more ingenuity than has fallen to your lot, or the lot of Young men in Kentucky, to keep from reproaching the conduct of Christ and his Apostles.

Now to the oar—and it is not a laboring one. I need only quote the XXXI chapter of the Confession of Faith of our Church, 4th section—viz:—"Synods and Councils are to *handle or conclude nothing, but that which is ecclesiastical*; and are NOT TO INTERMEDDLE WITH CIVIL AFFAIRS, WHICH CONCERN THE COMMONWEALTH, unless by way of humble petition, in cases extraordinary, or by way of advice for satisfaction of conscience, if they be thereunto required by the civil magistrate."

To evade this, there is no dodging—unless you claim slavery as an ecclesiastical affair. This I do not suppose you are willing to do, as you conceive it to be so very filthy a thing. Then slavery is, in the language of the constitution of the Presbyterian Church, a *civil affair*, with which Synods and Councils are not to intermeddle. Thus, according to my position, intermeddling with slavery, by Presbyteries, (being Councils,) is a *sin against Presbyterianism*. “*Quod erat demonstrandum.*”

Thus you see, that the constitution of the Church, to which you and I belong, debars us as Presbyteries, from interference with the subject. It is not, therefore, probable, that, in the absence of other difficulties, the Amite Presbytery will consent to pass your resolution—unless they forget that each of them, at their licence and ordination, with the solemnity of an oath, have “sincerely received and adopted the Confession of Faith, as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures,” which it is not probable they will.

After all that I have quoted, from the constitution of the Church, you will, perhaps, quote to me the decision of the General Assembly of 1818, to establish both the sinfulness of slavery, and the constitutionality of interfering with it. But you ought not, unless you give the acts of the Assembly the precedence of the constitution. The section of the constitution, immediately preceding the one I have quoted, authorises the calling in question, the correctness of the Assembly’s decision. The section is as follows :

“ALL Synods and Councils, since the Apostle’s time, whether general or particular, may err, and *many have erred*; therefore, *they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice*, but to be used as a help in both.” Besides, chapter I, section 4, prohibits, from any quarter, an addition to the “counsel of God,” as a church regulation, unless that addition “may be deduced from scripture, by good and necessary consequence.”

Now, if the General Assembly of 1818, by “*good and necessary consequence*,” in the face of all the scriptures I have produced, and of many more, can deduce the sinfulness of slavery, and can deduce, “*as a good and necessary consequence*,” from the 4th section of the XXXI chapter of the constitution, which I have quoted, that their interference with slavery, (a “*civil affair*,”) is constitutional. Then, you must permit me, respectfully, to suggest an amendment to the 3d section of the XXXI chapter of the constitution, that it may read thus:—“All Synods or Councils, since the Apostle’s time, whether general or particular, may not err, and never have erred; therefore, they are to be made the rule of faith and practice, and not to be used only as a help in both.” I would suggest also, a similar alteration to be made, on the XX chapter, section 2d:—“God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it *free from the doctrines and commandments of men*, which are in any thing contrary to his word, or beside it, in matters of practice or worship.”

SECTION XI.

I have now finished my review of your letter; and I am persuaded, that even your whole Presbytery will yield,

1. That the sinfulness of slavery, in the absence of scripture testimony, is not a matter of *belief*, but simply a matter of *opinion*, which is not predicated on testimony, but upon the higher probabilities, from the word of God.

2. That the higher probabilities, as presented in this review, are more against, than in favor of your maxim,

3. That, as your maxim is an affirmative one, instead of calling upon slaveholders, to prove the negative, you are bound, so far as the subject is an important one, to prove, from direct scripture testimony, or, in the absence of this, from the higher probabilities, predicated upon the Holy Scriptures, that slavery is a sin. And,

4. That, on failing to comply with the third, you are, at least, bound to pause; and, lest you be found fighting against God, to consider, whether, either the immediate or gradual emancipation of slaves, is the legitimate and Apostolic course to be pursued to ameliorate their condition; especially, as there is, happily, as I trust, between northern and southern christians, a perfect and entire union, *on one point*, viz:—the removal of the evils incident, not only to slavery, but to all the relations of life.

That it is important to put the truth of the abolition maxim to the *scriptural test*, will appear evident, from the fact, that it lies at the foundation, and constitutes the main and only pillar, of the whole abolition fabric. To shew that this is the fact, permit me to introduce a quotation, from the book of the present acknowledged, intellectual generalissimo and commander in chief, of the abolition army, in the United States—viz:—"In order to judge of the fitness of the *objects* contemplated by the [American Anti-slavery] society, we must first inquire into the soundness of the *principles* by which they are recommended." (*Objects and principles* are italicised by himself.) "*The first great principle of the society, and, indeed, the one from which all the others are deduced, is the SINFULNESS OF SLAVERY.*"*

I am truly astonished that so great a man as Judge Jay, and such great Young men as are in Kentucky, should, instead of applying to the scriptures, to prove the soundness of the maxim, labor to prove, that, because evils are incident to slavery, therefore slavery is sin. If this is a legitimate mode of reasoning, who could fail to prove, that "forbidding to marry," was a doctrine of God, instead of being, as the Apostle says, a "doctrine of devils."

Who that has been much in the world, and witnessed the moroseness, bitterness, turbulence, tyranny, crossness, asperity, and ill nature of husbands, but could collect a statistical account, without magnifying, of the evils which wives are obliged to suffer, without trial or redress, and hindered by the customs of society, from the poor privilege of *even complaining* of their wrongs—that would wring tears from almost a heart of stone?—Are we then to conclude, that matrimony is a sin, because it is abused by such monsters? Nay, are all those who do not arrive at, nor admit, the legitimacy of such a conclusion, to be marked as unfeeling advocates of cruelty, and blasphemy?

The evils of matrimony, consist not in the relation of husband and wife, but in the neglect of the duties suspended on the relation, and in overt acts against the relation—So also of the relation of parent and child. We never think of destroying, or abolishing a relation, for which the scriptures have made express provision, by clear and palpable regulations, in order to free the world from the evils, incident to that relation.

Although the Romans were, such as Paul described them to be, "without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful," and although children frequently suffered such cruelties as parents would inflict, who were void of natural affection, implacable, unmerciful—and although husbands were "wicked, deceitful, despitetul, proud, covenant breakers," and wives subject to the cruelties of such tempers, yet, neither Christ nor his Apostles, thought fit to prescribe abolition, as a legitimate course, to remove those evils. Indeed, the Apostle Paul, aware of the seductive arguments that would be used in favor of abolition—Arguments addressed to the sympathies of christians, pointing to the wretched condition of females, who were controlled

* See Judge Jay's Inquiry, page 128.

and wantonly abused, by their tyrannical, deceitful, spiteful husbands—Aware, also, that honest christians, would swallow such arguments, warns them solemnly, that “forbidding to marry,” however plausible and seductive, was, nevertheless, a doctrine of the Devil. So in like manner, although slavery, among the Romans, was marked as has been shewn, with the most unparalleled cruelties, and although the number of sufferers, was twenty four to where there is now one in the United States, and, although the masters were, such as Paul describes, yet, abolition or emancipation, was *not* the mode prescribed by Christ or his Apostles to get rid of the evils of slavery.

It is indeed worth while, to test the maxim by the word of God. I can admit no other test, so long as I hold, in common with all genuine Presbyterians, that it is the *ONLY* infallible rule of faith and practice. If I were convinced, by that word, that slavery itself is a sin, I trust, that, let it cost what it would, I should be an abolitionist; because, there is no truth more clear to my mind, than that the Gospel requires an immediate abandonment of sin. “This night thy soul may be required of thee!” And, as it is the legitimate tendency of the Gospel, to abolish *all sin* from the world, then, if slavery be a sin, it is plain and clear to my mind, that to abolish slavery, is the legitimate tendency of the Gospel.

From the views which I have given, in this work, you perceive, that it is neither my belief nor opinion, that slavery is any more a sin, than is the relation of parent and child. I do not, however, mean that the two relations are precisely alike, any more than the relation of husband and wife, are precisely like either. It is not necessary, in order to be analagous, that things should be *precisely* alike. Christ says—“My sheep hear my voice.” Here his children are compared to sheep. Their defence is in their shepherd—they are innocent and offending; so far they are alike—but his children are not quadrupeds, neither are they covered with wool—they are not *precisely* like sheep. Children and servants are alike, in being provided for—in being under the control, and sharing the regard of the same individual; but unlike, in, one being emancipated at the age of twenty one, and the other not at all—unlike, also, in the quantum of regard and consanguinity, &c.

If I believed, or was of opinion, that it was the legitimate tendency of the Gospel to abolish slavery, how would I approach a man, possessing as many slaves as Abraham had, and tell him I wished to obtain his permission to preach to his slaves?

Suppose the man to be ignorant of the Gospel, and that he would inquire of me, what was my object? I would tell him candidly, (and every minister ought to be candid,) that I wished to preach the Gospel, because its legitimate tendency is to make his slaves honest, trusty, and faithful; not serving “with eye service, as men pleasers,” “not purloining, but shewing all good fidelity.” And is this, he would ask, really the tendency of the Gospel? I would answer, yes. Then I might expect, that a man who had a thousand slaves, if he believed me, would not only permit me to preach to his slaves, but would do more. He would be willing to build me a house, furnish me a garden, and ample provision for a support. Because, he would conclude, *verily*, that this preacher would be worth more to him, than a dozen overseers. But, suppose, then, he would tell me, that he had understood, that the tendency of the Gospel was to abolish slavery, and inquire of me if that was the fact. Ah! this is the rub. He has now cornered me. What shall I say? Shall I, like a dishonest man, twist and dodge, and shift and turn, to evade an answer? No. I must, Kentuckian like, come out, *broad flat footed*, and tell him, that *abolition is the tendency of the Gospel*. What am I now to calculate upon? I have told the man, that it is the tendency of the Gospel, to make him so poor, as to oblige him to take hold of the maul and wedge himself—he must catch, curry, and saddle his own horse—He must black his own *brogans*, (for he will not be able to buy boots)—His wife must go, herself, to the wash tub—take hold of the scrubbing broom, wash the pots and cook, all that she and her rail mauler will eat.

Query. Is it to be expected, that a master, ignorant heretofore, of the tendency of the Gospel, would fall so desperately in love with it, from a knowledge of its tendency, that he would encourage the preaching of it among his slaves? Verily, NO.

But, suppose when he put the last question to me, as to its tendency, I *could*, and *would*, without a twist or quibble, tell him, *plainly* and *candidly*, that it was a slander on the Gospel, to say, that emancipation or abolition, was its legitimate tendency. I would tell him, that the commandments of *some* men, and not the commandments of God, made slavery a sin; and from this was deduced, legitimately, that it was the tendency of such commandments, to produce emancipation and abolition. And I would tell him, in the mean time, that Jesus Christ says—“In vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.”—I would tell him farther, that such was the tendency of the Gospel, on slaves, that, instead of producing discontentment with their own condition, and serving their master grudgingly, they would, so far as they were influenced by Gospel principles, be content, care nothing for slavery, feel willing to “count their own masters worthy of all honor;” and would do all their services “heartily, as unto the Lord, and not unto men.” I would tell him, that it was possible, and not at all improbable, that such good conduct, on the part of many of his slaves, might gain so much on his love and esteem, as cheerfully and freely to emancipate them, if he thought it was doing them a reciprocal good office—and that in so doing, he was not at all at variance with gospel principles. But, that if he apprehended, that emancipation, instead of ameliorating the condition of any one of his slaves, would injure him, the Gospel condemned his conduct, as much as if he emancipated his son, at ten or twelve years of age, and sent him adrift into the world, without a guardian, and in full possession of his legacy.

Doulos and oiketes, are the Greek terms, used in the New Testament, to express the condition of the Roman slaves, whether their term of service was limited or unlimited. Doulos is the term used, when there is a contrast made, by the Apostle Paul, between bond and free. Doulos is also the term used to designate the servant of God and Christ. In a word, it is the term used to convey the idea, of one bound to comply, whether willingly or unwillingly, with the expressed will of another. What is slavery, but this obligation of the slave to obey the dictum of his master?

Is it, indeed, or is it only imaginary, that implicit obedience to the dictates of another, is anti-scriptural, and irrespective of the character of a master? It appears to me, that the whole of the present mania, of abolition and emancipation, both in Europe and America, is predicated upon this tacitly assumed maxim. Independently, of whether the master be good or bad, whether a wise master or a fool, the power or authority must be abolished.

Independence is a charming idea, especially to Americans; but what gives it the charm? Is it the thing in itself? or is it because it is a release from the control of a bad master? Had Great Britain been a kind master, our ancestors were willing to remain her slaves. It was, then, the conduct of the master, that was objected to, and not the bondage itself, or the mastery. Petition after petition, humbly supplicating the master, to change from bad to good, were sent, expressive of perfect willingness to be the slaves of a good master; but not these, nor any thing else, could be brought to bear on the mind or conduct of the master. Hence the revolution and independence of the United States.

What reconciles us to be, as Paul says, “doulou of Christ,” but because he is a good master? Who objects to be his slave, on the ground that freedom from his commands, or the charming thing of independence, is better? It is very questionable, whether even those who refuse to serve him, are actuated, from the charm of freedom, to remain runaways from him, so much, as from an idea, of his being a bad master—“reaping where he did not sow, and gathering where he did not strew.” He is viewed, by runaways, as a master the prominent feature of whose

character is to take peculiar pleasure in evedropping it upon his doulou, and treasuring up every fault; not plots of insurrection and rebellion, merely, but even every inadvertent expression, and every foolish thought; always gratified when he can get hold of something, as an excuse to punish them. But when the spirit by the word, (which is his sword,) captures a runaway doulou, and he learns, that instead of the master being such an one as he imagined, "he is the fairest among ten thousand, and the one altogether, lovely" in every trait of his character, the charm of freedom and independence is dropped—he is dead to the enjoyment of such freedom—To know the living and true God, and Jesus Christ, his rightful Lord and master, is life eternal; and, whatever the idea of bondage, in serving a master, may be to others, to him it is perfect freedom.

He loves his master's commandments—he loves to hear him well spoken of—he delights to hear him talk, and he even loves any one, whom he happens to see, wearing the livery of his master's doulou.

It appears to me, that instead of abolition, the object of the Gospel is, to imbue the master, with so much of the spirit of his own master, who is in heaven, that it may in truth and reality be said of him, as was said of a master in old times—"I know him, that he will command his children and HIS HOUSEHOLD after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment."

It appears, also, to me, that the Gospel dispensation need not despair of making masters as good as the old dispensation made them, and thus supercede the necessity of a resort to abolition. I have lived long enough to see the fields in the southern country ripening for harvest, and promising an abundant crop, of temporal and spiritual comforts, to the slave and his master. But the hope of so speedy and plentiful a crop, is much blasted, by the breath of northern abolition.

I am ready and willing to confess to you, and the whole Church; and I hereby do it, that your course, with regard to slavery, is more open, bold, and brave, and, in my estimation, much more scriptural, than the course recommended by the late committee of the Synod of Kentucky, provided the maxim, adopted by you both, be in accordance with the scriptures.

You both admit, that slavery is in itself sinful. You are, therefore, for no compromise with sin—you will never admit the plea of necessity for its continuance—you insist on the immediate departure of the demon, if it should even drive a herd of syring down a steep place. I admire your openness, boldness, and candor—it is such as becomes watchmen on Zion's walls. I give in to your tacit position, that no consequences can be so fatal, nor so defiling, as to justify the continuance in sin; or, in other words, to continue sinning, until, in the providence of God, the door was closed, when the consequences of forsaking sin could be avoided.

On the other hand, it requires more moral vision, and intellectual comprehension, than is often to my lot, to understand how slavery, which is in itself sinful, can lose its date qualities by a fixed purpose, on the part of the sinner, that he will abandon, in some six, eight, ten, fifteen, twenty, or twenty five years, his continuance in the transgression of the law of God. It is not Holy Scripture, but the scriptures of an old divine, and which I have very little doubt is true, that "HELL IS PAVED WITH GOOD INTENTIONS." Hence, I can view gradualism, on this subject, to answer no better purpose, than a pavement to the parlor of his brimstone society.

Appalling for years the confusion of tongues, which must inevitably take place in the great injury of the Church, from the building of towers of abolition and emancipation, on so rotten a foundation, as the maxim which so many have adopted, I have been often inclined to take my weapons, and endeavor to batter it down with the consciousness, or rather the hope, that some able and renowned warrior of the armies of Israel, would take hold of the main pillar and demolish it, he would bid me hold back and keep silence. In 1834, I made a gratuitous offer of my weapons, to the Synod of Mississippi and South Alabama, who I knew to be composed of some of them, (at least,) to hold the pens of ready writers; but none

seemed disposed to handle them. In 1835, I sent them to South Hanover, Indiana—to Lexington, Kentucky—to Fayetteville, North Carolina, and to New York City, with a request to the first and last mentioned, if they were not disposed to try their metal themselves, that they would publish a request, that some one would put them to the test. This was declined, I suppose from a doubt of their goodness, and from my incapacity to teach their use to any body else.

Although Church and State are, as they ought to be, separate, yet they have a mutual influence on each other; acting each within its own legitimate sphere, they go on and prosper; bringing forth, to the great mass of the community, an abundant harvest of peace, comfort, and consolation. But interfering with each other's concerns is productive of turmoil, discord and strife, and paralyzing the healthful energies of both.

The pulpit has, and must forever have, a prodigious influence. It is like the lever and the fulcrum, of the ancient Archimedes—it is competent to move a world. Keeping within the sphere assigned it, it is the greatest and highest blessing, ever conferred on man. But travelling out of the Law and the Testimony, and entering into the field of discussion and breaking a lance in civil affairs, it becomes a curse. Hence the most calm, cool, dispassionate, able, and wise thinkers, have correctly stated, that ministers of the Gospel, on whose escutcheon is engraved, in legible letters, "THOU SHALT HEAR THE WORD AT MY MOUTH, AND WARN THEM FROM ME," are the greatest possible blessing, to any people.—They are mighty, in the hands of God, for pulling down the strong holds of Satan, and building up, in any community, the tabernacle of peace, harmony, and consolation. While on the other hand, a ministry, who, instead of going to the Bible, to learn what saith the Lord, but like the prophets Ezekiel speaks of, "follow their own spirit, and have seen nothing"—except a few isolated texts, with which they try to make the creature of their own imagination bear the image and impress of the divine word—are the heaviest judgment and most awful curse, which can be inflicted on any people. They bring forth a monster, more formidable than Nero, who will lord it over the consciences and understandings of God's heritage, by poisoning the sincere milk of the word, with the addition to it, of the doctrines and commandments of men, which mar the beauty, and destroy the peace of a whole community.

My silence and slumber continued, while abolition was carrying on its ravages at a distance, and did not feel myself called upon to come before the public, until the Chillicothe letter was sent, and came into my hands. Then, and not till then, did the trumpet seem to sound long and loud to me, in the following note—Ezek. xxxiii, 6, 7—"But if the watchman see the sword come upon a land, and blow not the trumpet, and the people be not warned: if the sword come and take any person from among them, he is taken away in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at the watchman's hand. So thou, O son of man, I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel: therefore thou shalt hear the word at my mouth, and warn them from me."

I felt the call, and delayed not to obey. I took my men—I collected, without the help of a concordance, what I could immediately find, in the Old and New Testaments, that the Lord said on the subject of slavery, and recorded it, as you have read in the preceding pages.

The part of the record that is mine, is made, as you perceive, without attention to the graces of composition—not because I disregarded the taste of the community, but because, in treating so important a subject, I found it quite convenient to consult my own ease—supposing that it is never *very material*, whether a servant tells his message *eloquently*, provided he tells the truth, and tells it in such a way as to be distinctly understood. In communicating my ideas, some may, perhaps, suppose, that in as much as I deliver ideas, entirely at variance with the views of so many great and good men, and bodies of men, I ought to express myself with more modesty, and, that "a little hesitation and faltering of speech would be more

becoming," from an obscure man in the pine woods. But I do now assure such, that where I had any hesitation, I expressed it; but where I had none, I had none to express.

Having no reputation among writers, I had none to lose; and if I had, I had still more at stake, than reputation. *The truth of God was at stake*, and I felt that his truth must be declared, *not in hesitating and faltering words*, which might induce a doubt whether I believed it myself, but in such a plain, "broad, flat footed" manner, as could leave no doubt of my conviction of the truth, on the mind of any.

It was not without design, that I placed the subject in such a variety of lights and attitudes, as no doubt you have observed. I considered, and do still consider it a subject of the utmost importance, drawing after it consequences of the utmost magnitude. The present and eternal prospects of our households, together with the peace, prosperity, and union of our beloved country; and, also, what is incalculably dear to me, the purity, peace, prosperity, and unity of our Churches. That the practical conclusions, to which the doctrines I advanced, in the preceding pages, would be of the most sweeping kind to abolition and emancipation, I was apprehensive, would be so appalling to some, that they would struggle against the principles, and thus turn aside from the word of truth.

If I have introduced any principles, which may appear exceptionable to any, let them examine the word of God, and if they prove, by that word, that they are not in accordance with it, so far from being grieved, I shall esteem such a production, the best evidence of christian friendship to me, and a favor to the Church. As I cannot, I will not calculate on pleading youthful indiscretion, in my own behalf; nor, for the same reason, will I plead any solicitation on the part of my brethren in the ministry, that I should write—should it be found that I have erred. "I have trodden the listed field," alone, on my own personal responsibility; consequently, none other is to blame.

Inasmuch, then, as the Review is mine, and must be mine, I give my brethren of the Chillicothe Presbytery, and my brethren of the whole world, fair notice, that such is the peculiarity of my head and heart, that it is in vain to attack me with any other weapon but the word of God; for I have endeavored through life, "to be bullet proof against any cannon of any calibre, unless the bullet be a text of scripture," supported by the context.

If in the meantime, this Review which I send to the Chillicothe Presbytery, and to the world, "should offend" any one of the children of my father's kingdom, I shall be grieved, as I feel conscious that it was not intended. To come at the knowledge of the truth, and that alone, so far as I know myself, has been my purpose.

If, in the meantime, this Review will have the desired effect, to enlighten any of my brethren, or which is the same thing, to cause them to examine carefully the word of God, on the subject of slavery; and if, besides leading to co-operation, in ameliorating the condition of slaves, it will tend to arrest the progress of error, and restore peace to our country—or, if it should have other beneficial effects, to the public, or private individuals, I can most sincerely adopt the following language—"Not unto us, O Lord; not unto us, but unto thy name be the praise." If, besides revolutionizing the sentiments of the Chillicothe Presbytery, it should produce a revolution in the views and sentiments of the great, and the otherwise good of my country and Church, who at present differ with me, I shall be more than ever confirmed in the truth of Paul's declaration to the Corinthian Church, chap. i, verses 27, 28, and 29—"But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound

the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty; and base things of the world, and things that are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to naught things that are: That no flesh might glory in his presence."—AMEN.

Not in form, but in deed and in truth, I reciprocate the excellent language in the close of your letter:—"Praying that the Great Head of the Church, may, by His Spirit and His Word, guide you in his own right way," I remain, affectionately,
Yours,

JAMES SMYLLIE.

APPENDIX.

NOTE--A.

Adam Clarke, on Ephesians vi, 5, says—"In heathen countries, slavery was in some sort excusable: among christians, it is an enormity and crime, for which perdition has scarcely an adequate state of punishment."

In his note on Titus ii, 9, he says—"Exhort servants to be obedient.--The Apostle refers to those who were slaves, and the property of their masters—even these are exhorted to be obedient to their own despots, though they had no right over them, on the ground of natural justice."

In his note on I Tim. vi, 1, he says—"The word douloi here means slaves converted to the christian faith."—See, also, Gill, Scott, and McKnight.

NOTE--B.

In the Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, published 1832, under the sanction of six Bishops, section X, pages 191 and 192, is the following regulation on the subject of slavery, viz.

"Question. What shall be done for the extermination of the evil of slavery?"

"Answer. 1. We declare that we are as much as ever convinced of the great evil of slavery: Therefore no slave holder, shall be eligible to any official station in our Church, hereafter, where the laws of the State in which he lives, will admit of emancipation, and permit the liberated slave to enjoy freedom.

"2. When any travelling preacher becomes an owner of a slave or slaves, by any means, he shall forfeit his ministerial character in our Church, unless he execute, if it be practicable, a legal emancipation of such slaves, conformably to the laws of the State in which he lives."

It is presumable that the above regulation would cease to form a part of the Discipline of the Methodist Church, if the southern section of the Church, in the United States, had the ascendancy. It is at all events in the south a dead letter. And it is hoped that the time is not far distant, when the above regulations will be entirely expunged from the Discipline, as it is even now expunged from the southern practice.

Shall no minister south of the Mason and Dixon line, ever be elected to the Bishop's office in the Methodist Church, unless it is done by a flagrant violation of the Church Discipline? Shall the power of governing that Church, which, in the hand of God, is the instrument of doing so much good, forever remain in the hands of men, whom the Apostle Paul expressly charges with being "proud ignorant dotards"?--(I. Tim. vi 4.) I hope not. I hope, sooner than submit to such antisciptural regulations, that the southern section of the Church will follow the advice of Paul to Timothy, vi chapter, latter clause of the 5th verse—"from such withdraw thyself."

NOTE—C.

In the Report of the Committee of the Synod of Kentucky, of which Rev. John C. Young was Secretary, there is a laboring to shew that slavery is a sin, and a plan proposed to abolish slavery. The following statements are made in the Report, viz:

"Now it is a notorious fact, that the Greek and Roman slavery was as much more cruel than ours, as the treatment with which Rehoboam threatened his subjects, was more severe than that they had received from his father, &c.—There was no species of misery, which the system of Greek and Roman slavery did not inflict on its unhappy victims—Masters were permitted by the law," (besides other cruelties enumerated) "to throw their slaves into their fishponds, to give an epicurean flavor to the mullets and carp which they were fattening for their feasts."

The Committee seem to make no distinction between slavery and the cruelties of masters—hence the following declaration written in capitals to make it doubly emphatical and certainly true, viz—"The New Testament does condemn slaveholding as practised among us, in the most explicit terms furnished by the language in which the inspired penmen wrote."—How, I ask, is this bold declaration established? Not by citing to us the passages of the New Testament for proof, but by telling us, "If a physician, after a minute examination, should tell a patient, that his every limb and organ was diseased—If he should enumerate the various parts of his bodily system, the arms, the legs, the head, the stomach, the bowels, &c., and should say of each of these parts distinctly, that it was unsound, could the man then depart and say, after all I am not diseased, for the physician has not said, in *express terms*, that my *body* is diseased? Thus has God condemned slavery. He has specified the parts which compose it, and denounced them, one by one, in the most ample and unequivocal form. The Greek language had a word corresponding *exactly* with our word *servant*, but it had none that answered *precisely* with our term *slave*. How, then, was an Apostle, writing in Greek, to condemn *our* slavery? Could it be done in the way in which some seem to think it must be done, before they will be convinced of its *sinfulness*? How can we expect to find in scripture, the words *slavery is sinful*? when the language in which it is written, contained no term, which expressed the meaning of our word slavery? Would the advocates of slavery wish us to shew, that the Apostles declare it to be unchristian to hold [doulou] servants? This would have been denouncing as criminal, practices far different from slaveholding." "That slavery is sinful, is as certain, as that the light of God's truth has shown upon our world." "As a conclusion of all that has been advanced, we assert it to be the unquestionable duty of every christian, to use vigorous and immediate measures, for the destruction of this whole system, and for the removal of all its unhappy effects."

In the above reasoning, the case of a diseased patient is introduced to prove the sinfulness of slavery, in the absence of scripture testimony. And the absence of scripture testimony is accounted for, because there was not a Greek word that would *exactly and precisely*, mark out slavery in Kentucky. The Evangelist Luke, however, used the Greek word *misthos* to convey the idea of a hired servant, and the word *doulos* to designate the common slave. Strange that the Apostles were unable to find the same word. Had the Greeks and Romans, and have the people of Kentucky, any servants but slaves or hired servants?

It is worthy of remark, that slavery is compared to a diseased patient, which must be killed to cure it! Is it legitimate to kill the patient to cure him? If not, there is no force in the reasoning. The latter part of the quotation shews that the design is to kill in order to cure the patient. If this be sound logic and good morals, then no one ought to censure Jonas' dear old wife, who was found choking her husband in a paroxysm of phthisis; for she declared he was diseased, and she was helping the Lord to kill him in order to cure him.

The plan which the Committee propose to kill slavery—or, in other words, the plan proposed to purge the conscience of the sin of slavery, is to hold to the sin, until every slave under twenty, and those that may be born in that time arrives at the 25th year—And that deeds of emancipation, to take effect at the 25th year, be recorded in the respective courts—in the mean time appending proper instructions.

This shews to what lame and wretched shifts, the wisest and best of men are reduced, when they give heed to the commandments of men, instead of plain scripture.

ERRATA.

PAGE 13	LINE 17	from bottom, instead of,	Ezek. xiii, 23, read, Ezek. xiii, 2—3.
14	1	do	Reeves', read Recse's.
19	33	top,	Ishmaelites, read Israelites.
22	5	bottom,	inend, read intend.
25	7	do	'Thereus', read 'Theseus'.
26	14	top,	Lacedemonia, read Lacedemon.
33	16	bottom,	Bithymia, read Bithynia.
26	<i>note,</i>		Milford, read Mitford.
32	28	do	ought, read oughtest.
27	14	top,	attest, read attests.
29	3	bottom,	farier, read farther.
32	18	top,	xi, read x.
34	19	do	debating, read doating.
37	8	do	becase, read because.
38	18	bottom,	subsequent part of his epistle, read subsequent epistles.
39	8	top,	part, read past.
46	12	do	belles, read bellies.
48	3	do	pursuc, read peruse.
53	1	bottom,	vocar, read vocare.
57	7	do	makes, read make.
60	18	top,	unwarrantable, read unanswerable.
60	18	top,	comma, period after Department.
64	1	do	them, read then.
64	6	do	sympathetic, read sympathetic.
66	22	do	menlally blind, read pur blind.
72	35	do	Is it, read is it so.
72	36	do	omit and between anti-scriptural and irrespctive.

