FIVE SERMONS AND A TRACT

BY LUTHER LEE

FIVE SERMONS AND A TRACT

BY LUTHER LEE

Edited

with an introduction by

Donald W. Dayton

Holrad House
5104 N. Christiana Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60625
1975

Wesleyan Church
ARCHIVES

All rights reserved by the
editor and Holrad House

Holrad House
5104 N. Christiana Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60625

Price

1-4 copies	$3.00 each
5 or more copies	$2.00 each

plus postage and handling
unless payment accompanies order.

252.07
L478f
C.2

PREFACE

The editing of this volume has been a labor of love. The profound ethical witness of Luther Lee and his fellow founders of American Wesleyan Methodist is now largely forgotten--even among their own spiritual descendents. It is hoped that this book will make a small contribution toward several goals: (1) provide historians with source material for a more adequate portrayal of this aspect of American Protestantism; (2) remind present-day Wesleyans of their heritage of Christian concern for the oppressed of this world; and (3) contribute to the current resurgence of social witness among biblically oriented people by more clearly displaying an earlier example of the conjunction of these concerns. It is now difficult to recapture or convey the excitement of discovering the existence of these materials and of efforts over several months to locate in some cases the unique extant copy. I hope that others will understand the extent to which this task has made me proud to have been reared among the Wesleyan Methodists.

Easter 1975

Donald W. Dayton
Director, Mellander Library, and
Assistant Professor of Theology
North Park Theological Seminary
5125 N. Spaulding Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60625

CONTENTS

Introduction 7

"On the Death of Elijah P. Lovejoy" . . 23

"The Supremacy of the Divine Law" . . . 43

"Prohibitory Laws" 59

"Woman's Right to Preach the Gospel" . . 77

"Dying to the Glory of God" 101

"Slavery: A Sin Against God" 121

INTRODUCTION

This volume contains six pamphlets authored by the Rev. Luther Lee, an early leader of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America (the oldest branch of the present Wesleyan Church formed in 1968). Produced by the anti-slavery struggle within Methodism, the Wesleyan Methodists were intensely revivalistic and explicitly reformist in their understanding of the Christian faith. As such, they illustrate the antebellum conjunction of revivalism and social reform--though the Wesleyans more often spoke of "piety and radicalism."

The materials here reprinted reflect issues that troubled the Wesleyans and the country from the emergence of abolitionism in the 1830's to the outbreak of the Civil War. Three of the sermons were preached in response to key events in the anti-slavery struggle. A fourth was the ordination sermon for Antoinette Brown, the first woman to be ordained, and reveals the interconnections between abolitionism and feminism. The other sermon was an early argument for prohibition and illustrates the development of the temperance movement. The tract argues the Wesleyan claim that slavery was not just a social and political problem, but was in effect "a sin against God." This introduction is an effort to set these writings in their historical context.

The Wesleyan Methodists

Early Methodism had been characterized by vigorous opposition to slavery and the slave-trade. John Wesley had resisted the practice from an early prohibition in the "General Rules" (1743) through his *Thoughts Upon Slavery* (1774) to his much quoted death-bed letter to William Wilberforce (1791). American Methodism attempted at first to maintain this witness, calling in the founding conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church (1784) for the expulsion of any member engaging in the slave trade. But rapid growth into America's largest denomination and

strong forces toward accommodation led to the relaxation of discipline so that early 19th century American Methodism was characterized by little more than the nominal disapproval of slavery preserved in the *Discipline* of the denomination.

This accommodation was called into question in the early 1830's by the rise of abolitionism, especially that school insisting on "immediate abolition." Most prominent among the Methodists who responded to this new movement was the Rev. Orange Scott. Though he later opposed the non-resistance and anarchistic tendencies of William Lloyd Garrison, Scott declared himself an abolitionist in 1834 after a year of reading Garrison's paper, *The Liberator,* and other abolitionist literature. By buying short subscriptions to *The Liberator,* Scott radicalized the majority of his New England Conference and was elected part of an abolitionist delegation to the General Conference of 1836.

At this Conference Scott emerged as the major spokesman for the abolitionist cause. But after extended debate the delegates declared themselves opposed to "modern abolitionism" and disavowed any intention "to interfere in the civil and political relationship between master and slave." This resolution and the resulting "pastoral address" of the Bishops, though viewed as morally defective by the abolitionist party, were taken by Methodist leaders as mandates to stamp out abolitionism in the church. During the intense struggle that followed great pressure was brought to bear on the abolitionists. Scott himself left parish work for two years to serve as an agent for the American Anti-Slavery Society, claiming to be no less engaged "in the 'regular and appropriate work' of a *gospel minister.*"

Though Scott returned to his church in 1839, he was soon convinced "to stand forth for a new anti-slavery, anti-intemperance, anti-everything-wrong, church organization." This new denomination, formally founded in 1843, adopted in addition to its reformist platform a more "democratic" form of church government in opposition to an "unscriptural episcopacy" that had used its powers to oppose abolitionism. Though Scott died in 1847, the Wesleyans continued their reformist thrust under other leadership.

Bibliography: Donald W. Dayton, "Orange Scott and the Wesleyan Methodists," *The Post-American*, January, 1975; Les Haines and Paul W. Thomas, *An Outline History of the Wesleyan Church* (Marion, IN: The Wesley Press, 1974); Donald G. Mathews, "Orange Scott: The Methodist Evangelist as Revolutionary" in Martin Duberman, *The Anti-slavery Vanguard* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1965); Donald G. Mathews, *Slavery and Methodism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1965); Lucius C. Matlack, *The Life of Orange Scott* (New York: C. Prindle and L.C. Matlack, 1847--reprinted by Books for Libraries, 1971); Orange Scott, *The Grounds of Secession from the M.E. Church* (New York: C. Prindle, 1848--reprinted by Arno Press, 1969).

Luther Lee

Luther Lee was born November 30, 1800, into an impoverished home in Schoharie, New York. At thirteen he set out on his own after the death of his mother, a pious Methodist. Lee reaffirmed the faith of his youth at the age of nineteen and though nearly illiterate, moved toward the Methodist ministry. In 1825 he married a schoolteacher Mary Miller, who contributed greatly to his education. After several years as a "local preacher" and two years service in the Malone Circuit of the Genessee Conference (Western New York), Lee was ordained "deacon" on the basis of his powers as a revivalist. Two years service on the Waddington Circuit qualified Lee for elder's orders in 1831.

After five years in other frontier circuits Lee transferred to the Black River Conference (Northern New York) where he emerged as a major figure. Lee possessed a vigorous mind, a disputatious temperament, and a reformist spirit. He frequently engaged neighboring Universalist ministers in debate and soon gained the nickname of "Logical Lee." But in 1837, while serving in Fulton, New York, Lee was captured by the abolitionist cause, and these gifts found new purpose in defending ministers charged with such breaches of church discipline as "agitating the slavery question," "patronizing abolitionist publications" and "attending abolitionist conventions." Charges were pressed against Lee and then withdrawn, but

Lee requested "location" and accepted assignment as an agent for the New York State Anti-slavery Society.

After a year of further church trials, anti-slavery lecturing, mob violence, etc., Luther Lee became the general agent in 1839 of a Massachusetts society that had separated from Garrison and his followers over their refusal to engage in political action. During this period Lee helped form the anti-slavery Liberty Party and campaigned for James G. Birney for President. He tried as well his hand at editing the anti-slavery *New England Christian Advocate* and the anti-Universalist *Sword of Truth,* but both collapsed after a single volume.

When the Wesleyan Methodist Connection was organized in 1843, Lee joined the secessionists and was propelled into the leadership of the new denomination. He was elected President of the first General Conference of 1844 (as well as two more of the next five) and made editor of its organ *The True Wesleyan.* In 1852 Lee returned to pastorates in Syracuse, where he was active in the Underground Railroad, and Fulton, New York. Here he pursued theological debate and published in addition to smaller works his *Elements of Theology,* the determinitive "systematic theology" of the Wesleyan Methodists. In 1856 Lee was called to the professorship of theology at Leoni College in Michigan. After a year, he left this financially precarious college to return to pastorates in Ohio. While serving in Ohio, Lee received an honorary doctoral degree from Middlebury College, Vermont. In 1864 Lee was called to the professorship of theology in Adrian College, Adrian, Michigan, recently organized under Wesleyan auspices.

After the Civil War Luther Lee rejoined the Methodist Episcopal Church through its Detroit Conference in 1867. Lee spent another ten years of intermittent ill health ministering formally and informally in Southern Michigan before retiring to Flint. After a dozen years of retirement Luther Lee died there on December 13, 1889, at the age of 89.

Bibliography: *Autobiography of the Rev. Luther Lee* (New York: Phillips and Hunt, 1882); entry in *Dictionary of American Biography;* obituary in *Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (1890).

The Sermons

This volume contains five sermons preached by Luther Lee and then published for wider distribution. This collection is not selective, but includes all Lee's separately published pamphlets still extant. The sermons were obviously called forth by unusual circumstances and are probably not typical of the usual fare enjoyed by Lee's congregations. More typical would be the sermons and outlines collected in his three volumes of *The Evangelical Pulpit*.

One sermon in the third volume of that set reveals Lee's self-understanding as a preacher. Under the title "The Radicalism of the Gospel," Lee insisted that "the Gospel is so radically reformatory, that to preach it fully and clearly, is to attack and condemn all wrong, and to assert and defend all righteousness." Lee presupposed a clear-cut distinction between good and evil, arguing that "the Gospel asserts its radical reform position, by maintaining the two extremes of right and wrong, of sin and holiness" and "denying all neutrality or middle ground." For Lee, the Gospel demands "absolute obedience and submission" and "never compromises its claims" for the sake of expediency. "Right must be responded to regardless of worldly considerations." Reformatory Gospel preaching is also to be specific. The Gospel will never reform mankind, only so far as it is applied, specifically to the evils to be removed."

Lee expected that such preaching would inevitably involve political issues. "A large portion of the evils are connected with civil government, and the Gospel will never remove them until it is so preached as to have something to do with politics." On the other hand, however, Lee had no interest in a politics not grounded in the Gospel. He insisted in his *Autobiography* that "I never had any politics which was not a part of my religion, and I urged men to vote the Liberty ticket as a religious duty." These principles are exemplified in the sermons in this collection.

I. "On the Death of Elijah P. Lovejoy"

Elijah P. Lovejoy was a Presbyterian minister under appointment from the American Home Missionary Society. In

1833 Lovejoy came to St. Louis and began to publish the *Observer,* devoted to "Christian politics, the diffusion of religious intelligence, and the salvation of souls." His developing abolitionism increasingly alienated the St. Louis community. Repeated mob violence and destruction of his office forced Lovejoy to move across the river to Alton in the free state of Illinois. There on November 7, 1837, he was shot and killed while defending his fourth press from a mob.

This event shook the country like the assassination of Martin Luther King or the Kent State tragedy in our own day. John Quincy Adams reported a "shock as of an earthquake throughout this continent." Lovejoy's friend and supporter Edward Beecher, son of Lyman Beecher and one-time pastor of Boston's Park Street Church, responded with a *Narrative of Riots at Alton* that Merton Dillon has called "probably the most eloquent defense of freedom of inquiry ever written in America." It was Lovejoy's death that prompted Wendell Phillips to seize the platform of Boston's Faneuil Hall to deliver his classic extemporaneous speech that marked his entrance into history as one of the most important figures of the Garrisonian school of abolitionism.

The martyrdom of Lovejoy similarly affected Luther Lee who until about this time had assumed that since abolitionists "were attacked by the religious press . . . they must be a set of desperate fanatics." The debates of the General Conference of 1836 had set Lee "to thinking more earnestly," but according to the *Autobiography,* we remained calm at Fulton until the death of Mr. Lovejoy." But then Lee "judged it wrong to remain silent any longer." As a result, "I preached a sermon on the death of Mr. Lovejoy, in which I condemned all mob violence, vindicated the principles for the utterance of which Mr. Lovejoy had been killed, and condemned slavery as an unmitigated wrong."

This sermon was Lee's declaration of having adopted abolitionist principles. President Wilbur Fisk of Moddletown University attempted to defuse the situation in the columns of the *Christian Advocate and Journal* (the official organ of the church) by blaming Lovejoy's death on his own actions. Lee was denied access to the *Advocate* and responded to Fisk in the independent *Zion's Watchman,* edited by LaRoy Sunderland, another founder of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection. By the next May Lee was

sharing the platform with Orange Scott at an abolitionist convention in Utica, New York.

Bibliography: Edward Beecher, *Narrative of Riots at Alton* (Alton: George Holton, 1838) reprinted with a preface by Robert Meredith (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1965); Merton L. Dillon, *Elijah P. Lovejoy, Abolitionist Editor* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1961); Joseph C. and Owen Lovejoy, *Memoir of the Rev. Elijah P. Lovejoy* (New York: J.S. Taylor, 1838--reprinted by Books for Libraries, 1970).

II. "The Supremacy of the Divine Law"

This sermon was preached on the death of Charles Turner Torrey, a Congregationalist minister, that Lee had known in Massachusetts. In 1839 Lee had been paired with Torrey in a debate against Garrisonian advocates of apolitical non-resistance. Torrey had left his church in Salem, Massachusetts, a year earlier for the anti-slavery struggle. Sometimes called the "Father of the Underground Railroad" (though inappropriately since the institution antedated his efforts), Torrey specialized in helping slaves to escape and actually invaded the South in his work. For such activity Torrey was arrested in Baltimore in June, 1844. After conviction Torrey was sentenced to six years of hard labor, but he served only a year-and-a-half, dying on May 9, 1846.

Torrey, like Lovejoy, became a martyr. His body was returned to Boston for a funeral at which Wesleyan Methodist Jotham Horton read the Scriptures and Elijah Lovejoy's brother Joseph preached. In this sermon Lovejoy claimed that Torrey's sentence had already been "repealed in that higher and impartial court, where human actions are rightly weighed" and predicted that the "life and death of Mr. Torrey will convince thousands . . . of the righteousness and expediency of direct efforts to assist the slaves, individually, to their freedom."

Lovejoy's was just the first of a flood of sermons, addresses and resolutions that included Luther Lee's sermon "On the Supremacy of the Divine Law." The sermon is not dated, nor does Lee mention the occasion in his *Autobiography*, but it was likely preached in May or June of 1846 while Lee was in New York City serving his first term as the editor of *The True Wesleyan*. The sermon, however, reflects a shift in Lee's position. On the death of

Lovejoy Lee had affirmed the law, calling for its enforcement against mob violence. Here Lee argues a doctrine of "civil disobedience," claiming "the law of Christ is to be obeyed whatever human laws may exist to the contrary, and whatever consequences may attend obedience."

This appeal to a "higher law" became an important part of abolitionist ideology in the next decade. An 1850 amendment to the 1793 Fugitive Slave Law forced Wesleyan Methodists and others active in the "underground Railroad" to justify their defiance of federal law. In particular they had to cope with conservative clergymen preaching on the text "let every soul be subject unto the higher powers" (Romans 13:1). This text, neglected in the wake of the American Revolution, was now vigorously reasserted to undercut abolitionism. These struggles climaxed a decade after Lee's sermon in the notorious "Oberlin-Wellington Rescue Case" at Oberlin College (another center of Wesleyan-like piety and radicalism) where efforts to rescue captured slaves led to the arrest of a number of prominent Oberlinites and a trial that attracted international attention.

Bibliography: Donald W. Dayton, "The Oberlin-Wellington Rescue Case," *The Post-American*, December, 1974; Joseph C. Lovejoy, *Memoir of Rev. Charles T. Torrey* (Boston: John P. Jewett & Co., 1847--reprinted by Negro University Press, 1969); Jacob R. Shipherd, *History of the Oberlin-Wellington Rescue* (Boston: J.P. Jewett & Co., 1859--reprinted by DaCapo Press, 1972).

III. "Prohibitory Laws"

Next to abolitionism Luther Lee was committed to Temperance Reform. His *Autobiography* frequently mentions trips to lecture on "abolition and temperance." In a defense of Wesleyan Methodist origins (*The Wesleyan Manual*, 1862) Lee even ranked temperance with abolition and church government as issues requiring the new denomination. The first Wesleyan *Discipline* differed from its Methodist Episcopal antecedent in more strongly forbiding the manufacturing, buying, selling, or using of intoxicating liquors. And Lee's advocacy of "prohibitory laws" became denominational policy resulting in close association with

the Prohibition Party and the Anti-Saloon League. The denominations successor, The Wesleyan Church, is still bound by its *Discipline* to seek prohibition.

The temperance movement passed through several stages. Early (late 18th and early 19th centuries) leaders were literally advocates of "temperance" and recommended that cider, beer, wines and coffee be substituted for "hard liquor." A new phase of the movement in the 1820's insisted on total abstinence and found Methodism particularly receptive to this emphasis. Luther Lee's sermon represents a final stage in which the temperance movement moved toward prohibition of the liquor trade by local, state, and national laws.

This sermon has a complex history. It originated in 1841 when the ministers of Lowell, Massachusetts, preached before the temperance society a series on various aspects of the temperance question. Lee was assigned "prohibitory law," a topic that he had earlier addressed in an 1836 series of newspaper articles. The final sermon, however, was not published until 1852 when Lee felt the situation in New York demanded it. Lee was particularly proud of this sermon, claiming that it was "the first of the kind published in this country." It was not the first call for prohibition, but Lee was a very early advocate, suggesting even the route of constitutional amendment.

Whatever the validity of the Prohibition experiment, it is clear that abolition and temperance were closely intertwined. Lee insisted that in 1836 "all antislavery men . . . were also strong temperance men." Both movements called for major changes in society to be effected by legislative action. Both movements also belie the common assumption that the revivalists were interested only in personal conversion which would then find expression in reform. The temperance movement in particular sought to correct environmental conditions that in the judgement of the reformers contributed to crime and antisocial behavior.

Bibliography: John Allen Krout, *The Origins of Prohibition* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1925); chapter on "The Temperance Crusade" in Alice Felt Tyler, *Freedom's Ferement* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1944--reprinted in Harper Torchbook edition, 1962).

Wesleyan Church
ARCHIVES

IV. "Woman's Right to Preach the Gospel"

Just as in the 1960's the women's liberation movement emerged from civil rights agitation, so the 19th century women's rights movement developed in the wake of abolitionism. Those who had attacked one social structure found it easier to criticize another. Women who mastered the anti-slavery arguments found parallels to their own situation. The Scriptural issues were also similar. Those who had learned to appeal to an equalitarian "spirit" of the Bible over against the "letter" that accepted slavery found similar hermeneutical problems in the discussion of the role of women. Even the crucial text of Galatians 3:28 seemed to conjoin the issues.

Not all abolitionists moved to a feminist position. Orange Scott and other early Wesleyans opposed Garrison's effort to broaden the abolition movement at this point--though perhaps to avoid blurring the anti-slavery issue rather than because of opposition to the women. The Wesleyans did have striking connections with the emerging feminism. The 1848 women's rights convention that first called for the franchise was held in the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Seneca Falls, New York. And Luther Lee defended the right of women to speak in the temperance movement. When the Men's State Temperance Society refused to seat female delegates to a June, 1852, meeting in Syracuse, Lee opened his church to the women for an evening meeting that over-shadowed the convention gathering.

One active participant in the early women's conventions and the women's struggle in the temperance societies was Antoinette Brown (later Blackwell after marriage in 1856). Born May 20, 1825, near Rochester into a home under the influence of evangelist Charles G. Finney, she had attended Finney's Oberlin College, a school that shared the commitments of the Wesleyan Methodists. Founded in 1835, Oberlin was the first college to attempt co-education, but had resisted Antoinette Brown's desire to take the theological course. But she was allowed to take classes without being awarded the degree.

Antoinette Brown left Oberlin in 1850 and lectured for two years before becoming in 1852 the pastor of the First Congregational Church in South Butler, New York. In 1853 she gained nationwide notoriety for an unsuccessful three hour struggle to speak at the New York City meeting

of the World Temperance Convention, to which she had been elected a regular delegate. Shortly thereafter Antoinette Brown was ordained, becoming the first fully ordained woman in a recognized American denomination and perhaps the first in Christian history. Though a Wesleyan, Luther Lee was asked to preach the ordination sermon, probably because of contacts made in the temperance movement.

The Wesleyans themselves did not ordain women for another decade. The 1864 General Conference was called upon to respond to an ordination in the Illinois Conference, but a resolution against the practice failed and the matter was left to the discretion of the annual conferences. In 1887, however, such a resolution was passed late in the General Conference after many delegates had left. But this was repealed in 1891 and the ordination of women flourished in the early decades of the 20th century when it was given additional impetus by the enthusiastic endorsement of the practice by related "holiness" denominations.

Luther Lee argues the ordination of women on various grounds, but particularly noteworthy is his use of Joel 2: 28 and its quotation in the second chapter of Acts: "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh and your sons and daughters shall prophesy." This text became the basis of a distinctive argument for the right of women to preach that flourished for the rest of the century. Phoebe Palmer, the major force behind the late 19th century "holiness revival," expanded this argument in a sizable book, *The Promise of the Father* (1859). This volume became the fountainhead of innumerable holiness and pentecostal writings arguing not only for the ordination of women, but also advocating the basic tenets of feminism.

Bibliography: Antoinette L. Brown, "Exegesis of 1 Corinthians, XIV, 34, 35; and I Timothy, II., 11, 12," *Oberlin Quarterly Review*, July, 1849; Lucille Sider Dayton and Donald W. Dayton, "Your Daughters Shall Prophesy: Feminism in the Holiness Movement," *Methodist History*, October, 1975; Elinor Rice Hays, *Those Extraordinary Blackwells* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1967); Laura Kerr, *Lady in the Pulpit* (New York: Woman's Press, 1951); chapter on "The Woman Question" in Aileen S. Kraditor, *Means and Ends in American Abolitionism* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1969).

V. "Dying to the Glory of God"

The abolitionists had originally expected to achieve their goals by moral suasion and political action. But just as the fugitive slave laws moved them toward a form of civil disobedience, so the growing tensions of the 1850's raised questions of violence and the right of the oppressed to revolt. Abolitionists began to notice examples of violence in the Scriptures and to reassert the revolutionary themes of the American struggle for independence. Some claimed that since slavery was maintained by force, such "implicit violence" could be justly opposed by force. Even Garrison diluted his earlier non-resistance by arguing that the slave had a duty to rebel.

It was John Brown and his October 16, 1859 raid on Harper's Ferry that focused these issues. Brown had been born May 9, 1800, of well-bred Connecticut stock and reared in a pious, abolitionist home. Though always anti-slavery in conviction and active in the Underground Railroad, Brown turned increasingly from a series of business failures to the anti-slavery struggle in the late 1840's, giving himself solely to the task in the mid-1850's. After experience in the violent guerilla warfare of the Kansas struggle over slavery, Brown began to dream of personally leading a revolt of the slaves. Early in 1857 Brown claimed the moral and financial support of a secret Northern committee of abolitionists. After long preparations Brown's hopes were destroyed when his raid on Harper's Ferry was crushed and the slave revolt failed to materialize. Brown was quickly brought to trial, convicted and executed on December 2, 1859.

Brown's execution triggered demonstrations, editorials, sermons, etc., throughout the North both to celebrate and condemn his actions. Luther Lee, clear as usual in his convictions and unflinching in his support of Brown, preached on the occasion in Chagrin Falls, Ohio, Congregational Church a sermon entitled "Dying to the Glory of God." (In 1859 Lee had been called to Chagrin Falls by Congregational and Wesleyan Churches that had united in his support and worshipped as one congregation.) In this sermon Lee defends a "just revolution" by arguing that "it is right to oppose oppression and defend human liberty by the sword" and by appealing to "the deeds of our revolutionary fathers, who drew their swords and dashed upon the

battle field to resist oppression." Brown was for Lee "an honest man, a hero, and a Christian."

Lee's *Autobiography* reports also a related address. On July 4, 1860, Lee delivered an oration from the rock overlooking John Brown's grave in North Elba, New York. The Brown family was present to hear what Lee called "the oration of my life, the most radical and, probably, the most able I ever delivered." Unfortunately this speech has not survived. Lee loaned the manuscript to a reporter and never saw it again.

Bibliography: Merton L. Dillon, *The Abolitionists* (Dekalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1974); Stephen Oates, *To Purge This Land with Blood* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970--also available in Harper Torchbook edition); Louis Ruchames, *John Brown: The Making of a Revolutionary* (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1969, a revised edition of *The John Brown Reader)*.

The Tract: "Slavery: A Sin Against God"

This essay is included with the sermons not only to complete the collection of Lee's pamphlet publications but also to illustrate the Wesleyan critique of slavery. It was published in 1853 as the first "Wesleyan Tract" of a "Large Series" and is nearly identical with the first 24 pages of Lee's later work, *Slavery Examined in the Light of the Bible* (1855).

In the tract Lee grounds his critique in the fact that slavery prevents the fulfilling of explicit commands of Scripture regarding man's religious duties to God, the marriage relationship, and filial responsibilities. The larger work broadens the argument to object more generally to "man-stealing" and "involuntary servitude" before identifying slavery with the "oppression" so repeatedly denounced in the Scriptures. A full three-fourths of the book attacks, text by text, the biblical defense of slavery.

Perhaps more important is Lee's conclusion that "slavery . . . must be morally wrong, sin in itself." This fact is crucial for understanding "evangelical" abolitionism. Both the threat and the power of evangelical abolitionism was an invasion of the pragmatic, political

arena by a discourse grounded in moral absolutism. The Evangelicals called not for political compromise or adjudication of sectional differences but repentance and the immediate turning from evil.

The "immediate abolitionism" advocated by the Wesleyans should also be correlated with the rising tide of perfectionism in pre-Civil War America. The Wesleyan appeal to primitive Methodism's anti-slavery witness involved a reaffirmation of John Wesley's doctrine of Christian Perfection. Timothy Smith has suggested that pre-Civil War revivalistic reform was the application to society of an activistic understanding of "entire sanctification."

This was clearly the argument of Calvin Colton in *Abolition a Sedition* (1839). There he argued that "*immediate* abolition . . . is the application of perfectionism to politics." Colton noticed that the "religious perfectionists of the country . . . are almost to a man Abolitionists" and found "our political fabric menaced by a visionary and fanatical religious notion." Colton's position was that "preaching to *private* conscience is one thing . . . but the political constitution and administration of society, is another thing; and this, in *our* opinion, Christianity never presumes to meddle with."

Whatever the validity of correlating immediate abolition and entire sanctification, this doctrine did emerge as a distinctive theme of the Wesleyans. Their 1844 article on "sanctification" was the first denominational adoption of "perfectionism" as doctrine and a harbinger of the "holiness movement" that was already gathering force. Though somewhat more classically Methodist in doctrine and ethos the Wesleyans increasingly found themselves at home in "holiness" circles. This transition is reflected in the gradual evolution of the 1844 article on sanctification from a more generally "perfectionistic" formulation into a statement of the "second blessing holiness" doctrine of the late 19th century. This process culminated in a 1968 merger with the Pilgrim Holiness Church to form the present Wesleyan Church.

Bibliography: *Abolition a Sedition,* by a "Northern Man" (Philadelphia: Geo. W. Donohue, 1839--reprinted by AMS Press, 1973); Donald W. Dayton, *The American Holiness Movement: A Bibliographic Introduction* (2nd edition; Wilmore, KY: B.L. Fisher Library of Asbury Theological

Seminary, 1975); Charles Edwin Jones, *A Guide to the Study of the Holiness Movement* (Metuchen, NJ: The Scarcrow Press, 1974); Timothy L. Smith, *Revivalism and Social Reform* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1957).

Other Writings by Luther Lee

Lee was the most prolific writer among the early Wesleyan Methodists. In addition to his various editorial positions, numerous contributions to other periodicals, and the six pamphlets here reprinted, Lee authored the following books:

Autobiography of the Rev. Luther Lee. New York: Phillips and Hunt; Cincinnati: Walden and Stowe, 1882.

The Debates of the General Conference of the M.E. Church, May, 1844, To which is added, a Review of the Proceedings of Said Conference by Luther Lee and Rev. E. Smith. New York: Orange Scott for the Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America, 1845.

Discussion of the Doctrine of the Trinity Between Luther Lee, Wesleyan Minister, and Samuel J. May, Unitarian Minister. Reported by Lucius C. Matlack. Syracuse, NY: Wesleyan Book Room, 1854.

Ecclesiastical Manual, or Scriptural Church Government Stated and Defended. New York: Wesleyan Methodist Book Room, 1850.

Elements of Theology, or, An Exposition of the Divine Origin, Doctrines, Morals and Institutions of Christianity. New York: Miller, Orton, and Mulligan; Syracuse, NY: S. Lee, 1856. This work went through at least eleven editions during the following four decades.

The Evangelical Pulpit. Three volumes. Syracuse, NY: Samuel Lee, 1854, 1856, 1864.

The Immortality of the Soul. New York: Wesleyan Methodist Book Room, 1850. Also published in a "revised and

improved edition" in 1859.

Natural Theology, or the Existence, Attributes and Government of God. Syracuse, NY: Wesleyan Methodist Publishing House, 1866.

The Revival Manual. New York: Wesleyan Methodist Book Room, 1850.

Slavery Examined in the Light of the Bible. Syracuse, NY: Wesleyan Methodist Book Room, 1855. This work is available in a modern reprint, Detroit: Negro History Press, 1969.

A Synopsis of Parliamentary Rules for the Use of Ecclesiastical Bodies and Popular Assemblies and Conventions. Syracuse, NY: S. Lee, 1862.

Universalism Examined and Refuted, and the Doctrine of the Endless Punishment of Such as do not Comply with the Conditions of the Gospel in this Life, Established. Watertown, NY: Knowlton and Rice for the author, 1836.

Wesleyan Manual: A Defense of the Organization of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection. With an introduction by Cyrus Prindle. Syracuse, NY: S. Lee, 1862.

SPECIAL NOTE

Variations in format and the condition of some of the original texts have necessitated retyping these materials instead of using a process of photographic reproduction. Title pages (where present) and typography have been matched as closely as possible. Spelling idiosyncrasies and even errors have been preserved. Original pagination is indicated in parentheses after the page number in this edition. The end of the text on an original page has been indicated in this edition by a double slash (//).

A

S E R M O N

PREACHED IN THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, IN THE VILLAGE OF FULTON, N. Y.

Sabbath Evening, December 3d, 1837,

ON THE OCCASION OF THE DEATH OF THE

R E V. E. P. L O V E J O Y

WHO WAS MURDERED BY A MOB AT ALTON, ILL. NOVEMBER 7th, 1837.

B Y R E V. L U T H E R L E E,
Of the Black River Conference.

PREACHED AND PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.

FULTON, N.Y.
PRINTED AT THE CHRONICLE OFFICE, BY T. JOHNSON

1838.

SERMON.

ACTS XIX, 38.

Wherefore if Demetrius, and the craftsmen that are with him, have a matter against any man, the law is open, and there are deputies: let them implead one another.

These are the words of the Town Clerk of the city of Ephesus, pronounced on the occasion of a lawless mob. St. Paul and his coadjutors had been made the instruments of the conversion of many souls from the worship of the Ephesian Goddess Diana, to that pure devotion which burns nowhere but on the altar of Christianity. As is usually the case so was it here, there were those whose interests were identified with the cause of error, and hence, who had strong motives to support error against the light of truth and the march of reformation. There were a class of silver smiths, who made shrines for the Goddess Diana, whose profit failed just in proportion as their idolatrous worship sunk into disrepute, hence, it was their interest to oppose the progress of christianity and keep up the worship of these gods whose glory was supplied by the skill of their own hands. It was with these views that Demetrius stirred up his fellow craftsmen, and raised a mob against the Apostle and his companions, and set up a cry for the space of // two hours, "great is Diana of the Ephesians." When the Town Clerk had succeeded in calming the tumult he addressed the multitude in a most calm and sensible speech, from which we have selected our text. Demetrius being the leader of the mob, the Town Clerk names him in particular. "Wherefore if Demetrius, and the craftsmen that are with him, have a matter against any man, the law is open, and there are deputies, let them implead one another." The meaning of the text appears to be this; if the men against whom ye have raised this tumult, are guilty of breaking any law, then prosecute them and have them punished according to law; "the law is open," that is, the judges are now sitting, "and there are deputies," persons whose office and duty it is to prosecute all proper

complaints, and see that every man has his lawful right; "let them implead one another;" let them present their complaints against each other and have the matter settled by law. This is sound doctrine, on which alone a republican government, republican institutions, and republican rights and liberties can be maintained, hence, the text has been selected for the purpose of bringing its correct and wholesome principles to bear upon the lawless violence of the mob, which resulted in the death of the Rev. E.P. Lovejoy, at Alton, Illinois, on the 7th of November last. Mr. Lovejoy was an Abolitionist, as are many other ministers of Jesus Christ, and has fallen a martyr to his principles. But you will please to bear in mind that it is not the abstract question of abolitionism, as being right or wrong, that is the subject of discussion this evening; it is the right of discussing the subject; it is the liberty of the press and of speech; is the press to be free? or is it to be gagged and the liberty of speech be taken away at the will of an infuriated mob? the question is not, are abolitionists right? but have they rights? or are they a set of outlaws to be hunted and killed as southern planters hunt and shoot down their absconded slaves?--Such then being the question, let us proceed to apply the doctrine of the text to our own times, and in particular to the death of Mr. Lovejoy; and to do this I shall attempt to prove.

I. That no circumstances or pretence whatsoever can justify, or be plead in extenuation of lawless violence, or of any illegal proceedings against a supposed criminal; and,

II. That in the case of the Rev. Mr. Lovejoy there was no offence or provocation on his part; nothing done or claimed // by him, which is not the constitutional right of every American citizen.

I. We are to show that no circumstances whatsoever can justify or be plead in extenuation of lawless violence or of any illegal proceedings against any supposed criminal.

1. I urge in support of this proposition the clearly stated doctrine of my text. The doctrine is, that if any person has a matter against any man the law is open. What was true of the city of Ephesus is true of this land of boasted law and liberty. Provision is made for the lawful punishment of crime, and the redress of wrongs, and to proceed unlawfully is not only unnecessary but also a contempt of law and of the civil authorities. Such a

procedure is wholly unnecessary, for as the law is open, redress may be obtained without lawless violence. If there is no wrong there can be no occasion for mob force, for it must be wrong to mob the innocent; and if there is a real wrong, a violation of law, law will correct it; in neither case therefore can there be any occasion for mob force. But it is not only wholly unnecessary to resort to mob law, but such a course is a contempt upon all good law, because it is in neglect of its ample provisions, which offer a redress to all who are outraged or in any way injured. Laws are made on purpose to secure equal justice to all, and judges and officers are appointed to attend to its enforcement, and every man may avail himself of the redress it offers, hence, no man, or set of men, can resort to mob violence to correct an evil, only in neglect of these ample provisions which the law holds out to all. It is also a contempt of law because it is a violation of it, and ranks among the crimes against which the law thunders its heaviest penalties. Law not only provides for the redress of wrongs, and the punishment of the guilty, but it prohibits a resort to any other means to secure the same ends. He who makes use of mob force to punish a real criminal, however guilty he may be, is himself as much a law-breaker, and contemner of law, as the guilty wretch against whom his shafts of violence and death are directed. These remarks have been suggested by the text itself. If any one "have a matter against any man, the law is open and there are deputies; let them implead one another."

2. If there could be one case which would justify the exercise of mob law, there may be more such cases, and the entire // want of rule to determine when to resort to mob force, and when not to, must render mob law universally applicable to the entire overthrow of the civil authorities. Suppose then, for the sake of the argument, that a mob may, under some peculiar circumstances, be justified, and where will you draw the line? where will you fix the bounds? by what rule will you determine when these justifying circumstances exist? No such rule exists--There is no law for the regulation of riots but for their suppression. Say then that a mob can be justified under some circumstances, and you make those, who are disposed to unlawful violence, the sole judges in the case, when to resort to mob law and when not to, and the lawless and infatuated have full liberty to fly to arms on any and every pretence, and civil society is subverted at a blow. There

is no way to evade the force of this conclusion; only admit that a mob may be justified under any possible circumstances, and by that admission we throw ourselves into the hands of the merciless rabble. This argument will admit of illustration. At Alton, Ill., the publication of abolition principles justifies the mob, in their opinion, in scenes of blood and death. In Boston the existence of a Convent was sufficient to justify the lawless in scenes of riot, fire and blood. In Philadelphia a political contest about a national bank was a signal for blood with the mobites. At Charleston, S.C. the appearance of a number of abolition papers, which no man was obliged to read unless he wished to, justified a riot in the seizure of the U.S. Mail, and in the unlawful destruction of its contents. In New York a political contest, at one time, justified a riot and the seizure of the armory itself to procure more weapons of death; and at another time, abolitionism excited the fury of the mob, causing a number of gentlemen to fly for their lives; and on a third occasion, the high price of flour justified the mob in attempting to destroy what little there was in market. In Vicksburgh, the existence of a club of gamblers justified the populace in seizing them, and hanging them up without law, judge or jury. In Baltimore the circumstances attending a broken bank were sufficient to excite the fury of the mobites, which led to the destruction of property and the loss of life. Thus it is clear that if mob violence can be justified under any circumstances, it is at once suited to all circumstances, enabling the lawless and vile to usurp, control and trample upon // the innocent and unoffending, and to riot upon the spoils which they may see fit to sacrifice to their lust, their avarice, or their revenge.

3. The system of mob violence makes the rioters judge in their own case. Let us illustrate this thought by the case under consideration. Mr. Lovejoy was an abolitionist, and as such claimed the right of speaking and publishing his views. For the exercise of this right the mob assailed him and thrice destroyed his property, and finally, took his life. Here you see the mob is one party, and Mr. Lovejoy the other; but who, I ask, is the judge between them? The only answer to this question is, the mob judged for themselves and executed their own judgment. The mob are always a party concerned, for disinterested persons will never enter into a mob. Now, who does not see that this is unequal! It cannot be certainly known that the

subject of mob force is guilty of what is laid to his charge. That Mr. Lovejoy was an abolitionist may have been understood by the rioters, but what is abolitionism? In this case it is any thing which the excited imaginations of the mob are disposed to call it, but what it is in fact very few if any of the infuriated knew or even had the means of knowing from impartial testimony. The complainants, the court, the witnesses and the executioners are all the same. In mob proceedings it cannot be determined that the facts charged, if true, constitute a crime. Mr. Lovejoy could assume that anti-abolition sentiments are criminal with as good a grace as his opponents could assume that his views were worthy to be rewarded with death. As they were both parties concerned in the affair, what right had the mob to decide for themselves that they were right and he wrong. But suppose Mr. L. to have been guilty of a real offence, how has it been determined what punishment he deserved. By what rule of law, morals, or common sense was it determined that the expression of abolition sentiments in Alton deserved to be punished with the destruction of the offender's property, and a second offence with the shedding of his blood? It is too plain to need proof that no man, or set of men, can claim the right of judging in their own case, and hence no set of men can be justified in resorting to mob violence.

4. No circumstance can justify a resort to mob violence, because mobs are themselves violations of law, more disas-// trous in their consequences than any evil they may be intended to correct. That mobs are violations of law, need not be proved for the sake of the well informed, but for the information of those who have never examined into the subject, I will give one quotation from the Constitution of the United States. It is from the fifth article of the amendments, and reads thus:--"No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on presentment or indictment of a grand jury, nor be deprived of his life, liberty or property without due process of law." This covers the whole ground of mob operations, and has been violated at least four times in the case of Mr. Lovejoy; thrice in the destruction of his property, and once by depriving him of life. All this has been done without any process of law whatsoever. Now, that this is an offence, worse than any evil against which mob violence can be directed, is clear. The simple violation of law, by the raging of infuriated mobs, is an evil

which threatens the overthrow of society. If one man, or one set of men, have a right to violate the law, another man, yea all men may; and if one law may be violated every other law may be violated on the same principle. What right had the inhabitants of Alton to outrage the constitution, by raising a mob, any more than the people of this place? If then you sanction their doings you say, in effect, that we may have a blood-thirsty mob here to destroy our property, and to make widows of our wives, and orphans of our children, and to send our spirits uncalled by God into his presence. What right have the people of Alton to determine what law may be violated any more than the people of this place? And may we not differ respecting the comparative importance of the different precepts in the book of the law? And is not the same true of every section and every individual? Thus one will choose to violate one law and another will choose to violate another law, and a third another, and so all law may be violated on the same principle that any one law may, which implies the overthrow of civil society.--But mobs not only involve principles which tend to the overthrow of all civil authority and order, but they combine almost every evil, and are therefore worse than any one supposed evil against which they may be professedly directed. Are they directed against some outlaw, who is rioting upon the property of others through dishonesty, theft or robbery? the mob // itself riots in the destruction of all property that comes in its way. Is the mob directed against some individual, or class of men, who are supposed to endanger the peace and safety of society? the mob itself breaks the peace and destroys all individual security, insomuch that no man knows how long he is to be permitted to wear his own head, where mobs bear rule. Is the mob got up to punish the wretch guilty of blood? its own path is marked with blood, too frequently with the blood of the innocent, and in the case under consideration with the blood of one of God's ministers. Is the fury of the mob directed against any of these evils, such mob is composed of them all, and wastes and destroys with the fury of the storm where contrary winds meet and howl out the rage of the contending blasts.

Having shown that no circumstance can justify a resort to mob violence, I am to show,

II. That in the case of the Rev. Mr. Lovejoy no offence or provocation was given on his part, that he did and claimed no more than is guarantied to every citizen of the

United States by the constitution. What then was Mr. Lovejoy's offence for which his blood was poured upon the ground? All that he published I cannot be expected to give in this discourse, but I will give you an extract, which I pledge shall contain the most objectionable part of what gave the offence, for which his press was destroyed and his blood spilt. The following are the words of Mr. L. taken from the very document which gave the offence, and constitute the most objectionable points in the document.

"WHAT ARE THE DOCTRINES OF ANT-SLAVERY MEN?

1. Abolitionists held that 'all men are born free and equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, LIBERTY, and the pursuit of happiness.'

2. As the above mentioned rights are in their nature inalienable, it is not possible that one man can convert another into a piece of property,--thus at once annihilating all his personal rights,--without the most flagrant injustice and usurpation. But American slavery does this --it declares a slave to be a 'THING'--a 'CHATTEL'--an article of personal 'PROPERTY'--a piece of 'MERCHANDIZE'-- and actually holds TWO AND A HALF MILLIONS of our fellow men in this precise condition. //

3. Abolitionists, therefore, hold American Slavery to be *wrong*, a legalized system of injustice, and a sin. They also hold that Slavery is a political evil of unspeakable magnitude, and one which, if not removed, will speedily work the downfall of our free institutions, both civil and religious.

4. As the Bible inculcates upon man but one duty in respect to sin, and that is immediate repentance, Abolitionists believe that all who hold slaves, or who approve the practice in others, should *immediately* case to do so."

Having given you the doctrines of Mr. Lovejoy, for the maintaining of which his life was taken, in order to vindicate his sentiments let them be compared with his constitutional rights, with what others have said on the same subject, and with the principles of eternal rectitude.

Had Mr. Lovejoy any constitutional right to believe and publish what he did? Let the Constitution speak for itself.--Article 1, of the amendments: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the rights of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for

a redress of grievances." It was, then, Mr. Lovejoy's constitutional right to express and publish his opinions on the subject of slavery, or on any other subject; for Congress, the highest authority in the Union, cannot "abridge the freedom of speech, or of the press." This right he refused to surrender, in its defence he fell, and in its defence would every true patriot fall sooner than give it up and tamely submit to be gagged at the discretion of the mob. But it may be urged that the doctrines which Mr. L. inculcated were calculated to excite insurrection among the slaves, and thereby endangered the slave holder. As this is a common objection to the measures of Abolitionists, one which has been urged perhaps with greater effect than any other, I will endeavor, in this place, to meet it with a serious and fair reply.

1. It is denied that Abolitionists have published any thing, or taught any thing in their lectures, calculated to excite insurrection among the slaves. Take the document from the pen of the outraged and murdered Lovejoy, and what is there in it calculated to excite insurrection? It is true he said "all men are born free and equal," and so says the Declaration of American Independence. He said that Slavery is wrong, and // others have said the same thing who have been honored by the church and the nation. The great cry about the incendiary publications of the Abolitionists, is all a bug-bear, intended to gull the ignorant and excite the fury of the mob. Let people read the publications of Abolitionists, and see what they can find so very incendiary; and having found the exciting passage, let them tell us what it is--give us chapter and verse--and then will we at least think the charge brought from honest motives. Here permit me to make a generous offer. If any person will produce something from the pen of an Abolitionist, more exciting, more calculated to excite insurrection among the slaves than any thing I can produce from some of the standard publications of the Church or State, I pledge to make a public recantation of what I have just stated. Let those interested make the examination, and if they will not do this, let them whine no more about the incendiary publications of Abolitionists.

2. Suppose the promulgation of Abolition principles does really endanger the slave-holders of the south, where does the fault rest? on the Abolitionist, or on the slave-holding system? All that Abolitionists do, or claim, is the right of free discussion; they honestly believe

slavery to be wrong, and hence, that it should be abolished; and believing, they speak and tell what they believe, and claim the right so to do; and that it is their constitutional right no one can deny. Now, suppose this to endanger the south, and the war is not between Slavery and Abolitionists, but between Slavery and the Constitution. The Constitution bears Abolitionists out in all they do, and hence, if their doings endanger slave-holders, Slavery is a system which cannot stand in connection with the free exercise of the rights conferred by the Constitution, and the conclusion is irresistible that we must give up a part of our Constitutional rights--the liberty of speech and of the press--or slavery must fall. Will freemen, then, suffer the press to be gagged, and their lips to be sealed up from uttering the truth, to preserve Slavery? This is the great question--if the anti-Abolitionists tell the truth when they say that the South is endangered by the movements of abolitionists--and it is a question to be answered by the events of the future.

But in further vindication of Mr. Lovejoy I am to compare his statement with what others have said on the same subject.//I cannot notice all that has been said by others, men who have gone to an honorble grave, but I will give enough of the sentiments of other times to show that Mr. Lovejoy did not utter a new doctrine. Hear then the declaration of American Independence, one of the most illustrious state documents that was ever read by the light of the sun. "We hold these truths to be self evident, that all mankind are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these rights are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." These words were quoted by Mr. Lovejoy as the ground of the first principle of abolitionism--in this he published nothing but what had been published before, than what has been inscribed upon the magna-charta of the nation, and written upon our banner, and read of all men; and yet for repeating it his blood has been shed!

Hear the language of Mr. Jefferson, a greater statesman than whom never graced the nation. Speaking on the subject of slavery he says, "I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep forever, that considering numbers, nature, and natural means only an exchange of situation is among possible events: that it may become probable by supernatural interference? The Almighty has no atribute which can take sides

with us in such a contest." This is far beyond any thing that Mr. Lovejoy ever published. Please to notice particularly the strong points in this extract from the man who was the glory of the "old dominion."

1. The nation is represented as being in danger from slavery. "I tremble for my country," says Mr. Jefferson; and what more than this did Mr. L. say?

2. It says that the slaves may revolt, conquer and enslave their masters. "Considering numbers, nature and natural means, an exchange of situation is among possible events." How alarming this! how incendiary! Much more so than any thing which abolitionists say and publish on their own responsibility.

3. The extract more than intimates that God may be the direct agent in bringing about such an event. A change of situation "may become probable by supernatural interference." What a comment this on slavery! It is represented as so // wicked that God may punish it by rolling the wheel of fortune round with his own almighty hand, and enslaving slave-holders.

4. It is declared that, should the slaves revolt, they would be sure to have the great Jehovah on their side. "The Almighty has no attribute which can take sides with us in such a contest."

5. The language of Mr. Jefferson represents slavery as being so corrupt, so unjust, so wicked, as to provoke the justice of God, that though his justice slumber long yet it "cannot sleep forever." "I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just," as though his wrath was kindling and his thunders growing impatient to leap from the chambers of justice to avenge the wrongs of an enslaved race! Now, consider that this was uttered in the midst of a slaveholding community, without exciting any alarm, and yet for saying much less than this, Mr. Lovejoy has been murdered in a free State.

Let us now hear what Mr. Wesley has said of slavery. I can only give a few very brief extracts from the much which this man of God wrote on the subject. The following are Mr. Wesley's words. "But waiving for the present, all these considerations, I strike at the root of this complicated villany; I absolutely deny all slave-holding to be consistent with any degree of natural justice. It clearly follows that all slavery is as irreconcilable to justice as to mercy. That slave-holding is utterly inconsistent with mercy, is almost too plain to need a proof.

* * * * * * * I deny that villany is ever necessary. It is impossible that it should ever be necessary for any reasonable creature to violate all the laws of justice mercy and truth. No circumstance can make it necessary for a rational being to burst in sunder all the ties of humanity. It can never be necessary for a rational being to sink himself below a brute. A man can be under no necessity of degrading himself into a wolf. The absurdity of the supposition is so glaring, that one would wonder any one can help seeing it. * * * * Perhaps you will say 'I do not buy any negroes; I only use those left me be my father.' So far is well; but is it enough to satisfy your own conscience? Had your father, have you, has any man living, a right to use another as a slave? It cannot be, even setting Revelation aside. It cannot be, that either war, or contract can give any man such a // property in another as he has in his sheep and oxen. Much less is it possible that any child of man should ever be born a slave. Liberty is the right of every human creature, as soon as he breathes the vital air; and no human law can deprive him of that right which he derives from the law of nature. --The following was written by Mr. Wesley four days only before his death, as is supposed, to Mr. Wilberforce. "Dear Sir,--Unless the divine power has raised you up to be as *Athanacius contra mundum,* [Athanacius against the world,] I see not how you can go through your glorious enterprise, in opposing that execrable villany, which is the scandal of religion, of England, and of human nature. Unless God has raised you up for this very thing, you will be worn out by the opposition of men and devils. But 'if God be for you, who can be against you?' Go on in the name of God and in the power of his might, till even American slavery, (the vilest that ever saw the sun) shall vanish away." Wesley's works, Vol. VI. page 286, 287, 289, 292.--Vol. VIII. 237. These sentiments were uttered by Mr. Wesley under the very throne of England, at a time when the British government was a slave-holding system, and yet no one was alarmed, but, for saying the same things in a free State, blood has been shed! Again these came sayings of Mr. Wesley, and many more of a similar character, are now published at the Methodist Book-Room in New-York, and circulated through every State in the Union; and yet, because a man of God, a minister of Jesus Christ, repeated them from the lips of the official organ of the Church, his blood has been poured upon the ground. Tell

it not in Gath, whisper it not in the streets of Askelon--let no breeze bear the faintest whisper of such an outrage upon law and justice to the ears of the tyrants who reign on the other continent, lest they rejoice in prospect of the downfall of American liberty.

But I am, finally, to compare the doctrines of Mr. Lovejoy with the principles of eternal rectitude, and see what there is in the sentiments themselves worthy of death. Is it a crime to hold and publish that slavery is wrong--that all men were born free--that it is wrong to hold two and a half millions of human beings in hopeless bondage:--that slavery being wrong, should be immediately abolished? If this be a crime worthy of death, then was Mr. Lovejoy's death an expiation of // his crime; but if the holding and publishing these sentiments be not a crime, then is Alton stained with the innocent blood of one of God's ministers. But, let me ask, who among us does not believe the doctrines inculcated by Mr. L.? I must confess that I believe them. I believe that all men are born free, and were endowed with the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and hence, that slavery is wrong; I believe these points for the following, among many other reasons:

1. All men have derived their existence from one common father, who was the federal head and representative of all men. God "hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on the face of all the earth." Acts XVII. 26. If it could be proved that God created different races of men, at different times, it might serve as a pretext for slavery; but such is not the case; he made but one man and one woman, and from these two all men have received their existence. Human nature is but one; though existing in different nations and with different complexions, yet human nature is still but one, is all derived from one original stock. Now, as Adam, the first man, was the federal head and father of all men, whatever endowments God bestowed upon him must have been the common property of his descendants, and may be claimed by every son and daughter of man as his heir; and among the endowments bestowed upon our common father was liberty; liberty therefore is the unalienable right of every man--white or black--and may be claimed by virtue of the relation which all men sustain to Adam, on whom it was bestowed in trust for his descendants.

2. I believe the doctrine under consideration, because

its denial would be subversive of the moral government of God, who says, "all souls are mine." If all men are not born free, have not an unalienable right to liberty, God cannot be a moral governor, so far as all those are concerned who have not a right to liberty. A moral government supposes liberty on the part of the governed; for obedience which is not free, is not moral obedience, and disobedience, which is forced, is not recognizable by a moral law; hence, where there is not liberty there can be no moral government. If God has marked out my duty and shown me the path in which I am required to walk, who dare set up a claim over me contravening the com- // mand of my Creator? Whoever does this,--King, President, Governor, or Southern Planter--assumes an awful responsibility, and arrogantly attempts to wrest the reigns of government from him whose throne is in the heavens. If these arguments are sound, and I believe they are, then slavery must be wrong, and *only* wrong from beginning to end. And if slavery is wrong, should it not be abolished?--should it not be *immediately* abolished? If it was wrong in the beginning, has it grown any less wrong by continuing it up to this time?--and if it is now wrong, will it grow better by continuing it still longer? Can it be right to continue or persist in what is wrong? It is impossible. Such a notion would be to say that a thing may be right and wrong at the same time, which is a contradiction. Suppose slavery to have been wrong yesterday, and that it is wrong to-day, does not the wrong of to-day depend upon the continuance of the wrong of yesterday? and if so, is not its *continuance* wrong? To say that slavery should not be abolished now, but that it ought to be abolished at some future period, is to say that slavery is not wrong now, but that it will be wrong at some future time. The one indivisible question is this; is slavery now right or wrong? If it is now wrong, it should now be abolished; for, to say that it should not now be abolished, would be the same as to say that it is now right. If slavery is now wrong, and yet should not now be abolished, the simple fact that it is wrong cannot prove that it ought ever to be abolished. If it be right to continue what is now wrong, it may be right to continue it to-morrow--next week --next year--and forever.

But it may be said these are the doctrines of abolitionists. I care not whose doctrines they are, so long as I am satisfied that they are true doctrines. Shall we

give up the truth because abolitionists embrace it? God forbid; if the devil should embrace the truth, I would not give it up. But if these sentiments are peculiar to abolitionists, if they are the only persons that embrace these views, then am I an abolitionist; then do I glory in being an abolitionist--then would I glory in having my abolitionism and my name inscribed together, in letters of fire, upon the wings of every breeze, to be seen and read of all men, and to be trumpeted in the voice of the wind from east to west and from north to south. //

But I must bring my remarks to a close, which I beg leave to do by observing,

1. We appear to have fallen upon evil times. Riots and bloodshed in the streets of our peaceful cities are of recent date, but they have already made fearful progress, and if they continue to increase as they have done for a few years past, our nation will soon present but one scene of misrule and anarchy. Unless this spirit, which as a destroying angel, has gone forth, is soon stopped, our beloved country will be ruined, the genius of liberty will take its departure for some more peaceful clime, and blood and death will become the portion of our cup; then will our nation appear as an infuriated tiger rending his own bowels, and glutting his thirst for blood in his own gore, and then will our republic fall with a tremendous crash as though some ponderous orb had broken the chains of gravitation and leaped from its centre! May heaven avert a doom so much to be deprecated!

2. What renders these portentous events more alarming, is the high source from whence they derive their principal support. I must speak plainly on this point--and I wish I could speak so as to be heard from the national hall to the farthest verge of our wide spread republic. It is a fact not to be disguised that the spirit of insubordination has been encouraged and favored by men first in authority and influence in the nation. A few instances shall be given. Take a notice, if you please, from the columns of the Charleston Courier.--"Gentlemen,--I am directed by the society of which I am the corresponding secretary, to request you to publish, for a time, the following resolve:--

At a meeting held this day, Saturday, the 15th of August, Judge Lynch presiding, it was resolved by a large majority, that the sum of *two thousand dollars* will be paid by this society to whomsoever will deliver the bodies of either of

the four northern abolitionists." A reward is here offered for men who have violated no law; and who knows that the leaders, who directed the murderous operations against Mr. Lovejoy were not paid for their services after this manner? It is not improbable that the whiskey which rendered the mob so furious, was paid for by negro toil. But the point at which I aim is this; when public journals spread before the populace offers of a high reward for the apprehension of persons, who have // violated no law--for the exercise of their constitutional rights--it may be expected that mobs and riots will prevail.

The Postmaster General has sanctioned violations of the law in giving countenance to outrages committed upon the United States Mail. The Postmaster at Charleston, S. C. detained in his possession certain papers, refusing to deliver them to the persons to whom they were directed, concerning which the Postmaster General wrote him a letter of instruction, from which the following is extracted. "I am satisfied that the Postmaster General has no legal authority to exclude newspapers from the mail, nor prohibit their carriage or delivery on account of their character or tendency, but I am not prepared to direct you to forward or deliver the papers of which you speak. By no act or direction of mine, official or private, could I be induced to aid, knowingly, in giving circulation to papers of this description. We owe an obligation to the laws, but a higher one to the communities in which we live." If this is not mob doctrine, I know not by what name to call it. Mr. Postmaster General first admits that the act of detaining papers is unlawful, and then says he is not prepared to direct his deputy to deliver them--that is, he is not prepared to direct his subordinates to keep the law in the discharge of their official duties. He then gives his reason for refusing to give directions that the law be kept and not broken--"We owe an obligation to the laws, but we owe a higher one to the community in which we live." This teaches that men are to violate the law when the interests of community require it. But who is to judge when to be swayed by the obligation we owe to the law, and when by that we owe to community? As there is no law determining this point, every one is left to judge for himself, and hence, the doctrine inculcated, by this head of department, is that every man is to judge for himself when to keep the law and when to violate it. This is the very quintessence of mob doctrine. The grand mistake here

is, in supposing that a citizen, as such, can be under any higher obligation than that which he owes to the laws. The obligation he owes to community is the obligation he owes to the laws, for the security and well-being of community depend upon obeidence to the laws.

A Senator, from the very land of steady habits, so far forgot himself as to address a multitude, in an exciting speech, on a // public dock, upon the Sabbath day, and afterwards plead in the Senate that the nation was in the midst of a revolution. When grave Senators talk of being in the midst of a revolution, is it any wonder that the mob should martial its forces? My hearers have, no doubt, all heard of the Utica riot which was got up against the Abolition Convention. Who suppose ye were the real authors of that mob? Think ye the rabble were?--No; the rabble never would have started had they not been encouraged by men of standing and influence. Let facts speak--The day before the riot, a leading paper published in Utica, appeared with an exciting article in its columns, from which the following extract is taken: "We have no patience with those who haggle about the RIGHT to come here and hold a convention. The right thus audaciously asserted, is a right to perpetrate mischief, disturb the peace of society, excite civil commotion, promote insubordination among the slaves, produce anarchy and bloodshed, and to dissolve the Union.--The Union must be preserved! It must then be defended against legal and illegal assaults. * * * * * We call, above all, upon the good citizens of Utica to keep this moral pestilence from their door. We call upon their respectable Mayor to rouse up, and with the aid of all the patriots of Utica to arrest this mischievous meeting." This is too plain to be misunderstood; it is beyond all question real mob doctrine.--Mark the language! "We have no patience with those who haggle about the right to come here and hold a convention." When those who guide the public press lose their patience, is it any wonder if the mob imbibe their spirit and rage and foam? But how does the excited journal show its impatience? By dealing in bitter language. It accuses the convention with coming there "to perpetrate mischief." But the convention did no mischief, and would not, had it been permitted to proceed--what mischief was done, was accomplished by the mob, for which this grave paper so loudly called. But the convention is charged with coming there "to dissolve the Union," and then it is

said, "it must be defended against legal as well as illegal assaults." This is clearly recommending a resort to illegal measures to put down the convention. What is legal, cannot be legally opposed; if, therefore, a defence is to be made against legal proceedings, the defence must be illegal. But it is said further, "We call upon the good citizens // of Utica to keep this moral pestilence from their doors." But they had no means of doing this--of keeping the convention away--only by force of arms--mob force--and that this is what was intended to be recommended is plain from the manner pointed out. It is said, "We call upon the mayor to rouse up, and with the aid of all the patriots in Utica, to arrest this meeting." But how could the mayor arrest the meeting unless by mob law? The meeting was a lawful one, and therefore could not be arrested but by unlawful measures. The mayor could not, in the exercise of his official power, or any lawful authority vested in him, arrest the meeting; why then call upon him unless it be to head a mob. And why call upon all the patriots of Utica to aid his honor the mayor, unless there is to be a resort to force? This is undoubtedly what was contemplated--the call was for a mob, and it was responded to, and the rights of the convention were outraged, and the Constitution trampled under foot.

Once more, and I will turn over this dark leaf. On that occasion a speech was made by an Honorable Senator, in the presence of the mob, from which the following is extracted. "They profess to come here on an errand of religion, while under the guise of religion they are hypocritically plotting the dissolution of the Union. They have been warned beforehand, and borne with, with unexampled patience. But if they now refuse, and any unpleasant consequences should follow, we will not be responsible. Let them yield to the wishes of the good and respectable citizens of Utica, and dissolve their convention. If they refuse, then the fault will be theirs." What language this to be addressed to a mob by a man filling the high station of a Senator! Understand, a large proportion of the convention were ministers of as undoubted piety as any in the land, and yet this grave Senator descends to call them HYPOCRITES "plotting the dissolution of the Union under the guise of religion." But, he says, "let them yield to the wishes of the good and respectable citizens of Utica"--Yield what to their wishes? Their constitutional rights is the proper answer! Very "good and respectable citizens" indeed, to

make such demands and to enforce them by mob violence! It is said further, "they have been borne with, with unexampled patience." And what is this but telling the mob that it is time for them to commence operations? It is added, "If they now refuse" (to yield their // constitutional rights) "the fault is theirs; if any unpleasant consequences follow, we will not be responsible." What is this but saying to the mob, if you assail them it will be their fault, not yours? "We will not be responsible"--that is, do what you please and you shall not be called to an account!--Now, I appeal to every man, who is the least acquainted with human nature, if these men, high in office and influence, are not the true authors of the mob spirit that is abroad in the land--The only wonder is that the flame has not been fanned higher. But I forbear--

3. What can be done to save the country from ruin? I answer, let the little patriotism that remains wake up and rally around the Constitution and the Laws. Let our magistrates no longer wink at violations of the law, let them become a terror to evil doers, and, from the bench of justice, speak in the deep-toned thunders of the law, bellowing in the ear of crime and lawless violence; and let all know and feel that if they countenance lawless violence, when such violence shall have gotten the reigns it may shift like the storm, and drive in another direction, and turn upon those who first set the elements in motion, scattering ruin and death in its course.

To conclude, the Rev. E. P. Lovejoy, whose death by unlawful violence has called forth this discourse, was a native of Maine, and graduated at one of the colleges of that State; he studied divinity at Princeton, and was murdered at Alton, Ill., November 7th, 1837. He fell in the cause of liberty; and as I take my seat let me predict that his blood will be as the seed of martyrs, that his death is a signal of the success of the cause in which he fell.--Let a monument be raised to his memory, and on it let these words be inscribed--MY BLOOD A RANSOM FOR THE OPPRESSED, AND THOUGH MORE BE REQUIRED, YET SHALL AFRIC'S ENSLAVED RACE BE FREE!

THE SUPREMACY OF THE DIVINE LAW.

A Sermon, preached on the occasion of the death of Rev. Charles Turner Torrey.

BY LUTHER LEE.

[*Published by Request.*]

Acts xxiii:29--Whom I perceived to be accused of questions of their law, but to name nothing laid to his charge worthy of death or of bonds.

These words are selected from a letter written by Claudius Lysias, a Chief Captain, to Felix the Roman Governor, concerning Paul the Apostle. St. Paul was accused of the Jews for having preached the Gospel, and when he was in danger, the chief captain took him out of their hands by force, and sent him to the Governor with the letter from which the text has been selected.

The words, we believe to be as true of Rev. Charles T. Torrey, whose death is the occasion of this discourse, as they were of St. Paul, of whom they were written. He was accused of slave-holders, and died in the penitentary under the infliction of the law of the State of Maryland, and yet on a careful examination of the subject, I am led to apply to him the language of the text, and say, He was accused of questions of their law, and yet had nothing laid to his charge worthy of death or of bonds.

To sustain this position, let us examine,

I. The facts of Mr. Torrey's conduct, and ascertain just what he did.

II. Inquire into the rightfulness of such conduct, and the consequent wrong of the law that condemned and punished him; and,

III. Indulge in some reflections which the subject is calculated to inspire.

I. The facts in relation to Mr. Torrey's conduct; what did he do?

It is not denied that Mr. Torrey violated the law of Maryland, but the defence is, that the law was wrong, and the law breaker right. But what did the accused do? What law did he violate? And by what acts did he violate that law? The answer is, it was the law of slavery that he violated, and it was by assisting fugitive slaves in their flight for liberty, that he violated that law. But, if Mr. Torrey did assist slaves, how could he plead not guilty to the indictment? This will be explained in the following remarks.

1. Mr. Torrey did not entice the slaves away from their master as was charged in the indictment. He never saw the slaves in question, or knew that there were any // such slaves, until days after they had made their escape from the legal owner. In this respect the indictment was false.

2. Mr. Torrey did not assist those slaves within the county of Baltimore, as was charged in the indictment. They were out of the county of Baltimore, before he even saw or heard of them. Here again the indictment was false in an important particular. From this it not only follows that he was justifiable in pleading not guilty, but that he was either condemned without evidence, or upon false evidence.

3. It should be remarked that when Mr. Torrey met with those slaves, he was not there for that purpose, he knew not that they were to be there; their meeting therefore was, in common language, accidental. This shows that he could not have acted from malice aforethought, so far as assisting those slaves was concerned.

4. Mr. Torrey was charged in the indictment with assisting only three slaves. They were a mother and her two children. We do not say that Mr. Torrey assisted no other slaves. This he may have done; if he did not, it must have been for want of an opportunity, for the principle and the humanity that would assist three, would assist more under the same circumstances. We say that Mr. Torrey was tried and condemned for assisting three slaves only.

5. Whatever may be thought of the moral character of the act of assisting a slave to escape from his legal

owner, Mr. Torrey, did what he did, with a firm belief that it was right, and that the religion in which he trusted, and which he preached to others, required it at his hand.

We now have the conduct of Mr. Torrey before us; he assisted a mother and her two children in their escape from bondage, he met with them on their flight, and helped them on their way. This conduct was right, or if wrong, it was in him, to make the worst of it, an act of mistaken philanthrophy. For this he was tried, for this he was condemned, for this he was punished, and for this he died in prison.

II. Let us now consider the rightfulness of Mr. Torrey's conduct, and the consequent wrong of the law that condemned and punished him.

All actions are right or wrong as they agree, or disagree with some law or rule with which they are compared, and which is admitted to be the standard of right and wrong. But it so happens, that different persons are wont to appeal to different standards to test the moral quality of actions, and to satisfy all these classes, we must compare Mr. Torrey's conduct with all these standards. My own standard is the Bible, but for the sake of the argument, I am willing to appeal to other standards.

1. Let us compare Mr. Torrey's conduct with the acknowledged sentiments of the nation on the subject of human rights. Fortunately for our argument, we have the concentrated opinion of the nation, drawn up and published to the world, under circumstances to imbue it with the authority of a nation's united voice.

"We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

This is the nation's voice, and speaks of the rights of universal humanity; and of course defines the rights of the slave by which we may test Mr. Torrey's conduct.

The slave has a natural and inalienable right to liberty, Mr. Torrey, therefore assisted the slaves in obtaining no more than what belonged to them by the endowment of the God of nature, stamped by the seal of inalienability. Nor can his wrong be found in the manner in which he did it, if the end be secured at all.

If the slaves had an inalienable right to liberty, they certainly had a right to possess themselves of that

liberty in so peaceable a manner as simply walking away from their chains and prisons. If the slaves had an inalienable right to the pursuit of happiness, they had as good a right to pursue that happiness towards the North, as in any other direction, they had a right to pursue their happiness by journeying towards the land over which the North Star hangs.

Mr. Torrey must have had a right to assist them on their way; If Mr. Torrey had no right to assist those slaves, they could have had no right to journey to the North, and if they had no right to travel towards the North, then they had not an inalienable right to liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and the declaration of // our fathers, for the support of which they pledged their fortunes, their lives and their more sacred honor, making an appeal to the Searcher of Hearts, for the rectitude of their motives, must be false. Will you then admit the rightfulness of Mr. Torrey's conduct, or by denying it, will you give the lie to the foundation principle of our national independence, and stir the bones, and disturb the spirits of our fathers who have so long rested in glory; and whose very ashes are so sacred to the living patriot?

2. Let us compare Mr. Torrey's conduct with the common sentiment of mankind. What we have said is peculiarly national, but let us take a larger view and listen to the voice of the civilized world. To come at the opinion of the world, we must consult cases involving the same principle on which the world has decided and rendered a verdict.

Take the case of imprisoned Americans in Tripoli. She plundered our commerce, and made prisoners or slaves of our citizens, and our Government sent out an armed force and brought the pirates to terms, and delivered their countrymen.

It was in this War that our Decatur and others first distinguished themselves, and in it we had the sympathy of all civilized nations, shedding a new glory on American arms and American valor. Here we have a case then which is right in the opinion of the world. I do not say it is right as my private opinion, but that it is right in the opinion of the world. Now, who will undertake to prove upon any sound principle that Tripolitans have not as good a right to enslave Americans, as Americans have to enslave Africans or Afric-Americans. If it be said that those who were assisted by Mr. Torrey, were held according to law,

so were those held according to the laws of the Tripolitans, for whose deliverance Decatur and Eaton fought.

Take the case of our revolutionary fathers, and can you justify them, without justifying the conduct of Mr. Torrey? We may consider the civilized world as having sanctioned the successful struggle of our fathers for National Independence. Great Britain herself has given us the right hand of national fellowship, and the world is pleased to honor the name of Washington, who by his private virtues as well as by his valor upon the field of battle, encircle himself and nation with the halo of immortal fame, and threw a light around the shring of humanity, the wide world over, which the more virtuous and enlightened Nations are pleased to own, and in which the darker nations delight to bask.

Amid the darkness of the conflict, in which our fathers were engaged, LaFayette came to their assistance with sword in hand and mingled in the strife, for which the world does him honor, and if so, is Torrey to be condemned and forgotten, or remembered only to be despised? Let us compare the cases and make an application of the principles involved. Our fathers resisted taxation without their consent; the amount was trifling, a few pence upon a pound of tea, but the principle was all with them. But what was the wrong inflicted upon those to whom Mr. Torrey lent the hand of assistance? Were they taxed a few cents without their consent? Alas! their oppressors stopped not to divide their cents by count, but took the whole, money, person, body, soul and all.

To resist the small tax, our fathers flew to arms and stained the land with blood, and shook the nation with the convulsions of war; and amid the battle cry, LaFayette came with his sword gleaming with war fires, and rushed into the scene of carnage, and quenched those fires in human gore. Such were the deeds which the world approves to resist a small tax. Now, what did Mr. Torrey do to save the helpless from the greater wrong of slavery which disdains to tax, but takes the whole, body and soul? He lit up no war fires; he raised no battle cry; no sword gleamed in his hand thirsting for blood; he aimed no deadly blow, not even at the oppressor. What did he do? He whispered peace and consolation in the ear of distress; as consolation in the ear of distress; as an angel of mercy, he extended a helping hand to the weak and helpless: he listened to the cry of the widow and orphan; he fell in

with the stranger mother and her two children, and helped them on their way, as they were journeying in search of what the God of their being had made theirs by a title indisputable and inalienable. More than this he did not; of worse than this he was never guilty. Will any one now say that Mr. Torrey did wrong? He who shall do this, will take upon him // self to condemn the common sentiments of the world.--It should be understood that in all that has been said above, we reason not from our own private views, but from the common sentiment of mankind; our own standard of right and wrong has yet to be brought forward, by which we will next attempt to test Mr. Torrey's conduct.

3. Let us compare Mr. Torrey's conduct with the Bible. This we regard as the book of ultimate appeal.

I will quote one text on which I would not fear to rest the whole argument, yet several shall be introduced.

Matt. xvi. 24:25.--"Then said Jesus unto his disciples, If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.

For whosoever will save his life, shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his life for my sake, shall find it."

The object of quoting this text is to prove the paramount claim of the gospel, that the law of Christ is to be obeyed whatever human laws may exist to the contrary, and whatever consequences may attend obedience. The meaning is, that whosoever will save his natural life by disobeying or denying me, shall lose his moral or spiritual life, and whosoever will lose his natural life for my sake, that is, die rather than disobey me, shall find, that is, secure all the objects of life, in the possession of moral or spiritual life. If it could be right to disobey Christ under any circumstances, or to escape any consequences, even death itself, then there could be no such thing as losing life for his sake, from regard to him; hence as he in the text does teach that men may be called to sacrifice life for his sake, it follows that nothing can justify us in disregarding his law; it is paramount, and must be obeyed, should all human laws contravene.

WITH THIS DOCTRINE AGREES THE EXAMPLES OF PROPHETS, APOSTLES, AND HOLY MEN OF OLD.

Daniel was commanded by the highest human authority of the Empire, not to pray to his God, but still he prayed as usual. Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego, were commanded by the highest civil authority to fall down and worship the image that had been set up in the plains of Dura, but they

refused. God had said in his law that they should not bow down to any image, and the civil authority said they should bow down to this image, and they obeyed God rather than man. We have a twofold case, a negative and a positive one; Daniel did what the civil law forbade him to do, and his friends refused to do what the civil law commanded them to do. This covers the whole ground. To the same effect have we the recorded examples of the Apostle, who went out under the promise that they should have the Holy Ghost to guide them into all truth. The apostles were arraigned before the rulers, and commanded not to speak at all, nor teach in the name of Jesus.--(Acts iv.18:28.) Now listen to the honest hearted and noble reply.

"But Peter and John answered and said unto them, Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye.

For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard."

They were true to their word, and the rulers arrested them again, when the following conversation took place, recorded Acts v. 27:29.

"And when they had brought them, they set them before the council: and the high priest asked them,

Saying, Did not we straitly command you, that ye should not teach in this name? and behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intended to bring this man's blood upon us.

Then Peter and the other apostles answered and said, We ought to obey God rather than men."

Is not this sufficient to settle the whole question of the supremacy of the divine law? Should an objector say, that though the fact of the supremacy of the divine law has been proved, it has not been proved that Mr. Torrey's conduct was in accordance with that law: My answer is, that I think it has been proved, implied at least, but we will leave no room to cavil here, but will directly and fully meet the point under the following proposition.

THE SPECIFIED DUTIES OF CHRISTIANITY INCLUDE THE ACTS OF MR. TORREY, FOR WHICH HE WAS CONDEMNED AND PUNISHED.

We will commence this argument with the Golden Rule: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them, for this is the // law and the prophets." Men are liable to be influenced in their opinions by selfishness, hence, what the slave in his

distress desires you to do for him, may not be the measure of your duty. You are not a slave, you are free and enlightened, and therefore are capable of an impartial judgment. Look then upon the slave and see what, with your present light and judgment, you would like to have done for you, were you the slave, and then you will have found the measure of your duty. Apply this to the case in point. Look upon the fugitive mother with her two children escaping from the land of their bondage, and the hand that oppressed them; the pursuer is after them with the chains in his hand, which they have just shaken off, to seize them and rivet those chains upon their scarred limbs more firmly than ever; they are faint and weary, and falling in with Mr. Torrey, solicit his assistance. Could he refuse as a Christian? Did he do more than the golden rule requires? Speak conscience, speak it out for God knows the judgment of the head, and the impulses of the heart. If the Golden Rule did not require all that Mr. Torrey did, we know not what it does require.

Take the principles by which our Lord represents himself as deciding the destiny of all men, and apply them to this case, and see if they will not justify Mr. Torrey. Matt. xxv. 34:45.

"Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world;

35. For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in:

36. Naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me.

37. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink?

38. When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee?

39. Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee?

40. And the King shall answer and say unto them. Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.

41. Then shall he say unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels:

42. For I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink:
43. I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison and ye visited me not.
44. Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee?
45. Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as he did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me."

This teaches that to have done less than he did, would have been to have placed himself upon the left hand, under the divine malediction. Jesus Christ here teaches that every disciple is his personal representative, and that he regards what is done to them, of good or ill, as done to himself. Now let us suppose the case to have resulted differently. Mr. Torrey was a professed Christian and Christian minister, he professed to teach and do the things of God, and as he was in the vicinity of Baltimore, he fell in with one of Christ's representatives. She was a poor woman, with two children; she was in distress; she was a stranger, and needed protection; she was hungry, with her children, and needed to be fed; she was weary, and needed to be assisted on her way to a place of security. Mr. Torrey, I have said, is a minister, and to retain his character as such, and secure a living in this corrupt age, he must not assist this class of sufferers; so, like the Priest and the Levite he passed by on the other side. They implored his assistance, but lest he should offend the world, and lose caste, he turned away. Time rolled on; the poor mother and her children were forgotten amid other scenes. Mr. Torrey was popular, and preached the gospel to the rich and the wise, and lived and died respected, as the result of turning away from the poor mother and her children, for, had he assisted them, he would have died in prison. //

Time is done; the fires of the last judgment kindle upon the hills; the trumpet sounds, the dead awake, and Mr. Torrey, and the poor fugitive mother and her children, meet once more, and are had in remembrance at the bar of God. On whose ear but Mr. Torrey's do the dreadful words fall--"I was an hungered and ye gave me no meat, I was a stranger and ye took me not in:" and of whom is this true but that poor mother and her children, pointing to

whom the judge says,--"Inasmuch as ye have not done it unto one of the least of these, ye have not done it unto me." Under this view of the subject, can you doubt the rightfulness of Mr. Torrey's conduct? To claim that he acted wrong, is to assume that Jesus mistook in his description of the way to heaven.

A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE DESIGNS OF DIVINE AND HUMAN LAWS, WILL LEAD US TO THE SAME GENERAL CONCLUSION.

The design of divine law is to reveal or make known to man what is right; the design of human law is to secure what is already known to be right. The only good reason why any human law should be enacted, is the fact, that the end to be secured by it is right. Now, as the right of the thing to be secured is the only reason why the law should be enacted which is to secure it, the right must exist before the law, and the law is based upon the right, and not the right upon the law. This view shows that human law makes nothing right which was not right previous to the enactment of the law.

The manner of constituting human legislatures may throw some light on the subject of the comparative claim of divine and human law. How are our legislatures constituted? By the suffrages of the people. The leaders of one party meet here and nominate a man, and the leaders of another party meet there, and nominate another candidate, and a third person gets upon a stump and nominates himself, and then they all go to work, and make their respective presses groan under the misrepresentations, slanders and falsehoods, with which they assail each other until the day of voting, when one of them is elected, and is thereby constituted a law maker. There are some honorable exceptions to the rule of general corruption, but still corruption is the general rule. Go to our national legislature, and of whom do you find it composed? Of tiplers, rum-drinkers, wine bibbers, beer-guzzlers, gamblers, fist-fighters, duelists, and libertines. So notoriously corrupt is Congress, that when it assembles, there is a priming up and moving on to the seat of government, among some of the higher classes of the frail sisterhood, from Maine to Georgia. Are these the men to make laws, more binding than the law of God? Is this the authority to ascend above the throne of God, their Maker, and reverse his decrees, and hush the voice that speaks his law? Will they roll up as a scroll his lightning's blaze, in which he wrapt the mount of Sinai when he delivered his law, and

silence the thunders with which he then spake in the startled ear of a listening world? All this, and more too, is involved in the idea that human law can be binding when it conflicts with divine. The very thought is blasphemous!

III. We are to indulge in some reflections which the subject appears calculated to inspire.

1. How corrupt must slavery be, which needs to resort to such measures to sustain itself. The persecution and death of Mr. Torrey is but one item in a system of warfare upon human rights, designed to support and perpetuate slavery. The spirit of mob violence, which went howling like a storm through the land a few years since, was the breath of slavery, breathing terror and death against the freedom of speech, and the liberty of the press. The hand that set fire to Pennsylvania Hall did the bidding of slavery, and the death of Lovejoy, whose blood was poured out as a libation at Alton, was to appease the wrath of the revengeful Moloch, whose ire was kindled by a freeman's voice, that dared to speak against slavery. An imprisoned Wort and Thompson, and others, have suffered at its hand, and a Fairbanks is now under its infliction, atoning for the crime of daring to interfere so far as to assist suffering humanity. So corrupt is slavery that it could not live, even in this corrupt world, were it not for the special efforts, and the force of special legislation surrounding it with legal supports and defenses on every side. That slavery may live, the liberty of speech and the freedom of the press must die, and the voice of conscience must be silenced. Slaveholders dare not trust each other; yea, they dare not trust themselves, // unrestrained by law, lest in some honest moment, under some impulse of humanity, they should emancipate the victims of their oppression. Hence all the laws against emancipation. How corrupting must such a system be, and how dangerous to all the best interests of humanity, and to social and civil relations?

2. The picture is darkened when we consider the intellectual, literary, moral and ecclesiastical standing of the victim, which, in the person of Mr. Torrey, has been sacrificed to the bloody Moloch. Mr. Torrey was a scholar, in addition to which he possessed what New-England calls a finished theological education. He commenced his theological studies in the school at Andover, but finished them in the private study of Rev. Dr. Ide, and received

the hand of this venerable man's daughter, who became the partner of his joys and sorrows. He was settled as the pastor of a Congregational Church in Providence, R. I. Subsequently he removed to Salem, Mass. Finally, he entered into the anti-slavery cause with his whole heart and soul, in which he died. The first introduction of the speaker to Mr. Torrey was at an Anti-Slavery Convention in Albany, N. Y., in 1839. He represented the Massachusetts Abolition Society, not only in the Convention, but as one of a committee to engage the labors of the speaker as an agent of the above named society. The arrangement was made, and for a season I acted as the general agent of the society, Mr. Torrey being one of the agents at the same time. This gave me an opportunity to learn the man, and though Mr. Torrey and I did not always think alike on every subject, yet I was never associated with a man whom I believe to have possessed a truer heart and sterner virtue, and to have been actuated by purer motives.

It is not to be disguised that his opposers accused him of imprudence and rashness, and that his friends strongly suspected him of indiscretion. In reply to this I have but two simple remarks to make.

(1.) All who have ever been worthy to be called reformers, have in like manner been accused by their enemies and suspected by their friends. No man can at this day and in this country, rise up and contend for all that is right in politics and religion, and carry out by consistent action the principles for which he contends, without being accused of rashness by his opposers, and suspected of indiscretion by his pretended friends.

(2.) Mr. Torrey's indiscretion was of a quality which is too rare among men, it was the indiscretion into which unsophisticated and unyielding virtue will lead men, in the estimation of an expediency-governed community like our own. But few men possess virtue sufficiently unyielding in the day of trial to render them indiscreet in the same sense and to the same extent that was Mr. Torrey. In a word, his rashness and indiscretion were the result of the standard of virtue which he had adopted, which *dares to do right!* placing the law of God and the claims of his Maker above all human law, and the praise or the wrath of man. But few men have virtue enough to make them as indiscreet as he was, under the selfish, time serving policy of the present age. His indiscretion is to be put down in the catalogue of his virtues, to be repeated to his honor.

3. The picture grows darker still when we consider the efforts that were made, in vain, to save Mr. Torrey from death. His friends were satisfied that he could not survive the term of his imprisonment, and that the only chance was in an effort to obtain a pardon. It was thought that if full satisfaction was made to the owners of the slaves that a pardon might be obtained. To meet all the probable expenses of such an effort, it was believed about three thousand dollars would be necessary. A private appeal was sent out to the known friends of humanity, and the money was pledged, and more might have been obtained if needed. This speaks well both for Mr. Torrey and his friends. The money was tendered in full pay for the slaves, petitions were presented from a number of the most distinguished men in Massachusetts, from the court that tried him, and what was more, from Mr. Torrey's wife, who, with the little pledges of their mutual affection around her, so soon to be orphans, plead with an eloquence and power which would have moved the heart of a stone, but it touched not the heart of slavery; the Governor of Maryland was unmoved, and showed no mercy. Slavery had got its victim in its power, and he must die.

4. With reference to this event, and all // other similar events that have or may transpire, we may look up to God and say, "The wrath of man shall praise thee, and the remainder of that wrath shalt thou restrain."

We have no doubt that the persecution and death of Mr. Torrey will hasten the overthrow of slavery. "He being dead yet speaketh." His body rests at Mount Auburn, between Bunker's Hill and Plymouth Rock, and his friends are about to erect a monument to his memory, which will lift its marble head and point to heaven as a witness against slavery; and when the slaveholder shall look upon that monument and read the name of Torrey thereon, he shall be pricked to the heart, and every ray of light it reflects shall be sent as an arrow to his soul.

Mr. Torrey is dead, and his wife sighs in widowhood, and his children weep in orphanage, but slavery will have to meet the account; his consumption of which he died shall continue to devour, until slavery shall be consumed out of the land; his blood shall corrode and eat off its chains; the sighs of the widow shall wake the winds of liberty, and swell the tempest that shall sweep slavery from the nation and the world; the tears of those orphans shall be bottled up before God, and their united prayers shall enter

into the ears of the Lord of Sabbaoth, and his released spirit, like the souls described in the Apocalypse, shall cry from under heaven's altar, "How long, O Lord, just and true, dost thou not avenge my blood on slavery's gory hands, and head, and heart."

5. Mr. Torrey has gone to a martyr's reward. We sorrow, but we sorrow not as those that have no hope. He was calm and resigned in death; he felt the force of the words of the poet,

"And prisons would palaces prove,
If Jesus would dwell with me there."

He found it even so, that Jesus did dwell with him in that prison, and he could say,

"His presence disperses my gloom,
And makes all within me rejoice."

It was then that experience taught him that,

"Jesus can make a dying bed
Feel soft as downy pillows are,
While on his breast I lean my head,
And breathe my life out sweetly there."

The cold stream of death rolled no deeper and darker between that prison and the rest that remaineth to the people of God, than between it and the home of his childhood, or the circle of his friends. His spirit found as direct a passage through the gates and bars of that prison, when it retired on the wings of an expiring breath, to join the spirits of martyrs on high, and mingle its praise with the songs of the redeemed, as it could have found from the place where he was first converted to God, or from the sanctuary, where, amid the hopes and joys of friends, he was inducted into the office of the Christian ministry. We have said that his friends took his body and deposited it at Mount Auburn, and that a monument is to be raised, to point out the place where his ashes rest, but the noble Torrey is not there; to say that it was he that his friends bore away from that prison, to be buried in the land of his pilgrim fathers, would be to speak in the language of infidelity; it was not he, it was only the house of clay in which he lived; he left the prison ere that, bidding adieu to its chains, and walls, and grates, and tears; he left the world, the sun, the moon and stars behind, to search and find out God. His friends took charge of his body, as Elisha picked up the mantle of Elijah when the prophet was gone, and that they have deposited at Mount Auburn. The marble column shall point

out the place where it lies, and we say peace to his ashes, and let every one that shall visit his tomb and read his epitaph, whisper peace; and when slavery shall be no more, when the chain shall be stricken from the limbs of the last slave, when the light of the nation's jubilee shall break upon the land, then amid the joy and songs of that glorious morn, let his epitaph be written anew. Until then, peace to his ashes, peace to his memory, peace to the martyr's spirit.

A SERMON

FOR THE TIMES:

PROHIBITORY LAWS.

BY REV. L. LEE.

NEW YORK:
WESLEYAN BOOK ROOM, 9 SPRUCE-ST.

1852.

PREFACE.

The history of the annexed sermon is as follows:-- In the winter of 1841, the Temperance Society of the city of Lowell, Mass., by a resolution, invited all the clergymen of the city, each to deliver a Temperance Sermon in the City Hall. The clergy held a meeting and responded to the invitation, and divided the work among the several ministers, by assigning to each a specific branch of the subject of Temperance, and the subject of prohibitory law, was assigned to the author of the following Sermon, which he delivered in the regular course. The several Sermons were published in a volume, and as the present state of the cause of Temperance, in this State in particular, calls for effort in this direction, we publish the Sermon. It shows what views the author entertained twelve years ago.

January, 1852. L. LEE.

TEMPERANCE SERMON.

PROHIBITORY LAWS.

Romans xiii.: 3. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil.

In this chapter, the apostle, as we understand him, vindicates the rightful existence of civil government, and lays down certain general principles respecting its design, its powers and its limitations. In the text which we have before us for contemplation this evening, we learn the object to which civil government should be directed, viz., to the suppression of vice, and the support of virtue. The apostle, in this text, most obviously speaks of rulers in view of what they *should be*, and not in view of what they too frequently *are*. It was the design of God, in ordaining the existence of civil government, that rulers by whom it is administered, should be a terror to evil doers, and support to the virtuous, and a protection to them that do well; hence, of the same rulers who are said to be a terror to the evil, it is said in the fourth verse, with reference to them that do well, "he is the minister of God unto them for good." From this it will be seen that in all those cases, where government has been di- // rected to purposes of oppression, to the injury of any portion of the governed, or to the suppression of virtue, or in which it has been made to yield any support to vice, there has been a departure from the design of the institution, and a violation, not only of the rights and interests of man, but of the law of God.

We might point out various instances in which government has been perverted, and instead of being a terror to evil doers, it has thrown its protecting arm around the workers of iniquity, and has become a terror to them that do well, but we must confine our remarks upon this subject to one point, viz., the countenance which government has given to intemperance. The subject assigned to me in the order of

the series of temperance sermons which is now nearly finished, is that of "*prohibitory laws.*" This subject I deem of the first importance, and though I cannot help feeling a regret that it had not been entrusted to more able hands, and especially to hands that might have sent it out to the public with a stronger personal influence, echoing with a name that would sound more grateful upon the public ear, yet as it has been committed to me, I shall discharge the obligation imposed upon me to the best of my ability, by attempting to prove that government, "instead of licensing the sale of intoxicating drinks, ought to prohibit the sale of the same under severe penalties."

In order to establish the above position, I shall attempt to show--

I. That a prohibitory law is necessary to consummate the temperance reformation;

II. That the passage of such a law comes perfectly within the design and powers of civil government; and, //

III. That civil government is bound by the strongest moral obligation, to enact and enforce such a law.

I. It is necessary to resort to prohibitory law to consummate the temperance reformation.

1. To license the sale of intoxicating drinks tends to produce intemperance, as every reflecting mind must see. We shall not in this place attempt to prove that moderate drinking is injurious, as we might do, but only that it leads to intemperate drinking. So long as the habit of drinking is continued, the habit of drunkenness cannot be broken up. This is a point so well established, that it is unnecessary to waste time to prove it again. If there were no moderate drinkers, there would soon be no drunkards; hence, the success of the temperance cause depends upon our success in persuading men to wholly abandon the use of intoxicating drinks. The question then is this, and it is a plain one, Does the act of licensing men to sell the evil spirit to be drunk, help or hinder us in the work of persuading our neighbors not to drink it? It cannot be denied that the act of licensing the sale of intoxicating drink is a decided and public testimony in favor of drinking it, and every man who in any way aids in giving licenses, and all who approve of the license system, declare to the world their acts and principles, that it is right to drink intoxicating liquor, and that it ought to be drunk. If it be right to license a man to sell spirit, it must follow that it is right for such person to sell

it; and if it be right for one man to sell spirit to be drunk, it must also follow that it is right for others to buy and drink spirit, for no man can have a right to sell to be drunk, what another has not a right to buy and drink.

The above view shows that the present system of // granting licenses to men to sell intoxicating drinks, is worse than to have no law on the subject, so far as moral influence is concerned. If there was no law, there would be no testimony on the subject, but the license law is a testimony speaking in the voice of the State, declaring through her statute books, that in the opinion of the people of this Commonwealth, intoxicating liquors ought to be sold and drunk.

But the present license system not only exerts the influence of moral suasion in favor of the use of intoxicating drinks, but it has the effect of a protective law. The law professedly grants licenses for the public good, hence it presumes that it is necessary that there should be some portion of our citizens engaged in the business of selling intoxicating drinks; and to secure this object, the law prohibits all but a certain number of licensed individuals to sell, to encourage them in it by making it profitable. The law does not restrict the *quantity* to be sold, but the *number of persons* by whom it is to be sold. If then, a man can make it profitable to sell spirit in a community where every one has the right of selling, he can make it much more profitable where the business is restricted by law to a very few individuals in each town. It is clear from these views, that the present license law tends to protect and encourage the sale of intoxicating drinks, and must therefore promote intemperance.

2. Moral suasion, without the aid of prohibitory law, is not sufficient to restrain all men from vice. There are various reasons why it is so--two of the principal of which we will notice.

First, All men are not sufficiently enlightened to see // and feel the force of moral principle, and, therefore, cannot be controlled by moral suasion.

Secondly, All men are not honest, and therefore disregard the voice of moral principle, and resist the influence of moral suasion. Taking the world as we find it, these two considerations show, most clearly, the necessity of prohibitory law to restrain men from vice. But it is often objected to this view, that nothing is gained, in a

moral point of light, by restraining men from vice by the force of law, inasmuch as it does not reform the disposition of the heart. To this it may be replied, that three important advantages may be gained by prohibitory law, admitting that it has no direct tendency to make the heart better.

First, it may prevent the formation of inveterate habits of vice, and the individual be thus kept within the influence of moral suasion.

Secondly, it will prevent all the individual and personal evils which would follow the commission of crimes thus restrained by law.

Thirdly, the influence of the bad example is prevented, when men are restrained from vice by the force of law.

I trust I have now shown, first, that the sale of intoxicating drink is a public evil, and, second, that moral suasion will not restrain it; we are, therefore, left to choose between resorting to law on this subject, or abandoning law on all other subjects. In no other way can we avoid the most glaring inconsistency.

Why not suppress horse-stealing by moral suasion, as well as to suppress rum-selling by the same process. It must appear easier to suppress horse stealing by the force of public opinion, than rum-selling. Horse-stealing cannot look back to the time when it could // plead the saction of law, but rum-selling will always be able to do this. Horse-stealing cannot name the time when it was reputable with the community generally, when the different churches had horse-stealing members and deacons and ministers, but rumselling will always be able to do this. No one can hope to make rum-selling more disreputable than horse-stealing, and yet moral suasion is not sufficient to suppress horse-stealing without the aid of law; yea, moral suasion and law combined cannot wholly suppress it; how vain then, to think of suppressing rum-selling without law.

Why not suppress false-swearing, slander, profane swearing, and Sabbath-breaking, by moral suasion without law? Why punish the crime by law, and at the same time legalise the cause that produces the crime? Drunkenness is prohibited by law in this Commonwealth; why not then prohibit the sale of intoxicating drinks, which certainly leads to the crime of drunkenness? Moral suasion can never be arrayed against rum-selling with a more united and powerful influence than it has been against the other vices above named; the civil law has proclaimed its penalty from

our seats of justice; every pulpit in the land has thundered and lightened with the law of God against stealing, lying, profane swearing, &c, and yet those evils have not been put down; it must therefore be a hopeless case to think of preventing the sale of intoxicating drinks by moral suasion, in view of the strong hold which it has upon the community, the many advocates it finds, and the countenance of the civil law. In conclusion, the experience of the world proves that moral suasion will not restrain all men from vice. It failed to do it amid the hallowed bowers of Eden; it // failed to do it on the day when the earth received the blood of righteous Abel, at the hand of the first murderer; it was not sufficient in the days of Noah's ministry; while the waters were gathering to drown the old world; it failed on the day when Abraham prayed for devoted Sodom, as the clouds of God's wrath were gathering, surcharged with fire; it was not sufficient at Sinai's base, while God rested in a cloud upon the summit, blazing with lightning and uttering his command in the thunder's voice, "Thou shalt do no sin;" moral suasion was not equal to the reformation of all men, under the unearthly and soul-subduing eloquence of the Son of God. If then prohibitory law is necessary to complete the temperance reformation, we will attempt to show;

II. That such a law comes within the design and power of civil government. By a prohibitory law I mean a law prohibiting the sale of intoxicating drinks, to be used as such. That government has such right and power must appear from the following considerations.

1. There is no valid reason in law, equity or morals, why government may not enact such a law. If it be said that such a law would be unconstitutional, the reply is two-fold;

First, It is demanded what part of the constitution would be violated by such a law? This has never been shown. Let those who talk about the constitution, give the chapter and verse on which they found their objection, and they shall receive attention.

Secondly, If it were a fact that such a law would be unconstitutional, the reply is, let the constitution be altered so as to remove this objection out of the way. The constitution makes provision for its amendment, // and hence, if, as the objection supposes, the obstacles in the way of a prohibitary law, is found in the constitution, nothing can be plainer than that government has power to

remove that obstacle out of the way, and hence, government must have power to pass the law in question.

Is it objected that such a law would be a violation of personal rights? It is demanded what rights would be violated by such a law? No right but the right to sell rum! And pray what right has any man to sell rum? No man would have a legal right to sell rum, when the law should forbid it; no legal right would therefore be violated by a prohibitory law. And no man ever had a moral right to sell rum, nor is it possible that such a moral right exist, therefore no moral right would be violated by such a law. Now as all rights are such by law or morals, it follows that no right would be violated by a law that should prohibit the sale of rum.

2. Laws already exist which involve the principle that would be involved in a law that should prohibit the sale of intoxicating drinks. The present license law involves, to all intents and purposes, the right to pass a prohibitory law. Though I have said it is in its operation essentially a protective law, yet it protects in a manner which involves the right to prohibit. The license law protects a few persons by ordaining that no others shall sell intoxicating drinks. Government then exercises the right of prohibiting ninety-nine out of a hundred of all the people the business of selling rum; and if they have this right, they must have the right of prohibiting one more on each hundred which would be the very thing for which I contend. But what must settle this question beyond dispute, is // the fact that the few that are permitted to sell intoxicating drinks, are dependant for their right so to do upon government. They must buy the right to sell rum, of government, and pay their money for it. This every man does who takes a license. Now as government sells the right to vend intoxicating drinks, it shows that the right of vending is in the hands of the government, and not in the hands of the people individually; otherwise government sells what is not its own. If then the right to vend intoxicating drinks belongs to the government, to grant or withhold, it follows conclusively that government has power to pass a prohibitory law. The very fact that no man has a right to sell without obtaining license from government, proves that government has the right to prohibit the sale thereof.

There are other laws which involve the same principle. Such as the law regulating poison, the law prohibiting the

sale of damaged meat, the law respecting exhibitions, theatres, &c., of which I will not speak in detail. The laws all involve the same principle that would be involved in a law prohibiting the sale of intoxicating drinks, and if it be decided that government has not the power to pass such a law, such decision must sweep all these other laws by the board.

3. To deny that government has power to pass such a law as that for which we contend, would be to subvert civil government, by removing from its reach every object which it is designed to secure. What is the design of government? or by what rules are we to determine the rights and powers of government? When these questions are answered, it must appear plain, that if government cannot rightfully enact the law in question, all enactments must be nullity, and government can hold no rightful existence. //

By what rule then, are we to determine what government may do, and what it may not do? If we infer the power of government from the general design of the institution, it must follow that the right and power is equal to the accomplishment of the design. What, then, is the design of government from which we are to infer its rights and powers?

Is it to suppress vice and immorality? Then must government *have power* to suppress vice and immorality, and that involves the right to suppress rum-selling, which is the cause of more vice than all other causes put together.

Is it the design of government to suppress crime? It is clear that there can be more effectual measure to accomplish this design, than to suppress the sale of intoxicating drinks?

Is government designed to protect the weak against the strong? No class need that protection more than the drunkard, his abused wife, and hungry and half-naked children--they need the strong arm of the law to protect them against the ravages of the rum-seller.

Is government designed to render men secure in their persons and property? It is known to all that neither are nor can be secure where men are allowed to vend and drink alcohol without restraint.

Is government designed to promote general welfare? No one can deny that the suppression of sale of intoxicating drinks would do more to promote such general welfare than any other one measure government could adopt. It is clear, then, that if the rights and powers of government are to

be inferred from the general design of the institution, government must have power to suppress the sale of intoxicating drinks.

But it may be said that the rights and powers of // government are to be inferred from the individual rights of the people. Those who take this ground, must admit that government has a right to do just what the people would have a right to do, were they assembled en masse to make rules for themselves. Now, nothing can be more plain than that it is the individual right of every person to refuse to sell, buy or drink rum; and if the right of government is inferred from the rights of the people, government must have the right, standing in the place of each and all the people, to determine for them that they shall neither vend nor drink rum. To deny this, would be to deny that the rights of government may be inferred from the individual rights of the people.

Do we infer the powers of government from the principles of righteousness as taught in the Bible?--then must government have power to carry out and enforce those principles. And when we look into this book of books, we find that it forbids all drunkenness, and all incentives to drunkenness, and all selling or giving away of intoxicating drink. Hab. ii. 15: "Wo unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, that putteth his bottle to him." If then the Bible is to be the standard, it will sweep this unholy traffic from the land and the world. If government has not power to pass such a prohibitory law on this subject, it must be incapable of passing such laws on other subjects, and government itself must become a nullity. With these considerations I will leave this part of the subject, trusting that I have shown to the satisfaction of the candid that it comes perfectly within the scope and power of civil government to prohibit by law the sale of everything which is hurtful to the community, including intoxicating drinks among the evils to be prohibited. //

III. We are to show that government is bound by the highest moral obligation to enact and enforce a prohibitory law in relation to the sale of intoxicating drinks.

1. The simple right of government involves the obligation to do it. To make out a moral obligation to perform any act, two things must be proved.

First, It must be shown that the proposed act is right in itself, and that it ought to be done. This is most obviously the case in relation to the subject in question.

Nothing can be more plain, that that the vending of intoxicating drinks ought to be stopped. The whole preceding argument goes to show this.

Secondly, To make out a moral obligation, it must be shown that the person or party appealed to is authorized to perform such acts.

Suppose it to be right to hang a man for murder, it will not follow that we have a right to hang the murderer wherever we can find him, for we are not authorized to perform the work of hanging. Now in the case before us, government is the party authorized to perform the act, and therefore, upon government must the obligation rest.

The argument stands thus:

The sale of intoxicating drinks ought to be prevented;

But government alone has power to prevent it;

Therefore, government must be morally bound to prevent the sale of intoxicating drinks.

2. The design of God, in the establishment of civil authorities, proves the point in question. My text says, "Rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of // the same: For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."

This most clearly shows, that the design of the establishment of rulers is, to protect and support virtue, and to punish and suppress vice, and the obligation to suppress most clearly involves the obligation to suppress the sale of intoxicating drinks. To put it in the form of a regular argument, I say,

It is the duty of government to suppress vice;

The vending of intoxicating drinks is the source of more vice than any other one cause;

Therefore, it is the duty of government to suppress the vending of intoxicating drinks.

3. The individual responsibility of those who administer government, involves the duty in question.

Every man is bound to do all that he can, that is right and lawful, to suppress intemperance, and when a man is clothed with govermental power, it only enlarges his *power* to do, without diminishing his *obligation* to do; he is still as much bound to do all he can as he was while a private citizen, possessing an enlarged capacity to do.

Let us illustrate this point:

I am honored this evening with the presence of Dr. Huntington, who is the President of the Temperance Society, at whose call I deliver this address. As a member of the Temperance Society, Dr. Huntington is pledged to do all he can to suppress intemperance, and to discountenance the sale and use of intoxicating drinks. But I am informed that the Dr. sustains another important relation to this community: he is the Mayor of your city, and as such is charged, to a cer- // tain extend, with the administration of law.* He holds in his hand especially, what is called the license law. As a temperance man, we have seen that he is bound to do all he can to discourage the use of intoxicating drinks, and this pledge to do all he can, consistently with law and religion, to discountenance the use of intoxicating drinks, covers every relation in which he is called to act, and binds him equally when he acts as the administrator of the license law, when he acts as a physician, and when he acts as a private citizen: he, therefore, can no more give *official* sanction to the sale and use of intoxicating drinks without violating his temperance pledge, than he could give *private* sanction to the same operation. It would be one of the greatest absurdities to suppose that he is bound, as *citizen* Huntington, to do all he can to suppress the sale and use of intoxicating drinks, and that he is at liberty, at the same time, as *Mayor* Huntington, to wield the arm of the law in protection of the sale and use of intoxicating drinks! These remarks have been made to illustrate the principle that men's temperance obligations bind them in every relation, and hence, what we have said of a particular case, is true of every man clothed with governmental powers. When men are elected to make laws for the people, they are not released from their individual obligations. A man bound to do all he can at home in his individual capacity to suppress intemperance, is no less bound to do all he can when in the legislative hall. Men are not all called to act in

---

* Dr. Huntington, who was at the time both President of the Temperance Society, and Mayor of the city, was in the chair, while the Sermon was delivered. This gave a point to argument at the moment, which can hardly be felt at a distance of time and place.

the same sphere, and hence, when it is // said that men are bound to do what they can for the suppression of intemperance, it is implied that it relates to the sphere in which each is called to act. It is a broad principle, which no man can deny, that every man is bound to do all that he can to suppress intemperance. Now, if I am bound to do all I can as a minister, because that is the sphere in which I act, and another is bound to do all he can as a physician, because that is his sphere of action, then it must follow that a legislator is bound to do all he can in law making, because that is the sphere in which he acts; it is therefore plain that government is under a moral obligation to suppress the sale of intoxicating drinks by law.

There is another way in which the moral obligation of government may be proved from the individual obligations of the people. Government is bound to do just what the people would be bound to do, were they assembled en masse to make their own laws. If then the sale of intoxicating drinks ought to be suppressed, it follows that the people would be bound to suppress it, were they assembled to make rules for the government of the whole; therefore, as the government is bound to carry out the obligations of the people, government must be bound to suppress the sale of intoxicating drinks.

It may be well here to correct a common mistake, which is this: many seem to suppose that government is bound to carry out the will of a majority of the people. This is not true, especially when we speak of moral obligation. Government is bound to do what the people would do, were they assembled en masse, but government is under obligation to do what the people would be bound to do, were they assembled. // Legislatures are not bound by the will of a majority of their constituents, but by the law of right. They cannot be bound by the will of the people, when that will is morally wrong. The people can have no right to entertain or express a will that is morally wrong; and surely, government cannot be bound by a will which the people have no right to entertain or express. Indeed, legislators themselves become transgressors, when they obey the wrong will of their constituents. Suppose the whole people join in requiring their representatives to pass and give their official sanction to a law that is morally wrong, has government a right to comply with the requisition? No more than an individual, or a number of individuals have a right to commit sin for hire.

Government is not only *not* bound by the wrong will of the people, but it *is* bound by the allegiance due to the throne of God, to resist every such wrong will, even at the sacrifice of life. Better aspire to a martyr's crown, than to set their seal to a law that is morally wrong, though the whole array of fallen spirits in this world should rise up to require it at their hands.

We will now close this argument by stating it thus:

Every person is bound to do all that is right to suppress intemperance;

It is right for those who are clothed with governmental powers to suppress intemperance by a prohibitory law;

Therefore, government must be bound to enact and enforce a prohibitory law for the suppression of intemperance.

4. The express declarations of God's Word involve the obligation in question. We will not enlarge upon this argument, but will only quote one text as a speci- // men of many of a similar character which might be adduced.

Jer. xxi. 12. "O house of David, thus saith the Lord, Execute judgment in the morning, and deliver him that is spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor, lest my fury go out like fire, and burn that none can quench it, because of the evil of your doings."

There are two points in relation to this text worthy of particular attention, viz., the persons addressed and the work they are required to do. The text was addressed to the house of David, which was, in other words, the government of the nation. So far, therefore, as the text has an application now, it is applicable to civil government; nor does it alter the nature of the obligation, whether the power to govern be in the hands of a king, a president, or an elective legislature, or in a government of a mixed character. What then, is the work which this text requires government to do? It is to "execute judgment and deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor." Who, then, is spoiled but the drunkard, who are the oppressed and ruined but the outraged wife and worse than fatherless children? And who is the oppressor but the rum-seller? And how can government deliver the spoiled out of the hand of this oppressor in any way so proper and effectual, as to pass a prohibitory law, which shall put a stop to his unholy and ruinous business?

I trust I have now shown first, that a prohibitory law is necessary to complete the temperance reformation; secondly, that government has all necessary authority to

pass such a law, and thirdly, that government is held responsible for the passage and enforcement of such a law, by the highest moral obligation; and having, as I believe, established these // points, I will close my remarks by drawing a few inference from the premises.

1. An awful responsibility rests upon this nation and upon the individual States of this nation. Instead of suppressing this great evil, government has employed its influence and power to protect it. We import by law, we manufacture, and we licence the cause of all sorts of crime, misery and death. Now, when we consider that this whole business is legislation against God, and by a nation too, with their Bibles in their hands, what a cloud of guilt must rest upon the nation, and what a storm of righteous yet fearful retribution must be gathering in the chambers where Jehovah treasures up his wrath and his thunder against the day of vengeance? So long as government tolerates the traffic in intoxicating drink, so long must the nation, and each State, pursuing the same policy, be responsible for the fearful consequences which flow from it, and the amount of guilt can be measured only by the number and enormity of the crimes, and the weight of wo produced. Intellects enough have been blighted and turned into night to have eclipsed any other age but this, and wrapped the world in darkness. Nerves and muscles enough have been enervated to have rendered puerile and helpless any other age but this one of wonderful enterprise and inventions. Property enough has been wasted to have banished hunger from the world, and to have supplied garments for all the naked and destitute of the human race.

Consider the tears that have been shed, the sighs that have been uttered, the groans that have responded to groans, the hearts that have been broken, and the spirits that have been ruined; consider no more than // woman's misery and orphan's tears, and how fearful must be the responsibility?

2. This responsibility, under our free system of government, rolls back upon the people, and they have got to bear it in their individual capacity. The people have it in their power to correct these evils, to repeal every law which gives any countenance to the deadly traffic, and to enact and sustain other laws, such as the crime demands; laws that should impose a withering penalty upon the business of poisoning men with alcohol. If then the people have it in their power to correct these evils, upon

them must the responsibility rest.

But I am aware that men are not apt to feel, as individuals, the responsibility that belongs to the whole. Feel it or not feel it, it is *theirs*, and they will find it out in the day of retribution, if not before. That responsibility which rests upon the whole, rests upon each, for the responsibility of the whole is made up of the responsibility of each individual, therefore, each individual must bear this fearful amount of responsibility upon his own shoulders. Suppose the lawful punishment of a crime to be ten years' imprisonment; suppose that crime to be committed by ten persons jointly, where does the responsibility and the guilt lie? How will you punish the offence? Will you imprison one of them ten years to satisfy the law, and let the other nine escape? or will you inflict one-tenth part of the punishment upon each, keeping each in prison one year, making up the ten years required by law between them? or will you imprison each and all of them for the whole offence, making each responsible for the whole crime? I answer, you will do the latter. The fact that many combined together to com - // mit a crime does not lessen the responsibility and guilt of each. So with the consequences of rum-selling. The whole people who countenance the traffic are responsible for all its consequences, and this responsibility falls with all its weight upon each individual of the whole, as though he had to bear it alone. How fearful then is the responsibility of those, who lend their influence in any way to sustain a practice so fraught with crime, misery, anguish and death?

3. How fearful is the responsibility of the vender of intoxicating drinks? The vender is no less guilty than he would be if there were no law in his favor. The license law confers no moral right; the law itself is morally wrong, and that which is morally wrong cannot form the basis of moral right. Civil law does not make any thing morally right--it is not the design of law to create right, but to secure what is previously right, and right is not founded upon law, but law should be founded upon right. The vender, therefore, is just as guilty as though there were no law on the subject. The law is wrong, and no man can have a right to avail himself of a wrong law to injure his fellow-beings; no, nor to benefit himself. Did the law even require a man to vend intoxicating drinks, he would have no right to obey that law, but would be bound

to disobey it.

Go to the Bible, and you will learn from Daniel, from Shadrac, Meshac, and Abednego, from Paul and Silas, Peter and John, that God is to be obeyed rather than man. Invoke counsel of the souls of the martyrs whose spirits made their exit from gloomy cells through iron grates on the wings of an expiring breath to a martyr's reward, and you shall learn from thence that no human authority can justify the least infraction of moral principle. //

We ask the vender, then, "By what authority doest thou these things, and who gave thee this authority?" Do they say they have a license? This may be, but that license confers no moral right--it is just such a license as no one can have a right to give--a license to do wrong. It is a license to destroy men--a license to rob the innocent --a license to make widows and orphans--a license to convert the hunger of the drunkard's family into plenty to put upon their own tables--a license to convert the rags of the drunkard's half-clad children into silk and lace to put upon their wives and daughters--a license to convert the tears of the drunkard's abused and neglected wife, into gold to put into their coffers or jingle in their pockets!

But will this license be an excuse in the day of retribution, when God shall make inquisition for blood? When the rum-seller shall stand at the bar of his Judge, and those whom he has destroyed shall stand around him; drunkards howling in his ears the reproaches of their own ruin, and their wives and children, loaded with all the fruit of his unholy traffic, pouring upon him the scalding, withering tale of their miseries; will he then look his Judge in the face and say, I had a license to do these things?

Let me say as I take my seat, that when the dreams of worldly interest shall have faded from the disordered imagination--when the lamp of life shall burn dim and hasten to expire amid the breaking in of light from the spirit world, and when eternity shall roll up its long concealed orb of abiding realities, and exhibit at one view the final and full results of this dreadful traffic, then will all wish there had been enacted and enforced a PROHIBITORY LAW!

WOMAN'S RIGHT TO PREACH THE GOSPEL.

A S E R M O N,

PREACHED AT THE ORDINATION OF THE

REV. MISS ANTOINETTE L. BROWN,

AT

SOUTH BUTLER, WAYNE COUNTY, N. Y., SEPT. 15, 1853.

BY REV. LUTHER LEE.

"Help those women which labored with me in the gospel."
--PAUL.

SYRACUSE, N. Y.:
PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR.
60 South Salina Street.

1853.

S E R M O N.

"There is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."--GAL. III.28.

The thinking portion of the assembly have, by this time, reasoned within themselves, "that is a singular text from which to preach an Ordination sermon." This may render it proper for me to remind my hearers, just at this point, that the text is no more unusual, as the basis of an Ordination sermon, than the occasion is unusual, upon which I am called to preach it.

The ordination of a female, or the setting apart of a female to the work of the Christian ministry, is, to say the least, a novel transaction, in this land and age. It cannot fail to call forth many remarks, and will, no doubt, provoke many censures.

For myself, I regard it in the light of a great innovation upon the opinions, prejudices and practices of nearly the whole Christian world. There have been some Christian communities who have allowed females to preach the gospel, but so far as I know, they have not ordained their ministers, male or female, or by any solemn form or service, set them apart to the work of the ministry, as I suppose is intended to be done at the conclusion of this discourse.

It is to be presumed that the parties concerned in this transaction, believe their course to be right, and that they have their reasons for so believing; and I feel assured that there can be no time nor place more appropriate for an exhibition of such reasons, than the time and place of the transaction, which breaks in upon long established opinions and usages. And as I have been called upon to deliver the discourse on the occasion, I should deem it out of place, tame and cowardly, for me to deliver an ordinary sermon setting forth the duties and responsibilities of a Christian minister, without taking hold of the peculiarity of the occasion, and vindicating the innovation which we this hour make upon the usages of

the Christian world. //

It is with these views, and under these impressions that I have selected the text which I have read as the basis of my discourse. "There is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

What does this text mean? and what was the Apostle's design in uttering these words? Whatever the text means, or does not mean, its application is to be limited to what is clearly and specifically Christian. It is in Christ Jesus that there is no difference, and that the sex become one. There may be differences of rights and positions growing out of incidental relations, and conventional rules and usages, in matters which do not affect the fundamental rights of humanity, which I need not discuss; but when we come to consider those rights and privileges, which we claim as Christians, and which belong to us as believers in Christ, there is no difference, we are all one in Christ Jesus. Without even presuming to discuss, on this occasion, the questions of civil and political rights, the text amply sustains me in affirming that in a Christian community, united upon Christian principles, for Christian purposes; or, in other words, in the Church, of which Christ is the only head, males and females possess equal rights and privileges; here there is no difference, "there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." I cannot see how the text can be explained so as to exclude females from any right, office, work, privilege, or immunity which males enjoy, hold or perform. If the text means anything, it means that males and females are equal in rights, privileges and responsibilities upon the Christian platform. I am very frank to confess that I had never very thoroughly investigated the question, until called upon to preach on this occasion, though I have held an opinion loosely on the subject for many years. This call, in my own estimation laid me under obligation to do one of two things, either step forward and assist this church, or decline so to do, for good and satisfactory reasons. I might have evaded the question, by declining for want of time, or some other fictitious reason, but that would not only have been in bad keeping with my general character, but would have been false to Christianity and my brethren. If those inviting me here are right in proposing to ordain a female to the Gospel ministry, they needed my help, and were entitled to it; if they were wrong, they needed my reproof and reasons for it,

and it was due to my own fidelity, and to truth, that I should administer it. But to do either, required thought beyond what I had ever bestowed upon the subject. You may then suppose me to have asked myself, "If I decline, what reason can I give for so doing? So far as I know there is no want of moral, // or mental or educational qualification on the part of the candidate; if it be right to ordain any female, it is right to ordain this female." At this point, the text which I have selected for the occasion, presented itself to my mind and I reasoned thus:-- "I acknowledge the candidate to be in Christ, to be with me a sister in Christ; if I deny her the right to exercise her gifts as a Christian minister, I virtually affirm that there is male and female, and that we are not all one in Christ Jesus, by which I shall contradict St. Paul, and though he is not among us to reply to me, to know myself at variance with him, would give me more uneasiness than to differ from modern doctors of divinity, and divinity schools. I am then brought to this conclusion, which I will state in the form of a proposition as the sequence of the text.

FEMALES HAVE A GOD-GIVEN RIGHT TO PREACH THE GOSPEL.

I take it upon myself, as my portion of the effort on this occasion, to defend and substantiate the above proposition. To make any distinction in the church of Jesus Christ, between males and females, purely on the ground of sex is virtually to strike this text from the sacred volume, for it affirms that in Christ there is no difference between males and females, that they are all one in regard to the gospel of the grace of God. If males may belong to a Christian church, so may females; if male members may vote in the church, so may females; if males may preach the gospel, so may females; and if males may receive ordination by the imposition of hands, or otherwise, so may females, the reason of which is found in my text; "there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

But it will be asked, why this sense of the text has not been discovered before, why has it lain hid until this hour? I answer, it has been discovered and understood, but not practically applied, as has been the case with a great many other truths. Dr. Clarke concludes his comment upon the text in these words. "Under the blessed spirit of Christianity, they have equal *rights*, equal *privileges*,

and equal *blessings;* and let me add, they are equally *useful."*

This goes as far as I have gone. But Dr. Clarke was a Methodist, and may be suspected of having been influenced by the usages of his sect or denomination by which females have been allowed to exercise their gifts in social meetings, composed of both sex. Well, then, hear what a Scotch Presbyterian Divine says on the text. Dr. McKnight gives the following comment:

"In Christ Jesus there is no distinction of persons, as under the // law: under the gospel no Jew is superior to a Greek, neither are slaves inferior to free men, nor are males preferred to females, for ye are all one, in respect to dignity and privileges under the gospel dispensation." "Under the law males had greater privileges than females. For males alone bore in their bodies the sign of God's covenant; they alone were capable of the priesthood."

Whether Dr. McKnight designed it or not, he has affirmed, by the most clear and certain implication, that females may be priests or ministers under the gospel. And remember that I am not responsible for his inconsistency in having advocated the opposite opinion in other places, which he has done. Just let me read the two clauses, reversing the order, and see by what logical necessity the mind will be carried to the conclusion that females have an equal right to the Christian ministry with males. The Dr. says, "Under the law males had greater privileges than females. For males alone were capable of the priesthood. In Christ Jesus there is no distinction of persons as under the law, males are not preferred before females, for ye are all one, in respect to dignity and privileges under the gospel dispensation." It is clear then that I have the authority of Dr. McKnight for my construction of the text. And any construction which will make it mean less than I suppose it means, must make it mean nothing.

The general design and scope of the apostle's reasoning, greatly strengthens the view I have taken of the text. The design was to counteract certain Judaizing teachers, and show that Christians were not bound to observe the law of Moses, that the Gentiles need not be circumcised and observe other Jewish rites. To accomplish this he shows that the law is abrogated. Now the law made distinctions between Jews and Gentiles, and between males and females, excluding females from the priesthood, and laid them under other disabilities, and the apostle comes to the

conclusion that under the gospel, there is neither Jew nor Greek, that is Gentile, neither male nor female, but that all are one in Christ Jesus.

The Apostle clearly designs to say that females are exempt, under the gospel, from the disabilities imposed by the law, and that they enjoy equal rights with men. There is clearly an extension of their rights and privileges under the gospel, and if so, how far does such extension reach? The text fixes no limits, prescribes no bounds, names no places, occasions, subjects or duties, but affirms in general and unqualified terms, that there is neither male nor female, but that all are one in Christ Jesus, and this is done by way of proclaiming the abro- // gation of the Mosaic law, and it of necessity places males and females upon an equal platform of rights under the gospel.

The declaration concerning males and females, is just as full and unqualified as it is concerning Jews and Gentiles, and if it does not place males and females upon an equality, it may be argued with equal force that it does not place Jews and Gentiles on an equal footing. Having said what I judge to be necessary by way of explaining my text, and bringing out its meaning and force, I will proceed further to confirm the doctrine arrived at by other considerations.

1. There were female prophets under the Old Dispensation. "And Miriam, the prophetess, the sister of Aaron, took a timbrel in her hand, and all the women went out after her with timbrels and with dance. And Miriam answered them, Sing ye to the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously." Exo. xv. 20, 21.

"And Deborah a prophetess, the wife of Lapidoth, she judged Israel at that time." Judges iv. 4.

Thus have we an account of two female prophets, and one of them judged Israel; yes, a female was both prophet and judge.

I will now call your attention to a more remarkable case. During the reign of King Josiah, the book of the law was found, which appears to have been lost, and it was read before the king, and on hearing the law, the king become alarmed, and commanded his principal officers to go and inquire of the Lord for him, and for all the people, concerning the words of the book that was found. Now to whom did they go to inquire of God? We have the rest of the history as follows:

"So Hikiah the priest, and Ahikam and Achbor, and Shaphan, and Asahiah, went unto Huldah the prophetess, the wife of Shallum, the son of Tikvah, the son of Harhas, keeper of the wardrobe; (now she dwelt in Jerusalem in the college;) and they communed with her. And she said unto them, Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Tell the man that sent you to me, Thus saith the Lord, behold, I will bring evil upon this place, and upon the inhabitants thereof, even all the words of the book which the king of Judah hath read: Because they have forsaken me, and have burnt incense unto other gods, that they might provoke me to anger with all the works of their hands; there fore my wrath shall be kindled against this place, and shall not be quenched. But to the king of Judah which sent you to inquire of the Lord, thus shall ye say to him, Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, As touching the words which thou hast heard; Because thine heart was tender, and thou hast humbled thyself before the Lord, when thou heardest // what I spake against this place and against the inhabitants thereof, that they should become a desolation and a curse, and has rent thy clothes, and wept before me; I also have heard thee, saith the Lord. Behold, therefore, I will gather thee unto thy fathers, and thou shalt be gathered into thy grave in peace; and thine eyes shall not see all the evil which I will bring upon this place. And they brought the king word again." 2 Kings xxii. 14-20. See also 2 Chron. xxxiv.

This woman, Huldah, was undeniably a public religious teacher, according to the usages of the times in which she lived. She spake for God, in his name, and by his authority, and her words are recorded in the book. "And there was one Anna, a prophetess, the daughter of Phanuel of the tribe of Azer." Luke ii. 36.

Of this woman and her public labors we have no account, only that she preached publicly in the temple concerning Christ, when he was brought there, an infant in his mother's arms, to be presented to the Lord. The fact that she recognized the Saviour, and spake of him as she did, proves that she was endowed with the extraordinary gifts of a prophet.

This case, though recorded in the New Testament, occurred under the Old Dispensation, where I have classed it. There were other cases of less note, as Nehemiah mentions a prophetess that discouraged him in his work. vi. 14.

Isaiah appears to have had a prophetess for his wife. Chap. viii. 3.

So common a thing was it to have female prophets, that the propagaters of error judged it an object to counterfeit the usage, and hence there were false female prophets, as well as false male prophets. God said to his true prophet, Ezekiel, "Likewise, thou son of man, set thy face against the daughters of thy people, which prophesy out of their own hearts, and prophesy thou against them." xiii. 16.

This proves beyond a doubt, that it must have been common for females to have the true spirit of prophesy, or there would not have been false pretenders. There is never a counterfeit, without a genuine; and had it not been believed and understood that God did call females to the office and work of prophets, the fact of a female pretending to prophesy in the name of God, would have proved her false. The fact therefore, that there were false female prophets, furnishes strong evidence, not only that there were genuine female prophets, but that they must have been common; sufficiently so, at least, as not to create suspicion upon its face when one appeared.

2. There were prophetesses or female prophets in the Primitive Church // under the gospel. The fact that there would be, was foretold by the Prophet Joel. "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy." Joel. ii. 28.

This text most clearly began to be fulfilled at the day of Pentecost, as we learn from Acts ii. 17; where Peter declares the development of that day, to be what was foretold by the prophet. But how was the prediction, that daughters should prophesy fulfilled on the day of Pentecost? The history of the subject answers this question. It is as follows:

In the first chapter, we are told who constituted the assembled Christians. "Then returned they unto Jerusalem from the mount called Olivet, which is from Jerusalem a sabbath-day's journey. And when they were come in, they went up into an upper room, where abode both Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, Philip, and Thomas, Bartholomew, and Matthew, James the son of Alpheus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James. These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jeus, and with his

brethren." Verses 12-14.

Here we have named the eleven apostles, then "the women," then Mary the mother of Jesus in particular, and lastly "his brethren." By his brethren is probably meant his near relatives. It is probable that there were a number of women in the company, as they are mentioned as forming one portion of the assembly. In the 15th verse we are told that the whole number present was about one hundred and twenty persons. In the fourth verse of chapter two, we are told that they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues.

Who were filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues? Most clearly the hundred and twenty persons, consisting of the apostles, the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and his brethren. To deny this would be to falsify the plainest portion of the record. The record declares that there were about one hundred and twenty persons assembled together, that this number embraced the women, and that they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues. Thus did the Holy Ghost, in his first descent, crown females as well as males, with tongues of fire, to speak the wonderful works of God.

But the remarkable prophesy of Joel did not receive its entire fulfillment on the day of Pentecost, for about twenty-seven years afterwards // we read, Acts xxi. 9, that Phillip of Cesarea, "had four daughters which did prophesy." As this fact is mentioned only incidentally and not as a new or strange thing, it appears probable that female prophets were not unusual in the Primitive Church.

This is the proper place to remark that prophesying is not to be understood in the restricted sense of foretelling. A prophet is not exclusively one who foretels, but who explains prophesies, and teaches; and to prophesy is to explain prophesies and to teach. In this sense every gospel minister is a prophet, and every prophet under the new dispensation is a gospel minister. Here then were four female gospel ministers, daughters of one man. When it is said, "Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy," the meaning is, your sons and your daughters shall become teachers, or gospel ministers.

The Greek word which we translate prophet, is *propheetuo*, and signifies "to foretell, to predict, to explain and apply prophesies." To explain and apply prophesies, was

the peculiar work of the first ministers. The Greek word which we translate prophet, is *propheetees,* and signifies "a declarer, a foreteller, a priest, a teacher, and instructor." It was always the work of prophets to labor as religious teachers, and to explain and apply the predictions which had been previously uttered by others, and when we consider that there were whole schools of prophets, we may conclude that but few of the whole number were employed to foretell, and that their principal calling was to labor as religious teachers. That prophets were preachers or religious teachers, is perfectly clear from the use of the words, prophet and prophesy, by the apostles.

The church at Antioch sent Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem for the settlement of the great question, whether Gentile converts were bound to keep the law of Moses concerning circumcision and other rites. The apostles and the church at Jerusalem, having considered the case, sent back a written answer, and sent also two messengers of their own company, Judas and Silas. "And Judas and Silas being prophets also themselves, exhorted the brethren with many words, and confirmed them." This proves beyond a doubt, that they exhorted, or preached in the common acceptation, by virtue of their prophetic office, and the conclusion is that to be a prophet, is to be a preacher, or public religious teacher. We read again, 1 Cor. xix. 3: "He that prophesieth, speaketh unto men to edification, and exhortation and comfort." Here the entire pulpit work of a gospel preacher is described as the act of prophesying, which renders it certain that prophets were preachers. // Again, we read Rev. ii. 20, "Nevertheless, I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jazebel, which calleth herself a prophetess to teach, and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things offered to idols." This proves two points; first, that the doctrine must have prevailed that women might rightfully be prophets; and secondly, that being prophets, they taught the people. The complaint is not that she was a *woman,* but that she was a bad woman; not that she was a *prophetess,* but that she called herself one when she was not; not that she *taught,* but that she taught false and corrupting doctrine. It is clear that there would have been no false female teachers, had there been no true ones, and that a false female teacher could not have been sustained in the church, had the doctrine prevailed that

the gospel forbade females to preach the gospel.

I have now proved that there were a class of females in the Primitive Church called prophetesses, that is, there were female prophets, and these prophets were preachers or public teachers of religion. Here I rest this branch of my argument, and will proceed to introduce another branch of evidence.

3. There were female preachers of the gospel in the primitive church, and some cases in which it appears that females occupied the official relation of minister, or religious teacher, to particular congregations. If this position can be sustained, the whole controversy will be settled, and there is one text, so clear and full on the subject, that I would not fear to rest the whole argument on that alone. Paul says in his Epistle to the Romans, chapter xvi. 1: "I comment unto you Phebe our sister, which is a servant of the church which is at Cenchrea." The words, "servant of the church," clearly express an official relation. The churches had no servants but officers, and what office did Phebe fill, if not that of preacher, teacher or minister?

The translation obscures the sense, which will became plain by an examination of other texts where the same word occurs in the original. The Greek word here rendered servant, is *diakonos*. This word occurs just thirty times in the New Testament. In two instances it is translated servant, where it means a common house servant or waiter. John ii. 5, 9: "His mother said unto the servants," &c. "But the servants which drew the water knew." Here the word is applied to the waiters at a marriage feast. In three instances the word is applied to civil officers. Once by Christ, Matt. xxii. 13: "Then said the king unto his *servants,* bind him hand and foot, and take him away and cast // him into outer darkness." Here it is rendered *servant,* but clearly means an officer of the king.

Paul uses the word twice in the same sense, Rom. xiii. 3, 4: "Rulers are not a terror to good works, but to evil. For he is the *minister* of God to thee for good--for he is the *minister* of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." Here the same word is twice translated *minister,* and it clearly means a civil ruler or judicial officer. Once it is translated servant, where it means any christian or follower of Christ. John xii. 26: "Where I am, there shall also my *servant* be." Twice the word is applied to Christ, and is translated *minister.*

Rom. xv. 8: "Now I say that Jesus Christ was a *minister* of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers." Gal. ii. 17: "But if while we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves are found sinners, is therefore Christ the *minister* of sin." In two other texts it is translated servant, where its meaning may be a little doubtful. Matt. xxii. 11: "But he that is greatest among you shall be your *servant*." This I think clearly means minister, but it is not important. Mark ix. 35: "If any man desire to be first, the same shall be last of all and *servant* of all." Servant here may mean simply an inferior position, and the text may be a maxim, that ambition will generally defeat itself.

I have now disposed of ten of the thirty texts in which the word *diakonos* occurs, which is rendered servant when applied to Phebe. This leaves twenty other instances of the use of the word, in the Greek Testament, in every one of which it clearly and unequivocally means a minister of the gospel, or religious teacher of some grade. In one case it is applied to false ministers. 2 Cor. xi 15: "It is no great thing if his (Satan's) *ministers* are transformed into an angel of light." In every other case the word is used to express a true minister of the gospel, or teacher of some grade. In three cases it is rendered Deacon, and clearly means a church officer. The texts are Phillip. i. I: "Paul and Timotheus to all the saints which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." 1 Tim. iii. 8, 12: "Likewise must the deacons be grave." "Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own house well." We will not pause here to dispute about what the office of a deacon was, for the word rendered deacon, is so rendered only three times out of thirty.

I have now disposed of four other texts of the thirty, leaving sixteen, and in every one of these the word is translated *minister*. I need not quote all these texts, but will refer to a few of them as specimens. //

Matt. xx. 26: "But whosoever will be great among you, let him be your *minister*."

1 Cor. iii. 5: "Who then is Paul, or who is Apollos, but *ministers* by whom ye believed?"

2 Cor. iii. 6: "Who also hath made us able *ministers* of the New Testament." Chap. vi. 4: "But in all things approving ourselves as the *ministers* of God."

Eph. iii. 7: "Whereof I was made a *minister*, according

to the gift of the grace of God."

Chap. vi. 21: "Tychicus, a beloved brother and faithful *minister* in the Lord."

Col. i. 23: "Whereof I Paul am made a *minister*."

I. Thes. iii. 2: "Timotheus, our brother and *minister* of God."

The above texts are sufficient, the remaining ones are just like them. Here it is seen that the same word which Paul applied to Phebe, to describe her official relation to the church at Cenchrea, is the word which the same writer generally used to denote a minister of the gospel. Take another view of the matter. Out of the thirty instances of the use of the word in the Greek Testament, twenty two of them are in the language of Paul. Note, Paul uses a word twenty two times, and in eighteen cases out of the twenty two, the translators have rendered it *minister*; in three they have rendered it *deacon*, and in the one remaining case they have rendered it *servant*, and that is where it is applied to Phebe. Poor Phebe is made a single exception out of twenty two instances of the use of the word. In eighteen cases it means a *minister*, in three it means a *deacon*, and in one only, where it is applied to a female, it means a *servant*. The translators could not even allow her the subordinate honor of being a deaconess, but because she was a woman, she must be a servant, though Paul, whose language they thus translated, had declared that there is neither male nor female, but that all are one in Christ Jesus. Had it been a man of whom Paul thus wrote, there is not a shadow of doubt that they would have rendered it, "the *minister* of the church which is at Cenchrea." We see then if we conform the translation to the almost undeviating course of the translators, we shall make it read, "I commend unto you Phebe our sister, which is a *minister* of the Church which is at Cenchrea," and so reading as it ought to read, the question of a woman's right to preach the gospel is settled.

But it does not depend upon this one text alone, but I have pushed the argument far enough in this direction, and will only glance at a few // texts which speak of female laborers. After commending Phebe, the minister of the Church at Cenchrea, Paul proceeds to name other worthy persons, among whom are a number of females. "Great Priscilla and Aquilla, my helpers in Christ Jesus." Priscilla was a woman, the wife of Aquilla, and they were Paul's helpers in Christ. "Salute Tryphena and Tryposa

who labor in the Lord." These were two females, and they labored in the Lord.

"Salute the beloved Persis which labored much in the Lord." Persis was another female laborer, and she labored much in the Lord. Paul says, Phil. iv. 3., "Help those women that labored with me in the gospel." If it were now said of any persons, that they labor in the gospel, it would be understood that they preach the gospel, and it is clear that Paul labored in connection with females, who preached the gospel of the grace of God.

It is a fact worthy of mention in this connection, that women were the first persons employed by Christ, after his resurrection, to tell the story of his triumph over death and the grave. They were last to forsake him when his enemies triumphed, first to visit his grave amid the gray dawn of the first morn after the Sabbath was past; and first to go and tell the glad news of his resurrection, for they "did run to bring his disciples word;" and yet the men were so far behind them in faith and feeling, as to regard their words of love and joy as an idle tale.

4. All antiquity agrees that there were female officers and teachers in the Primitive Church, the only dispute being about what their functions were, and by what title they were known. The fact is universally admitted that they were appointed to the office of deaconess, that is, there were female deacons. It would be improper to attempt extended extracts. I will therefore only refer to a few authorities. In Calmet's dictionary, under the word deaconess, it is said "They were in the Primitive Church, appointed to this office, with the imposition of hands." These persons appear to be the same as those whom Pliny, in his famous letter to Trajan, styles "*Ancillis quae ministrae dicelentur*," female attendants called assistants, ministers or servants. It appears then, that these were customary officers throughout the churches; and when the fury of persecution fell on Christians, these were among the first to suffer." See Robinson's Calmet.

Here we have not only the authority of Calmet, but that of Pliny also, who was a Roman Consul, and sometime governor of Bithynia where he checked the persecution against the Christians. His letter // to Trojan the Emperor, above alluded to, was written with a design to check the persecution, in which he succeeded.

The same essential facts may be found copied into Watson's Dictionary. *Article Deacon.*

In Buck's Theological Dictionary, *Article Deaconess,* it is said "the apostolic constitutions, as they are called, mention the ordination of a deaconess, and the form of prayer used on that occasion," and refers to Lib. viii. Chap. 9. 20.

Dr. Adam Clarke says, "It is evident that they were ordained to their office by the imposition of the hands of the bishop; and the form of the prayer used on the occasion is extant in the apostolic constitutions. In the tenth or eleventh century the order was suppressed in the Latin Church, but continued in the Greek Church till the end of the twelfth century. Clarke's Com. Rom. xvi. 1. Dr. Clarke refers to Broughton's Dictionary. Article Deaconess.

This discourse would be defective, should I not pay some attention to those scriptures which some suppose forbade females to exercise their gifts in public. There are, so far as I know, but two texts, that are, or can be relied upon as proof against the right of females to improve in public. They are as follows:

"Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for woman to speak in the church." 1. Cor. xiv 34, 35.

"Let the women learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence." 1 Tim. ii. 11, 12.

These two texts, I believe, are all the proof there is to offset the array of texts and arguments which have been adduced in proof of the right of females to preach the gospel. If I were to say, "I do not know what they mean," they could never disprove the fact that females did prophesy and pray in the church, and if explained at all, they must be so explained as to harmonize with that fact. Let us then examine the matter.

If these texts are to be understood as a general prohibition of the improvement of female gifts in public, it must be entire and absolute, and must cut females off from all vocal part in public worship. It will preclude them from singing and vocal prayer. The expression, // "Let your women keep silence in the churches," if it touches the case at all, forbids singing and vocal prayer. Can a woman sing and keep silence at the same time? Can she

pray vocally, and keep silence at the same time? Such then is the true issue, and as we must meet the issue before the people, it is important that it be presented to them in its true light. Singing is as much a violation of the command to keep silence as praying or preaching. We must then put locks upon the lips of the sisterhood in time of prayer, and compel them to let their harps hang in silence while we, the lords of creation, chant Zion's songs, and leave the song itself devoid of the softer melodies which flow from woman's soul.

Such a construction of these texts most clearly makes them conflict with other portions of divine truth. Glance for a moment at the weight of evidence on the other side. My text affirms, as a broad foundation on which to stand, "There is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Miriam was a prophetess and led the host of women in Israel forth, and when the men sun of Jehovah's triumph, she responded loudly and gloriously in the face of all Israel. Deborah was a prophetess and was a judge of all Israel. Huldah was a prophetess, and dwelt in the College at Jerusalem, and prophesied in the name of the Lord, to king Josiah. "Thus saith the Lord God of Israel." Anna prophesied concerning Christ in the temple to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem. The prophet Joel foretold that daughters should prophesy under the New Dispensation; and God did pour out his Spirit on females and they spake with other tongues. Philip "had four daughters which did prophesy," sixty years after the birth of Christ. Paul the author of this supposed law of silence imposed upon females, tells us that Phebe was a deaconess or minister of the Church which was at Cenchrea; and commends several other females in the same chapter, who labored in the Lord. Paul also wrote to the church at Philippi, and told them to "help those women that labored in the gospel." And all antiquity agrees that women were set apart to some church office by the imposition of a bishop's hands.

Now, in the face of all this, are we to understand Paul as issuing a command, covering all countries and all ages, absolutely requiring all women to keep silence in the churches, and not to speak a word within the walls of the sanctuary? Those must believe it who can, but I cannot believe it with the light I now have, and must seek some ex- // planation, which will, in my view, make a better harmony in the word of God.

Every writer should be so construed, if it be possible, as to make him agree with himself, and to do this, Paul must be so understood in these two texts, as to make the sense accord with what he has so plainly taught in other places, that females might and did exercise their gifts in public. Compare with I Cor. xi. 5, 6, 13, 14, 15.

"But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered, dishonoreth her head; for that is even all one as if she were shaven. For if the woman be not covered, let her be covered. Judge in yourselves: is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered? Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him? But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering."

Here the apostle most clearly gives directions how women are to pray and prophesy in public, and are we to understand him as first giving directions how females should pray and prophesy, and then in the same letter, absolutely forbid the thing he had given directions how to perform? I cannot believe this, and must seek another exposition. It is clear that women did pray and prophesy in that church, and the apostle told them it must be done with their heads covered, that is wearing the customary veil. This was founded upon the customs of the times, to which it was necessary to conform in order to success, as to appear in public without a veil, in that community, subjected a female to suspicions of a want of virtue. What the apostle calls nature was only the prejudice of education, which has now ceased to exist, or rather never existed among us. The Greek word, *phusis,* here translated *nature,* signifies not only nature, but "constitution, disposition, character, custom, habit, use." We have no such nature in this country, and as the rule grew out of the then existing customs and prejudices of society, it is no longer binding, and females may appear with or without veils as may suit their taste or convenience. But the point is, that as Paul gives instructions for women to pray and prophesy with their heads covered, he cannot be understood as forbiding them to pray and prophesy under any and all circumstances. But what does the apostle mean when he says it is not permitted for women to speak?

It is certain that he does not speak of female teachers or preachers, as such, for he comprehends the entire membership of the church. The twenty-third verse says, "If

therefore the whole church be come // together into some place, and all speak with tongues," &c. This proves that the apostle is not treating of teachers as officers, as a distinct class, nor of the eligibility of persons to the office or teacher, as distinguished from the membership generally, but of the duties, rights and privileges of the membership in common, as members. If, therefore, the text precludes women from speaking in the church as a general rule, it precludes them, not merely as authorized teachers, but from the right of speaking as common or unofficial members of the church.

In view of the numerous and unanswerable proofs that God did employ females, under the Old and New Covenants, as public instrumentalities of spreading truth, all who hold the doctrine of the absolute equality of males and females, under all circumstances, and in all relations, will as a matter of course, regard these two texts as local and specific in their application, founded upon some peculiarity in the circumstances of the community at that time and in those places, and as having no general bearing on the question. It will be much easier for them to believe that there were circumstances, which were then understood, calling for such a rule, thus specific and local in its bearing, and constituting an exception to the general rule, that women had a right to, and did prophesy; than to believe that the facts that they did teach, scattered, as they are, through a period of more than fifteen centuries, are proved by these two texts to be the exceptions to, and in violation of, a positive law of God, the foundation of which he has laid in nature. The simple admission of such numerous and wide spread exceptions to what is claimed to the law of God, having its foundation in nature, must come but little short of nullification. For the benefit of those who hold as above, no further exposition is necessary. But as many conscientiously believe that the Scriptures teach that women are to be subordinate, especially to their husbands, it is proper to show that the texts will admit of an exposition which will harmonize their views with woman's right to preach the gospel. This will I now undertake.

The rule whatever it means, is based upon some law, which must have been known and understood by the Corinthian church. The clause reads thus:--"It is permitted unto them to speak, but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law." It is worthy of remark

that the words, "they are commanded" are not in the original text, but were added by the translators, to make plain what they supposed to be the sense. Without these words it reads, "Let your women keep silence in the churches, for it is not // permitted unto them to speak, but to be under obedience as also saith the law." Supplying the ellipses in brackets, it reads, "It is not permitted unto them to speak [in the church] but to be under obedience as also saith the law.

From this aspect of the text it is clear, first that speaking is the antithesis of being under obedience, and that being under obedience, is the thing required by some law at the time known to the parties. "As also saith the law," is an appeal to the law, which proves that whatever the apostle commanded in this matter, it was only a reiteration of the sense of the law which already existed. To what law then does the apostle appeal? If we can decide this, it will determine the sense of the text.

I say then it cannot be any of the statute laws of Moses, for two reasons. First, no such law can be found, and secondly, if it existed, it must have been violated under divine sanction, by the existence of female teachers and rulers, as Miriam, Deborah and Huldah. If it was only some law of the Sanhedrim, or some law regulating Jewish Synagogues, it cannot be binding now, though Paul might have thought best to conform christian assemblies to Jewish Synagogues in some particulars at that time. But I do not say that it is any such law that is referred to in the text.

The universal opinion, so far as I know, is that the law referred to is, Gen. iii. 16: "Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." This is the reference made in all our reference Bibles. It is the opinion of Dr. Clarke, who held that women might speak in public. Dr. McKnight, who was an opposer of women's right to preach the gospel, supposes that the apostle refers to Genesis as the law in question. Scott is of the same opinion. Barnes, who is one of the most strenuous opposers of female improvements in public, holds the same view, and so far as I know, no person has ever expressed any other opinion. So far then as those are concerned who insist that the apostle forbids women to speak in the church, as a general rule, I may regard it as settled that when the apostle appeals to the law as teaching the doctrine of woman's obligation to be silent, he refers to the

words addressed to the mother of us all, "Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." As the apostle appeals to this, as expressing the same thing which he teaches, in it we must find the sense of the text in question. By this I am willing to abide, if those who have given this exposition will do the same. // Now, allowing that the above is the law referred to, two consequences must follow, fatal to the argument for female silence.

1. The law is binding only upon married women. As it is to their husbands that they are to be under obedience, the obedience can be required of none but such as have husbands. This must leave all unmarried females and widows free from the law of silence.

2. The law imposes silence on married women, only in obedience to the will of their husbands. If a woman has a husband who not only approves of her speaking in public, but who requests her so to do, her public improvement will be no violation of the law, but rather a compliance with its demand. The text already quoted from 1 Tim. ii. 1, 12, is in perfect harmony with the above exposition. It says, "Let the women learn in silence, with all submission." This explained by the same law, must mean submission to their husbands. But the apostle adds, "I suffer not a woman to teach or to usurp authority over the man." by "*the* man," a woman's husband must be meant, and keeping the same law before our eyes, she is forbidden to teach contrary to the wishes or command of her husband, by which she would seem to usurp authority over him, in violation of the law referred to, which says, "thy desire shall be to thy husband and he shall rule over thee."

This view is greatly strengthened by the fact that it was disorderly and contentious proceedings that the apostle was laboring to correct, and not a wrong proceeding, conducted with due solemnity and order. This will appear by reading the whole connection, as follows:

"How is it then, brethren? when ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying. If any man speak in an unknown tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and that by course; and let one interpret. But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church; and let him speak to himself, and to God. Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the other judge. If anything be

revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace. For ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted. And the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets. For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints. Let your women keep silence in the church; for it is not permitted unto them to speak: but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also // saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home; for it is a shame for women to speak in the church."

There was most obviously disorder and confusion, in consequence of all wishing to speak at the same time, and each wishing to advance different and conflicting views. It is also most clearly inferable that the women took part in these disorderly proceedings, and talked in opposition to their husbands, and questioned them and others on the disputed points, by which husbands and wives became opponents, increasing the confusion, and destroying the harmony of the church. The application of the law given to our mother Eve, specifically made by the apostle to this case, is proof positive that there must have been a violation of the law, by the insubordination of wives to their husbands in those disorderly meetings, as I have supposed above. If then the difficulty arose in part from conflicting movements of husbands and wives in the church, there was no way to cure the evil, by a specific direction, but to command the men or the women to keep silence, and the apostle did the latter, appealing to the law as a reason which says, "Thy desires shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee."

Thus is it seen that the apostle's injunction was not given as a general rule, but as a remedy for a specific difficulty, and to construe it against the public efforts of competent and orderly female teachers, in the face of all the unanswerable proof that females did teach under divine sanction, is in my view, doing violence to the word of God.

This is still further supported by the doctrine of true expediency and utility. The females in the Corinthian church, I presume were not divinely inspired, or church-appointed teachers, but common members, and perhaps recent converts from heathenism, ignorang and incompetent to teach. Such surely should keep silence, and ask their husbands at home. But suppose a woman to be ever so well

qualified intellectually and morally,--and a woman by study and prayer, may know as much of God, and divinity, and the plan of salvation, as a man,--if she has a husband, it would be a matter of very questionable expediency and utility, for her to undertake to preach the gospel, without the consent and in violation of the commands of her husband, even if there were no precept on the subject. But it has been seen that such females as have no husbands, of whom Paul says she "careth for the things of the Lord," and such as have husbands, who approve of their public efforts to persuade sinners to repent and be saved, are not estopped by the law upon which Paul bases his directions, that the // women keep silence in the churches, even as understood by those who so contrue the apostle's words. Here I rest my argument, and will proceed to close this already too long discourse.

We are here assembled on a very interesting and solemn occasion, and it is proper to advert to the real object for which we have come together. There are in the world, and there may be among us, false views of the nature and object of ordination. I do not believe that any special or specific form of ordination is necessary to constitute a gospel minister. We are not here to make a minister. It is not to confer on this our sister, a right to preach the gospel. If she has not that right already, we have no power to communicate it to her. Nor have we met to qualify her for the work of the ministry. If God and mental and moral culture have not already qualified her, we cannot, by anything we may do by way of ordaining or setting her apart. Nor can we, by imposition of our hands, confer on her any special grace for the work of the ministry, nor will our hands if imposed upon her head, serve as a special medium for the communication of the Holy Ghost, as conductors serve to convey electricity; such ideas belong not to our theory, but are related to other systems and darker ages. All we are here to do, and all we expect to do, is, in due form, and by a solemn and impressive service, to subscribe our testimony to the fact, that in our belief, our sister in Christ, Antoinette L. Brown, is one of the ministers of the New Covenant, authorized, qualified, and called of God to preach the gospel of his Son Jesus Christ. This is all, but this even renders the occasion interesting and solemn. As she is recognized as the pastor of this flock, it is solemn and interesting to both pastor and flock, to have the

relation formally recognized. But as a special charge is to be given to both, by others, I forbear to open the subject of their mutual responsibilities, and will conclude by invoking the blessing of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost upon both preacher and people. Amen.

DYING TO THE GLORY OF GOD.

A SERMON,

PREACHED ON THE OCCASION OF THE EXECUTION OF

CAPT. JOHN BROWN,

IN THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH, AT CHAGRIN FALLS, OHIO,

BY REV. LUTHER LEE, D. D.

SAMUEL LEE--SYRACUSE, N. Y.

1860.

N O T E.

Capt. John Brown was executed at Charleston, Virginia, Dec. 2, 1859, for the alledged crimes of Insurrection, Murder and Treason. The reader is entreated not to overlook the fact, that four others were executed on the 16th of the same month, of whom no mention is made in the following discourse. The reason that no mention is made of the latter is, the Sermon was written before their execution transpired. The writer, believing that they are entitled to honorable mention with their leader, Capt. Brown, takes this method of doing them justice. They were doubtless all noble-hearted men, and acted and died for the good of the enslaved, being moved by no selfish considerations. When slavery shall be abolished, they will doubtless have ample justice done then in the history of emancipation.

THE AUTHOR.

DYING TO THE GLORY OF GOD.

"Verily, verily, I say unto thee, when thou wast young, thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldst: but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldst not. This spake he, signifying by what death he should glorify God."--JOHN, xxi. 18. 19.

These are the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, spoken to Peter, with a comment by the writer.

The text virtually affirms two things, namely:

1. That Peter would die a violent death.

He is said to have been crucified head down, at Rome.

2. That Peter should honor God by the death he should die.

This latter fact is the one to be made prominent in the present discourse. A man may glorify God in death. It is not death in itself that honors God, but the character of its subject, the life he has lived, the cause and circumstances of his death, and the manner in which he meets his fate. In the light of these attendants, Peter glorified God by the death he died, and so has John Brown.

The latter half of this proposition embraces the subject to be discussed. JOHN BROWN HAS HONORED GOD IN HIS DEATH UPON THE GALLOWS. It is not through the agency of Governor Wise, as God's minister of wrath, bearing the sword, to execute vengeance upon John Brown as an evil doer, that God is honored by his death. While God has been honored by his death, the authorities of Virginia, by whom it has been effected, have been disgraced.

The honor of God is to be looked for in the developments of the man himself; and to exhibit him in his true light, a brief outline of his origin, life and death is required.

1. He was a noble son, descended from noble sires. He was of Puritanic origin. He descended from Peter Brown, who came in the May Flower in 1620, being of the Pilgrim band that // fled from oppression, and landed upon Plymouth Rock, amid the winter scenes of this then new wild world.

"The breaking waves dashed high
On a stern and rock-bound coast,
And the woods against the stormy sky
Their giant branches tost;

And the heavy night hung dark
The billows and the waters o'er,
When a band of exiles moored their bark
On the wild New England shore."

It is true this is rather remote from the life and death of John Brown. It is just 239 years this present month since Peter Brown set his foot on Plymouth Rock. It is a well-understood fact, that family traits may often be traced through several generations, and John Brown appears to have shared largely the old puritanic character.

2. John Brown was an honest man. It can hardly be necessary to offer proof of this; perhaps none will be disposed to deny it. His whole life shows him to have been most scrupulously and undeviatingly honest, in little things and great things. No act of his life can be referred to which does not wear the face of honesty, when looked at in the light of the circumstances that surrounded him at the time of the transaction. That he often differed in opinion from others, need not be denied, for honest men often differ. His opinions, wherein he differed from others, were honest opinions, honestly held. His honesty is not likely to be called in question, only in regard to slavery, and the means he employed in opposition to this dark and humanity-crushing institution of our land. But here his honesty will not suffer in comparison with those who differ from him. He had the honesty and courage to look at things as they really are, and to take up and follow the principles involved, and carry them out to their legitimate conclusions, regardless of personal and selfish considerations. If all others would do the same, there would be less difference between John Brown and the rest of mankind.

As his honesty is the most vital point involved, it may be well to look at it a little closer. Honesty involves the rectitude of // the intention, upon which a man's guilt or innocence depends. If, then, he was honest, it follows that he was innocent, and that an innocent man has paid the forfeiture of his integrity upon the gallows, under American law, and at the demands of American slavery.

What, then, were his views of American slavery? He held it to be an unmitigated wrong, a sin against God, the worst outrage that can be perpetrated upon humanity, and a national curse and disgrace. Was he not honest in these views? If he was not, we must charge the most brilliant and pure minds that ever shone upon the darkness of the world with dishonesty, for they have held the same views, and hold them still. Among religious men, I will quote the following:

Mr. Wesley--"That execrable sum of all villainies, commonly called the slave-trade, I read of nothing like it in the heathen world, whether ancient or modern. It infinitely exceeds in every instance of barbarity whatever Christian slaves suffer in Mohammedan countries. I strike at the root of this complicated villainy. I absolutely deny all slave-holding to be consistent with any degree of natural justice. That slave-holding is utterly in consistent with mercy, is almost too plain to need a proof. This equally concerns all slave-holders, of whatever rank and degree; seeing men-buyers are exactly on a level with men-stealers."

This was written 87 years ago.

Dr. Clark--"Slavery, and the buying of the bodies and souls of men, no matter what color or complexion, is a high offence against the holy and just God, and a gross and unpardonable attack upon the liberty and rights of our fellow creatures."--1 Cor. vii. 23.

"I here register my testimony against the unprincipled, inhuman, anti-christian, and diabolical slave-trade, with all its authors, promoters, abettors, and sacrilegious gains; as well as against the great devil, the father of it and them."--*Infine.*

"In heathen countries slavery was in some sort excusable; among Christians, it is an enormity and a crime for which perdition has scarcely an adequate state of punishment."--Eph. vi. 5.

Presbyterian Church--"1 Tim. i. 10. 'The law is made for men-stealers.' This crime among the Jews exposed the perpe- // trators of it to capital punishment. Exodus xxi. 16: and the apostle here classes them with sinners of the first class. The word he uses, in its original import, comprehends all who are concerned in bringing any of the human race into slavery, or in retaining them in it." --*Larger Catechism, 42d question, 1794.*

"We consider the voluntary enslaving of one part of the

human race by another as a gross violation of the most precious and sacred rights of human nature; as utterly inconsistent with the law of God, which requires us to love our neighbor as ourselves, and as totally irreconcilable with the spirit and principles of the gospel of Christ." --*General Assembly, 1818.*

It is proper also to introduce the testimony of political men as well as religionists.

Patrick Henry--"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but for me, give me liberty or give me death."

These words would be just as appropriate and just as patriotic in the mouth of slaves to-day as they were when uttered by the immortal Henry.

John Jay, first Chief Justice of the United States, appointed by Washington--"An excellent law might be made out of the Pennsylvania one for the gradual abolition of slavery. Till America comes into this measure, her prayers to heaven will be impious."--*Letter from Spain.*

Thomas Jefferson--"What an incomprehensible machine is man! who can endure toil, famine, stripes, imprisonment, and death itself, in vindication of his own liberty, and the next moment be deaf to all the motives whose power supported him through his trial, and inflict on his fellowman a bondage, one hour of which is fraught with more misery than ages of that he rose in rebellion to oppose."

It is not necessary to give further extracts, which might be done to almost any extent; enough has been quoted to show that John Brown only held sentiments on the subject of slavery in common with the great and good among Christians and statesmen. Even to-day millions of hearts throb in union with his on // the dark and fearful crime of slavery. I should do injustice to my own internal self --the manhood that lives within--if I did not here declare that I believe, not only with my head, but with my heart of hearts, that American slavery is the most God-provoking and man-degrading crime that can ever be perpetrated by incarnated depravity.

It will be said that John Brown's crime lay not in what he believed, but in what he did; that he was not hung for his opinions, but for his actions. This may be admitted, and still it may be maintained that his actions were only the out-gushing of his opinions; and if so, his daring honesty must constitute a halo of glory around his gallows,

and his grave, in the midst of this Janus-faced, time-serving, go-between generation. He believed not only that slavery is a great wrong, but in common with mankind, that it is right to oppose oppression, and defend human liberty, *vi et armies*--by force and arms. Those who believe it right to oppose oppression and defend human liberty by the sword, must not call John Brown dishonest for believing the same. Some few, indeed, hold that all violent resistance of wrong is in itself wrong; but this class do not clamor against Brown, but are, to a man and woman, in deep sympathy for him and his fate. But this is not the sentiment of mankind. It is not the sentiment of this nation. The nation to-day glories in the deeds of our revolutionary fathers, who drew their swords and dashed upon the battle field to resist oppression--ages of which, Mr. Jefferson declares, is fraught with less misery than one hour of that against which John Brown drew his sword. To-day this nation has its fleets and armies spread abroad, upon your expense and mine, professedly, at least, to resist encroachments and enforce right by the sword. If it be wrong to detend liberty by the sword, then are you and I as guilty as some may suppose John Brown to be, for we are doing it every day by our agents.

Did Abraham deserve to be hung for his daring feat of rescuing Lot from captivity? Did Deborah and Barak deserve to be hung when they discomfited Sisera and his host? Did Gideon and his three hundred men deserve to be hung when he had // routed the Midian host? Did David deserve to be hung when he had smitten the Amalekites and rescued his wives and the other captives? Did the seventeen men who threw the tea into Boston harbor deserve to be hung? Did the men who dared to fight the first battle of the Revolution on the blood-stained field of Lexington, deserve to be hung? Did Ethan Allen deserve to be hung for taking Ticonderoga in the name of the great Jehovah and the Continental Congress?

But it is not necessary to pursue this train of thought further for Virginia herself, who has hung John Brown for taking the' sword, believes that it is right to defend liberty, yes, and slavery too, with the sword. Under her authority was John Brown assailed by the sword, and several times smitten with it after the old hero lay prostrate and defenseless, as proved in her own court.

But it may be said, John Brown took the sword in violation of the laws of Virginia. This is admitted, and so do

all revolutionists the same. This our fathers did, and had they failed, their names would have been handed down to posterity as rebels, and Washington would have been hung as a traitor, and his name immortalized on the scroll of infamy. But God ordered a better fate for them and our common country. But it is not a question of success, but a question of right that we are now discussing, and it is clear that we are agreed that it is right to resist wicked and oppressive laws. To deny it, would be to condemn our fathers and to stamp the Revolution with the name of an unjustifiable rebellion.

But it will be said that Mr. Brown was rash, imprudent, unwise in his attack. This is all admitted, but it only involves a matter of opinion, and not his honesty the only thing now under consideration. He was mistaken beyond a doubt, but for that mistake there may be found an apology sufficient to leave his honesty untouched. It must all turn on the prospect of success which he saw or thought he saw. If he supposed there was a chance of success, his principles bound him to strike for that success. There may then have been in his honest view a fair chance for entire success to the extent of his intended enterprise. It is // not to be supposed for one moment that he expected to conquer Virginia with the men and means which he commanded or could hope to command. He was not foolish or insane enough to think any such thing. The only rational construction that can be put upon his conduct, is that he never expected to subvert directly the government of Virginia or of the United States, but his design was to gather around him a large number of slaves and march them off in triumph to Canada. The swords and spears and firearms were not used in an insurrection in Virginia, but in self-defense by migrating parties of slaves, should they be attacked on their flight to Canada. This view may have looked to him like driving for a time at least, a prosperous business. And may he not have been honest in all this? Look at the facts as they may have appeared to his mind, and you will find an apology at least.

He had suffered in Kansas, where his own son was shot down in cold blood and unarmed; he had there seen the horrors of a guerrilla war, carried on under the authority of the United States, or by its connivance, and all to force slavery into Kansas. He, therefore, felt that government had failed to secure its legitimate end, and had lent itself to the cause of oppression, and that he

was absolved from all obligation to respect or obey it. Unprotected by government, he regarded himself as thrown back upon his inherent rights to use and exercise them at his own discretion. He regarded the country as in a guerrilla warfare, and felt that it was right for him to play a part for the deliverance of a few of the most deeply wronged and oppressed.

His firm belief in the scriptures may have moved him to the enterprise when he read therein, "Remember those in bonds as bound with them." Heb. xiii. 3. And then turning to Prov. xxiv. 11, 12, he read, "If thou forbear to deliver them that are drawn unto death, and those that are ready to be slain; if thou sayest, behold we knew it not; doth not he that pondereth the heart consider it? and he that keepeth thy soul, doth not he know it? and shall not he render to every man according to his works?"

If there were any scruples in his mind on the ground that // slavery is rendered lawful, he may have been relieved by reading from Mr. Wesley's thoughts on Slavery as follows:

"The grand plea is, 'they are authorized by law.' But can law, human law, change the nature of things? Can it turn darkness into light, or evil into good? By no means. Notwithstanding ten thousand laws, right is right, and wrong is wrong. There must still remain an essential difference between justice and injustice, mercy and cruelty."

It may be, that he thought that Virginia enactments were not laws, that she was not a State, and that when he and his men were present, he was the State himself. Some muse may have whispered the idea in his ear:--

"What constitutes a State?
Not high raised monuments or labor'd mound,
Thick wall or moted gate,
Not cities proud with spires and turrets crown'd;
Not bays and broad arm'd ports
Where, laughing at the storm, rich navies ride;
Not star'd and spangled courts,
Whose low brow'd baseness wafts profane to pride.
No! men, high-minded men!
With powers as far above dull brutes endued
In forest, brake or den,
As beasts excel cold rocks and brambles rude;
Men who their duty know,
But know their rights, and knowing dare maintain,

Prevent the long aim'd blow,
And crush the tyrant while they rend the chain!
These constitute a State."

Mr. Brown may have been quickened in his zeal, by reading the following clause from Daniel Webster's speech upon Plymouth Rock.

"If there be within the extent of our knowledge and influence any participation in this traffic in slaves, let us pledge ourselves upon the Rock of Plymouth, to extirpate and destroy it. It is not fit that the land of the pilgrims should bear the shame longer. Let that spot be purified, or let it be set aside from the christian world; let it be put out of the circle of human sympathies and human regards; and let civilized men henceforth have no com- // munion with it. I invoke those who fill the seats of justice, and all who minister at her altar, that they exercise the wholesome and necessary severity of the law. I invoke the ministers of our religion, that they proclaim its denunciations of those crimes and add its solemn sanctions to the authority of human laws. If the pulpit be silent whensoever and wheresoever there may be a sinner, bloody with his guilt, within the hearing of its voice, the pulpit is false to its trust."

He may have been inspired to make the attempt by reading Judge Story's charge to the Grand Jury in Portsmouth, from which I extract the following:

"May we not justly dread the displeasure of that Almight Being who is the common father of us all, if we do not by all means within our power, endeavor to suppress such infamous cruelties? If we cannot, like the good Samaritan, bind up the wounds and soothe the anguish of the friendless Africans, let us not like the Levite pass by on the other side. What sight can be more acceptable in the eye of heaven than of a good man struggline in the cause of oppressed humanity? What consolation can be more sweet in a dying hour, than the recollection that at least one human being may have been saved from sacrifice by our vigilance?"

Mr. Brown may have received his final impulse, which drove him into the jaws of the slave power, from reading Thomas Jefferson's terribly alarming words: "I tremble for my country when I remember that God is just, that his justice cannot sleep forever. When the measure of their tears shall be full; when their groans shall have

involved heaven itself in blackness, doubtless a God of justice will awaken to their distress, and by diffusing light and liberty among their oppressors, at length by his exterminating thunder, manifest attention to the affairs of the world that they are not left to the guidance of a blind fatality."

Allow, that John Brown saw and felt the force of all these truths, uttered by the best and wisest men, the best and most learned christians and wisest politicians, and that he had honesty and courage enough to carry out his honest convictions of right // and duty, and you will have sufficiently accounted for his course. He differed most from others in that he alone dared to live up to the American idea of human rights and liberty. Millions of others hold the same principles that guided and governed him, yet pursue a different course, and which is most honest, posterity will decide.

I have dwelt longer upon Mr. Brown's honesty, because it is the foundation of every other virtue, and once admitted, must render any practical errors that may be detected, consistent with moral goodness.

3. John Brown was a hero. Of this, in its true sense, no one will pretend to doubt. He was a brave man, ever ready to defend the right, whatever odds might be against him. This was proved in his entire Kansas career, to the discomfit of border ruffians, many of whom licked the dust before his prowess. The history of the Kansas war cannot be admitted here for want of time; suffice it to say, that Kansas owes her freedom to-day more to his firm, self-sacrificing, daring courage, than to the efforts of any other one agency. John Brown and Liberty should be inscribed upon the banner of Kansas, while it shall wave over free men and free soil.

His last effort, by which he fell into the devouring jaws of slavery, has seldom, if ever been surpassed in point of courage, and when smitten and borne down by superior force, lying prostrate under the repeated blows of the cowardly sword that would smite a fallen foe, his courage forsook him not, and he lay under those blows the same old hero, that he stood in battle.

But he manifested a more sublime courage still, when he was examined by the Executive of the State, whose laws held him as a prisoner worthy of death. The flashing eye of Governor Wise grew dim, and its fires shrunk away and hid themselves in the inner caverns of his soul, when he

looked upon the honest and brave face of such a man as John Brown. "Are you Ossawatomie Brown," asked Governor Wise. "I tried to do my duty there," was the calm, noble reply of the prostrate hero.

Through the whole tragic scene that followed, up to the moment when he was launched into the presence of God, his bear- // ings were all those of the most noble of heroes. The particulars would be interesting, but for them I have no time. On his way to the gallows, he remarked, "I am cool, I have suffered much more from modesty in my lifetime than I have from fear. For thirty years I have been educated to look on fear as myth, and now I do not know what it is." When all was ready, the sheriff inquired, "Will you take a handkerchief and use it as a signal, letting it fall when you are ready?" Brown replied, "No, sir, I am always ready. Do not keep me unnecessarily long." In a moment more, the platform dropped from under his feet, and he hung between the heavens and the earth. Thus passed away one of the heroes of the nineteenth century, one of earth's noblemen.

4. John Brown was a christian. On this head my own words shall be few. It has been seen that he was an honest man. None but an honest man would do and dare as he did, in his circumstances.

He professed to be a Christian, and to act in the fear of God, and no honest man would make such a profession falsely. In his prison and in prospect of death, he professed faith in God through Jesus Christ, and a hope of eternal life. In the honest hour of death, when earth could have retained no lingering influence over him, and there could have been no worldly motives to deceive himself or others, he persisted in maintaining his integrity, and held on to his unshaken confidence in God.

The clearest proof that he was a Christian, is found in his last letters written to his friends from his prison. These letters are all interesting, but I can give only short extracts from a few of them.

Nov. 8, he addressed a letter as follows:

"Dear Wife and Children, every one:--* * * I am quite cheerful, having, as I trust, the peace of God which passeth all understanding to rule in my heart, and the testimony, in some degree, of a good conscience that I have not lived altogether in vain. I can trust God with both the time and manner of my death, believing, as I do, that for me at this time to seal my testimony for God and

humanity with my blood, will do vastly // more towards advancing the cause I have earnestly endeavored to promote, than all I have done in my life before. I beg you all meekly and quietly to submit to this; not feeling yourselves in the least degraded on this occasion. Remember, dear wife and children all, that Jesus of Nazareth suffered a more excruciating death on the cross as a felon, under the most aggravating circumstances. Think, also, of the prophets, and apostles, and Christians of former days, who went through greater tribulations than you or I; and try to be reconciled. May God Almighty comfort all your hearts, and soon wipe away all tears from your eyes. To Him be endless praise. Think, too, of the crushed millions that have no comforter. I charge you all never in your trials, to forget the griefs of the poor that cry, and of those that have none to help them. * * * I cannot remember a night so dark as to have hindered the coming day, nor a storm so furious or dreadful as to prevent the return of warm sunshine and a cloudless sky. But, beloved ones, do remember that this is not your rest; that in this world you have no abiding place or continuing city. To God and his infinite mercy I always commend you."

Did a guilty, dying murderer ever talk like that before? Never, no, never. Under date of November 28, he wrote a letter to Judge Tilden, of Cleveland, from which the following extracts are made:

* * * "I have enjoyed remarkable cheerfulness and composure of mind ever since my confinement; and it is a great comfort to feel assured that I am permitted to die *for a cause,* not merely to pay the debt of nature, as all must. I feel myself to be most unworthy of such a distinction. * * * I may be very insane, and I am so, if insane at all; but if that be so, insanity is like a very pleasant dream to me. I am not in the least degree conscious of my ravings, of my fears, or of any terrible visions whatever, but fancy myself entirely composed; and that my sleep, in particular, is as sweet as that of a healthy, joyous little infant. I pray God that he will grant a continuance of the same calm, but delightful dream, until I come to know of those realities which eye hath not seen, and which ear hath not heard." //

The following is extracted from his last letter to his family, dated Nov. 30:

"My dearly beloved Wife, Sons and Daughters, every one:-- As I now begin what is probably the last letter I shall

write to any of you, I conclude to write to all at the same time. * *

* I am waiting the hour of my public murder with great composure of mind and cheerfulness, feeling the strong assurance that in no other possible way could I be used to so much advantage to the cause of God and humanity, and that nothing that either I or all my family have sacrificed or suffered will be lost. The reflection that a wise and merciful, as well as a just and holy God, rules not only the affairs of this world, but of all worlds, is a rock to set our feet upon under all circumstances, even those more severely trying ones into which our own feelings and wrongs have placed us. I have now no doubt that our seeming disaster will ultimately result in the most glorious success. So, my dear shattered and broken family, be of good cheer, and believe and trust in God with all your heart, and will all your soul, for He doeth all things well. Do not feel ashamed on my account, nor for one moment despair of the cause, or grow weary in well-doing. I bless God, I never felt stronger confidence in the certain and near approach of a bright morning and glorious day, than I have felt, and do now feel, since my confinement here. I am endeavoring to return like a poor prodigal, as I am, to my Father, against whom I have always sinned, in the hope that He may kindly and forgivingly meet me, though a great way off. O, my dear wife and children, would to God you could know how I have been travailing in birth for you all; that no one of you may fail of the grace of life through Jesus Christ; that no one of you may be blind to the truth and glorious light of His word, in which life and immortality are brought to light. I beseech you, every one, to make the Bible your daily and nightly study, with a child-like, honest, candid, teachable spirit of love and respect for your husband and father. And I beseech the God of my fathers to open all your eyes to the discovery of the truth. You cannot imagine how much you may soon need the consolations of the Christian religion. Circumstances like my own, for // more than a month past, have convinced me beyond all doubts of our great need of some theories treasured up when our prejudices are excited, our vanity worked up to the highest pitch. Oh! do not trust your eternal all upon the boisterous ocean, without even a helm or compass to aid you in steering. I do not ask of you to throw away your reason; I only ask you to make a candid, sober use

of your reason.

"My dear young children, will you listen to this poor admonition of one who can only love you? Oh! be determined at once to give your whole heart to God, and let nothing shake or alter that resolution. You need have no fears of regretting it. Do not be vain and thoughtless, but sober-minded; and let me entreat you all to love the whole remnant of our once great family. Try and build up again your broken walls, and to make the utmost of every stone that is left. Nothing can so tend to make life a blessing as the consciousness that your life and example bless and leave you the stranger. Still it is ground of the utmost comfort to my mind, to know that so many of you as have had the opportunity have given some proof of your fidelity to the great family of men. Be faithful unto death: from the exercise of habitual love to man, it cannot be very hard to love his Maker. I must yet incert the reason for my firm belief of the divine inspiration of the Bible, nothwithstanding I am, perhaps, naturally sceptical, and certainly not credulous. I wish you all to consider it most thoroughly when you read that blessed book, and see whether you cannot discover such evidence yourselves. It is the purity of heart, filling our minds as well with work and actions, which is everywhere insisted on, that distinguishes it from all the other teachings, that commends it to my conscience. Whether my heart be willing and obedient or not, the inducements that it holds out, is another reason of my convictions of its truth and genuineness; but I do not here omit this my last argument on the Bible, that eternal life is what my soul is panting after this moment." * * *

John Rogers wrote to his children, to "abhor that arrant whore of Rome." John Brown writes to his children, to "abhor, with undying hatred, also that sum of all villainies, slavery. * * * And // now, dearly beloved family, to God and the word of his grace I commend you all." Was not he a christian? Yea, yea, yea.

5. John Brown is now a martyr. On this I shall not multiply words. He is as clearly a martyr to the cause of liberty, as Stephen was to the cause of Christ.

It is a necessary conclusion from the points already established. It has been seen that he was an honest man, a hero and a christian, and yet he has been hung for his efforts in the cause of human liberty. He has been hung for his efforts in behalf of the oppressed, and yet those

efforts were the efforts of an honest man, a hero and a christian, and such a man, dying for such a cause, can be nothing but a martyr.

I will now bring this protracted discourse to a close by two general remarks.

1. From a view of the whole subject, as it has been presented we may see by what death, wherein and how, John Brown glorified God.

It was by daring to do and die for what he believed was right. No selfish considerations could have moved him; he had nothing to gain but the reward of a good conscience and the favor of God; while he perilled all of earth and life for the good of the poor crushed and bleeding slave. For the benefit of the despised and outraged of earth, he labored and died, and a death in such a cause redounds more to the glory of God, than brilliant talents, high sounding titles, wide-spread power ruling empires, lofty thrones, flashing domes, crowned heads and mitred brows. These all, in the eye of God, are nothing, compared with honest John Brown, dying for human rights. The manner in which the honest brave old man witnessed for the truth, and bore his testimony against oppression, and finally met his doom, is the most clear exhibition of God's supporting truth and grace, by which God is glorified. Calmly, firmly and constantly did he assert the right of the slave to his freedom, and the guilt of the slave-holder, and that too, in the face of his captors, persecutors, judges and executioners. He neither denied or sought to evade a single opinion he held, or act he performed; his transparent soul was thrown open to the gaze of those who sought oc- // casion to take his life. When the Redeemer trod the walks of life, his presence constrained the devils to bear testimony to his incarnated divinity, crying out, "thou art the Son of God." and so Governor Wise, the embodiment of the spirit of Slavery, cried out in the presence of John Brown, "He is the most honest, truthful and brave man I ever saw." It is written, "out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast ordained praise," but in the death of John Brown he ordained it out of the mouth of dragons, and the promise is fulfilled which says, "The wrath of man shall praise thee, and the remainder of that wrath shalt thou restrain." And then the calm, unruffled manner in which he ascended the steps, and stood upon the fatal platform between heaven and earth, awaiting the signal for his

flight, throws around his gallows the rainbow of christian hope and renders his death gloriously radient with the sustaining grace of God, and the light of immortality. St. Paul said, in prospect of death, "I am ready to be offered," but John Brown's last words were, "I am always ready."

2. Just in proportion as God has been glorified by the death of John Brown, has Virginia been exposed and disgraced. Innocent blood is on her escutcheon, and human gore is now folded in her archives. Virginia has put to death an honest man, a hero and a christian. Virginia has put to death a man, whom her own executive pronounced the most honest, truthful and brave man he ever saw. If it be said that necessity compelled her to do it in self-defense, that nothing short of the blood of the brave old man could quench the kindling fires of liberty, that without it those fires would burst out and consume oppressors and melt the chains from the limbs of their enslaved bondmen, the disgrace is only the deeper. Is it true that Virginia lives under, and maintains a system which is so removed from common sense, and common honesty, and common justice, and common christianity, that it is unsafe to allow brave, honest christian men to live and walk abroad, and talk and act out the convictions of their honest hearts? It is even so, slavery dreads the light, and dares not to spit the gag from its own mouth, or to allow others to speak, least bondmen should hear, or their own hearts // should be stung with the point of truth. How terrible is that system of bondage which cannot stand in the light of free discussion, which renders it unsafe to sleep, until the eyes of common sense are put out, and the tongue of free speech is cut out, and the moral sense is perverted, and honest, brave christian men are hung? Such a system is Virginia slavery.

If John Brown's temerity has done no other good, it has developed and exposed the weakness and danger of the slave system. If we may allow the Virginians to know themselves and their own system, the proof is terrible against slavery. Fifteen white men and five negroes throw the whole State of Virginia into the most terrible convulsion of alarm. Terror seized upon all, the brave trembled, and women and children shrieked. Nor did the arrest of the leader and a portion of the band, and the flight of the remainder lay their terror; it increased as imagination had time to work, alarm after alarm spread with the wind,

as though the moan of every breeze was the sounding wings of unseen spirit foes; the song of the bird of night was to their excited imaginations the battle-cry of terror, and the harmless footsteps of domestic animals in the ear of brave sentinels became the fearful tread of an invading army. And then they dared not hang their victim without an army to keep their own fears down. One poor old man goes to the gallows, calm and without fear, while two thousand soldiers are employed to execute him, clad in habiliment of war, epaulette, plume, side-arms, cavalry; infantry and artillery: sword drawn, musket poised, cannon loaded, match burning, ready for the work of carnage, should the poor old man refuse to be hung. It is not possible that any but a slave-holding community should ever be betrayed by needless fears into such a superfluity of ridiculous folly. And all this is destined to still further expose and hasten the overthrow of slavery. There must come an hour of calm reflection when the fright is over, and then, what there may be of reason left, will inquire, why all this fear? and can the system pay which costs so much terror for so slight a cause?

The death of John Brown has condemned slavery and sealed its doom. It hung him, but the gallows on which it hung him shall become the watch-word of liberty, the glory of him who // died thereon, and the terror and death of slavery. When Brown hung on the gallows, it was slavery only that hung in moral effect. Brown is dead and passed to his reward, but slavery has yet its doom to meet and to die, and die it must and die it will. So terror-stricken was slavery at the thought of hanging the good man, that it dared not open its guilty ear to hear his dying word. It imposed on him a silent death, for it dared not let him speak. Dared not trust its own guilty conscience to hear a word from a dying man.

> They dare not give freedom to speak,
> They dare not give freedom to write,
> They fear that the truth should be heard--
> Who know that the truth will indite.

John Brown is dead, died under the gag of slavery, died in silence, but, he being dead, yet speaketh, and slavery shall hear his voice and tremble yet again. He is dead, but the cause of human freedom in which he died still lives, and shall yet triumph. Yes, martyred one,

"Thou hast left behind
Powers that will work for thee, air, earth and skies;
There's not a breathing of the common wind
That will forget thee; thou hast great allies-
Thy friends are exultations, agonies,
And love, and man's unconquerable mind."

The murdered body of John Brown sleeps the sleep that shall know no waking till the resurrection morn, but his noble spirit lives in a million hearts, by whom freedom's battle shall be pushed to its final triumph. God will overrule this and every other outburst of pro-slavery wrath for his own glory and the overthrow of oppression. Peace to his ashes, peace to his soul; let a decent monument be reared over his remains to mark the spot where they sleep, and when freedom's day shall dawn, when the chain of slavery shall be stricken from the iron-eaten limbs of every bondman, and our nation shall become the land of the free, the asylum of the oppressed, and the home of the brave, then let the emancipated gather around the spot, and build his // tomb high, and sing as his requiem one of their loudest and most joyful anthems of jubilee. Until that day shall come--for come it must and come it will--peace to the memory of honest, brave John Brown, the first martyr to the slave power, executed under the forms of law to the everlasting disgrace of the State of Virginia. Peace to his ashes, peace to his soul, resting for its time under the altar with the souls of those who were "slain for the word of God and for the testimony which they held." When they cried, "How long, O, Lord, holy and true, doest thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" "White robes were given unto every one of them, and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, "until their fellow-servants also, and their brethren, that should be killed as they were should be fulfilled." So let it be, O Lord, as seemeth good in thy sight, for thou doest all things well. Amen, and Amen!

S L A V E R Y.

A SIN AGAINST GOD.

BY LUTHER LEE.

SYRACUSE:
WESLEYAN METHODIST BOOK ROOM
1853.

W E S L E Y A N T R A C T S

LARGE SERIES.--NO. I.

SLAVERY--A SIN AGAINST GOD.

Limited servitude or such as pertains to children in their minority, and persons under various limited contracts and obligations, is not meant in the following Treatise. It is admitted that one person may rightfully owe service to another person under various circumstances.

By slavery is meant the system which reduces man to a chattel, and buys and sells him, and subjects him to the liabilities of other property, claiming the same right of property in the offspring by virtue of the right previously asserted to the parent. This is the system of American slavery, and against it and all other slavery involving the same principles, the arguments are directed.

Slavery consisting in the right of property in man, with the usual incidents of that right must be morally wrong, sin in itself, for the following reasons. //

ARGUMENT FIRST:

IT IS INCONSISTENT WITH MAN'S RELATION TO GOD, AND THE OBLIGATIONS GROWING OUT OF THAT RELATION.

Dr. Payne, in his "Elements of Moral Science," says,--

"Virtue as it regards man, is the conformity or harmony of his affections and actions with the various relations in which he has been placed--of which conformity the perfect intellect of God, guided in its exercise by his infinitely holy nature, is the only infallible judge."

If this be a correct definition of virtue, and we believe it is; it follows, that man cannot rightfully sustain two relations at the same time, with both of which his affections and actions cannot harmonize; which is the

case with the relation that all men sustain to God, and the relation of *property,* to manwith its usual incidents. The relation we sustain to God, are various. He is our Creator, our Preserver, our Benefactor--He is the framer of our bodies and the Father of our spirits, and he is our Governor.

The quotation from Dr. Payne asserts that God is the judge of the conformity of man's affections and actions to his relations, and this judgment God has expressed in the first // great commandment, which reads as follows:--

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength." This commandment clearly lays such a claim to the affections of the heart, and demands such an entire devotion of the soul (*Psukee Life*) as gives tone to, and controls the actions; it therefore contains the foundation of absolute obedience to God. This is seen in the expression, "with all thy strength." This requires a consecration of the physical powers in obedience to God, under the control of the affections of the heart.

There is but one question more to settle, which is, can these affections and *actions* exist in the same heart and life, at the same time with those affections and *actions* which are consonant with the relation of a piece of property to its owner, a personal chattel to a chattel holder? Slavery may say what it pleases; common sense says no.

To be under obligation to obey God, there must exist the right and power of devoting our lives to God, for there can be no obligation where there is not both *right* and *power* to respond to that obligation. But the slave, who is the property of man, has not and *cannot have* the power of devoting his life to God, because his life is not at his own disposal, according to the dictates of his own understanding of right; he cannot do what God *requires,* but must do what *men require,* and wicked men too, who fear not God and regard not his law. Should it be said that // slave owners do not interfere with the slave's right to obey God, and liberty of conscience, every one must know that such an assumption would be false, for the extension of the right to slaves, to obey God, as free men professing the religion of the Bible deem it their duty to obey God, would overthrow the system of slavery.

Further, if it were admitted that slave owners grant their slaves the privilege of obeying God, it would not relieve the difficulty, for it would still follow that the

system of property in man, takes away from the human chattel the *right* to obey God, and puts it into the hand of the owner, who has the power to close up before the chattelized traveller to eternity, the path of obedience and with authority direct his footsteps in the way of sin and death. Man cannot sustain the relation of property to man, without an infraction of the relation that he sustains to God, and of the rights and powers essential to the conformity of his affections and *actions* to this relation, hence, the *right* of property in man cannot exist.

The assumption of the relation of a chattel holder to a subject of God's moral government, is to step in between such subject and God, and disannul man's relation to his Maker, and absolve him from his allegiance to Jehovah's throne. Can this be right? Does the Bible sanction such a principle, beaming as it does with the mind of Him who declares himself to be a jealous God; flashing with the lightnings of his displeasure, and speaking in the thunder tones // of his wrath against all who turn away from the claims of his law to acknowledge any other authority, to serve any other God or bow down to the likeness of any thing in heaven, earth or hell? It cannot be.

ARGUMENT SECOND:

SLAVERY CONFLICTS WITH VARIOUS SPECIFIC DUTIES WHICH THE BIBLE REQUIRES OF ALL MEN.

Dr. Paley, in his moral philosophy, lays down the following rule:

"A state of happiness is not to be expected by those who reserve to themselves the habitual practice of any one sin, or the neglect of any one known duty."

If then it can be shown that a state of slavery does interfere with a single duty to God, or involves its subjects in the necessity of violating one single precept of the gospel it will follow that it is and must remain wrong under all circumstances and forever.

It is the duty of all intelligent beings to use all the means within their reach to acquire a knowledge of God and his will. To remain ignorant of God and of his will concerning us through neglect of the means within our reach, is of itself a sin of the darkest shade. But from what

source is the knowledge of God to be derived? The answer is plain, // the *Scriptures*. "To the law and the testimony; if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them."

It is clear that if the Scriptures are an expression of the mind of God, and have been inspired by his spirit, all must possess a common right of direct access to this fountain of moral light. This none will deny but the Pope and his menials. With this accords the practice of all Protestants; whenever they establish missions in any part of the world among the heathen, they put the Bible into their hands so soon as they can speak its language, or so soon as it can be translated into their own language. The only exception is found in the act of withholding the scriptures from the slaves of our own country, who might be taught to read them with far greater facility.

But God has made it our duty to know him, and to know him through this medium.

Luke xvi. 29. "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them."

John v. 39. "Search the scriptures, for in them ye think he have eternal life."

Acts xvii. 11. "These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether these things were so."

W. M. Discipline--"It is expected of all who desire to continue in these societies, that they should continue to evidence their desire of salvation BY SEARCHING THE SCRIPTURES. All this we know his spirit writes // on truly awakened hearts. All which we are taught of God to observe."

The same principle is contained in the creed, written or unwritten, of every Protestant religious sect on earth; and every Protestant sect condemn the Romanists for withholding the scriptures from the people; and if it be wrong to withhold the scriptures, slavery cannot be right.

The right and duty of all men to possess themselves of the scriptures and to read and study the same being established, it only remains to show that slavery is of necessity and forever inimical to this right and duty; taking away the one, and nullifying the other. The right of property in man cannot exist co-ordinate with the right and obligation to 'search the scriptures.'

1. The right and obligation to search the scriptures

necessarily includes the right of acquiring property, first in money or money's value with which to procure the scriptures to be read: and secondly, in the scriptures themselves. But property cannot acquire property; the very idea of the right of property in any thing, supposes an equal right of properity in all productions and increase or income of such property; so that property cannot acquire property in its own right and for itself. If property increases or gathers other property around it, such increase does not belong to the property that produces or acquires it, but to the owner of the property. If this be denied, it will follow that the productions of the slaves do not belong to the slave owner but the slave him- // self, which will overthrow the whole system of slavery. This view shows that the slave, as property, cannot possess, in his own right, a Bible or the value of a Bible in any form, and therefore, the command of God to search the scriptures,' and the assumed right of property in man, are totally and irreconcilably opposed to each other, so that while God requires all men to search the scriptures, no man can rightfully be reduced to a chattel. With this agrees the law of slavery which says that a slave "can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire anything but what must belong to their master." If a Bible should be given to a slave, so as to alienate the right of the giver in favor of the slave, the right to the Bible would not lodge with the slave, but pass over him and vest itself with the master, and this is not only by law but in the very philosophy of the right of property.

2. The right and obligation to search the scriptures includes the right to devote sufficient time to the pursuit of religious knowledge. But the right of property in a man includes the right to monopolize and dispose of his whole time, so that he cannot possess the right of devoting his time or any part of it to the study of the scriptures, from which it follows again that the right of slavery is at war with the duties which God has commanded. If the advocate of slavery will attempt to evade the force of this, by denying that the right of property in man includes the right to control the time of such property, he will ruin his own cause; for if the // slaveholder has not a right to say how the slave shall improve his time, his right of property in him will not be worth contending about. If the right of property in man includes the right of controling his time, it conflicts with duties which God

requires and must be wrong; and if it does not give the master the right to control the time of the slave, the whole practical system of slavery is a violation of right.

In showing that slavery conflicts with certain specified duties, it is proper to notice the duty of publicly worshipping God. On this point we will quote but one text.

Heb. x. 25. "Not forsaking the assembling of yourselves together, as the manner of some is." This text clearly teaches the duty of meeting together in Christian assemblies for religious purposes, while slavery declares that the right of slaves so to assemble cannot be admitted with safety to the system.

To conclude this argument, we say that to grant the slaves the simple *right of obeying the Gospel,* by attending to all its devotional and social *duties as they are commanded and understood by Christians generally,* would *overthrow the entire system.* To give them the Scriptures to be read according to the dictates of their own consciences, and to allow them the privilege of *selecting their own ministers* from whose lips they choose to hear the words of life, which is the inalienable right of all Christians, would come so near to the abolition of slavery as to leave but little to be done to complete it. The *right of proper- // ty in man* cannot exist without taking away the right *of doing the duties and enjoying the privileges of the Gospel,* and therefore the right of property in man cannot exist *as a right,* but must be *wrong,* whenever assumed.

ARGUMENT THIRD:

SLAVERY CONFLICTS WITH THOSE SOCIAL RELATIONS AND DUTIES WHICH NOT ONLY SPRING FROM OUR SOCIAL NATURE, BUT WHICH GOD HAS ALSO ENJOINED BY POSITIVE ENACTMENT.

Man is a social being, and has received a social nature from the hand which formed him; which seeks intercourse, sympathy, and reciprocal enjoyments from kindred spirits. The various relations into which we are thrown by the current of our social nature, have been provided for by God in his word, where he has prescribed the circumstances, conditions and obligations of our social and domestic

relations, and has thrown around them the protection of his law.

We will commence with the institution of marriage. This of course was provided for by the hand of God when he originally created man, and is the first institution in the chain of social relations; first in the order of nature, and first in the order of the positive institutions of the divine law. Matt. xix. 4-6. //

"Have ye not read that he which made them at the beginning, made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain but one flesh? what therefore God hath joined together let no man put asunder."

Heb. xiii. "Marriage is honorable in all, and the bed undefiled; but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge."

On these texts it may be remarked, that God obviously designed marriage for all nations, races and classes of men. To say that God does not require marriage on the part of the African race, would be to say that he designs the extinction of the race, for all such perpetuation of the race out of wedlock is condemned and denounced by God himself. We are now prepared to show wherein slavery conflicts with the institution, and rights and obligations of marriage.

1. The right of property in man is inconsistent with the rights of the parties who lawfully enter into the marriage relation.

The husband has a monopoly of right in his wife. A wife belongs to her husband, in a sense which renders it impossible that she should be the property of another at the same time; if she is the wife of one, she cannot be the property of another; if she is the property of one she cannot be the wife of another. It is impossible from the nature of the two things that a woman should hold out the attributes of a wife to one man, and the attributes of property to another, at the // same time. The husband has an exclusive right in his wife, and the owner has an exclusive right in his property; hence, a woman cannot sustain the relation of a wife to one man, and the relation of property to another. The husband has not only an exclusive claim to the affections of her heart, but also to her time and attention; what power she possesses to promote the happiness of another belongs to him, and she has, as a wife, no right to seek the happiness of others beyond

what is consistent with his happiness; her happiness should be his and his should be hers; they are partners in both joy and sorrow; "they are no more twain but one flesh." The right of property includes the right of controlling, using, and disposing of such property for the promotion of the happiness of the owner; hence, two persons cannot possess, the one the rights of a husband and the other the rights of property in the same woman at the same time. In the same manner the rights of the wife forever forbid the right of property in the husband. The man is not alone in securing rights to himself when he enters into the marriage relation; corresponding to his rights are the rights of the wife; if they are not in every respect the same, they are nevertheless equal in number and importance. The husband is bound no less to devote himself for the promotion of the happiness of the wife than she is to promote his happiness. This right of the wife to the love, the protection, the support, and entire devotedness of the husband to promote her happiness must forever preclude // the right of property to such husband vesting itself in the hands of another.

2. The right of property in man is inconsistent with the obligations resting upon the parties to the marriage relations. Rights and obligations are always reciprocal; hence, in treating of the rights of the parties, the corresponding obligations have been implied, but we wish to bring them out a little more distinctly. The right of the husband to the due regard and proper submission of the wife, involves an obligation on her part to render these things; the right of the wife to the love and protection of the husband, involves an obligation on his part to love and protect her. We will now present a few plain declarations of scripture on this subject, and see how effectually they overthrow the assumed right of property in man.

1 Cor. vii. 2. "Nevertheless, *to avoid* fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband."

The system of property in man, making them personal chattels, to be bought and sold in the market, cannot be reconciled with the above text. To let every man have his own wife, and every woman her own husband, in the apostle's sense, would overthrow the whole system of slavery.

Eph. v. 21. "Wives submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord."

23. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the Saviour of the body."

Can wives, who are the personal chattels // of men not their husbands, comply with the above text? When the husband is sent to one market and the wife to another, can the wife obey the scriptures? Can the wife who is in the power, the absolute power of a man who is not her husband, and who can enforce his will in all things without let or hindrance by flattery, bribes, strength, prisons, whips and tortures; can such a wife submit herself to her husband as unto the Lord? and can a husband, who is under the same absolute control of another, be the head of such a wife, as Christ is the head of the church? Answer, common sense!

1 Cor. vii. 10. "And unto the married I command, *yet* not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband?"

Is it consistent with this text for one man to sell another man's wife, or to buy another man's wife, and drive her off in chains, to see her husband no more? It cannot be. If the wife has not a right to depart, then no other person can have a right to force her to depart. No person can have a right to compel another to do what such person has not a right to do without being compelled. A wife has no power to depart from her husband, and therefore no person can have a right to sell her, to buy and drive her away from her husband; and hence the right of property in husbands and wives cannot exist.

Eph. v. 28. "So ought ment to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself.

29. For no man ever yet hated his own // flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church?"

1 Peter iii. 7. "Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with *them* according to knowledge, giving honor unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered."

How can a man, who may be sold and driven away at any moment, be under obligation to dwell with his wife? We will not multiply quotations or remarks; enough has been said to show that slavery and the marriage institution cannot exist together. Slavery takes away the power of the wife to preserve her own purity, and this is true of married and unmarried females. The female that is made an article of property, cannot call her purity her own; it

may be taken from her at the pleasure of her owner. He may violate her at pleasure, and she has neither the right or the power to resist. He may tie her up with cords; he may confine her in any way he pleases; he may apply the lash to her cringing back to any extent he pleases; and all this he may do before the face of the man she may call her husband, and no one, bond or free, has any right to interfere; and in so doing he violates no law but the law of God, with which slavery has nothing to do more than to set it at nought.

All this follows of necessity, from the admission of the right of property in human beings. Note, the argument is not that all slaveholders actually commit these wrongs on the marriage institution and on female // purity, but the argument is that the system of slavery gives every slaveholder the power to do it at pleasure, and with perfect impunity; and that this is inseparable from the system itself; and that the system which lays the heaven ordained institution of marriage, and heaven-protected female virtue in the dust, helpless at the feet of the spoiler, for the riot and triumph of the baser passions of human nature, cannot be right, but must be wrong now and forever.

To settle the question, we say that matrimony exists among slaves or it does not.--The one or the other of these positions must be true. Which is true, we care not, so far as this argument is concerned. 1. If matrimony does exist in moral right among slaves, the parties are joined together by God, and Christ says, "what God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." But slavery does sunder them, and the right of property includes the right of sundering them. If therefore slaves are married in moral right, slavery is guilty of parting those whom God has joined together, and drags after it the crime of adultery. The slave system separates the parties and joins them in other connections, so that within a few years the same man may have several wives, and the same woman several husbands, and all living at the same time.

2. If slaves are not married in moral right, as they are not and cannot be in the eyes of the civil law, slavery stands charged with breaking up this heaven appointed institution, and of involving the slave population // in the crime of general whoredom. There is so far as we can see, no way to escape these conclusions; if the advocate of slavery allows that slaves are brought within the marriage institution, he assumes that the power to

separate those whom God hath joined together can rightfully exist; a thing, in our view, impossible. If he admits that slaves are not brought within the marriage institution, he assumes the rightfulness of general sexual intercourse without the bans of matrimony. Such is slavery, consisting in the assumed right of property in human beings, wherever it is found, in the church or out of the church. We speak as to wise men; judge of what we say. //

ARGUMENT FOURTH:

SLAVERY FURTHER CONFLICTS WITH THOSE SOCIAL RELATIONS AND DUTIES WHICH NOT ONLY SPRING FROM OUR SOCIAL NATURE, BUT WHICH GOD HAS ALSO ENJOINED BY POSITIVE ENACTMENT BY SUBVERTING THE RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS WHICH GROW OUT OF RELATIONS SUBSISTING BETWEEN PARENTS AND CHILDREN.

That there are rights and obligations connected with this relation, around which God has thrown the protection of his law, armed with the arrows of his lightnings, and the voice of his thunders, cannot be denied; and that slavery disregards them and tramples them under foot, if not admitted shall be proved.

When God descended upon Mount Sinai and gave his law amid the dreadful lightnings that blazed and glared, and shot their fiery arrows athwart the smoke and gloom that mantled the Eternal upon the mount, and amid the thunders that bellowed terrors and poured the voice of condemnation in the ear of sin; He then wrote with his own finger upon a table of stone, as the fifth of the ten commandments, the following words: "Honor thy father and mother, that thy days may be-long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee."

The duty of the child to honor his father and mother, clearly implies the obligation of the parents so to teach and so to behave towards the child, as is calculated to inspire // the feelings and write upon the heart of the child what God wrote in the book of his law. This sentiment is clearly brought out in the comment of St. Paul.

Ephe. vi. 1-4. "Children, obey your parents in the Lord for this is right. Honor thy father and mother which is the first commandment with promise, that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth. And ye, fathers, provoke not your children to wrath; but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

Here we have the obligation growing out of the relation that subsists between parents and children, as defined by the spirit of inspiration; and that slavery necessarily wars upon, and entirely subverts these obligations, is all that remains to be proved, and this is so plain and obvious that it is like proving what is self evident.

1. Can parents, who are subject to all the liabilities of property, and whose children are also property in the same full sense, bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord? This cannot be pretended. Sons are torn away from the embrace of their father, and removed forever beyond the sight of his eye; daughters are borne in chains from the throbbing, heaving bosom and bleeding hearts of their mothers.

"Where no mother's ear can hear them,
Where no mother's eye can see them."

Slavery which assumes the right of property in man, in fathers and mothers, and mothers and children, takes from the parents all right of control over their children, and // hence, it violates the divine law, for that commands them to control them for good. God says to parents, "bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; but slavery says, no, you cannot have the right of bringing them up, or if you do, you must bring them up for the market, bring them up for me, that I may sacrifice your sons upon the altar of my avarice, and your daughters upon the altar of my lust.

2. Can children who are "personal chattels to all intents and purposes and constructions whatsoever," honor their fathers and mothers? Can they "obey their parents in the Lord?" Most certainly not. The son looks not, cannot look to his father, if father he knows, for authority and direction during the years of his minority; nor can he honor, comfort, and support that father in his declining years, after the son has come to the riper years of manhood. The daughter cannot obey her own mother in childhood and youth, much less can she honor and cherish her in riper years; she must see her mother, if she be allowed to see her at all, languish, faint and die under the effects of toil, hunger and the lash, without dropping a word of consolation in her ear, or extending a daughter's hand to her relief--all this is true of the daughter, concerning her who in anguish gave her being, and sheltered her in her bosom during the cloudy morning of her existence, and nourished her upon the milk of toil and

weariness until she was strong enough to endure life's heavier storms.

That all this is wicked, it would be an in- // sult to common sense to attempt to prove. It directly violates and sets aside as plain a command as there is in the book of God, and if this is not sin, the ten commandments may all be violated without sin.

Should it be said in reply to this, that under the circumstances of the parents are released from the obligation to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and children are released from the obligation to obey their parents in the Lord, as God's law does not require impossibilities; we respond, that God's law can never be annihilated or nullified in its claims. It is and must forever be, binding in some form; and if the above circumstances exempt parents and children from the obligation to obey God's law, or rather from the penalty of the law, for it is not obeyed, the guilt rests upon those who are the authors of such circumstances. If a man who is stronger than we put fetters upon us so that we cannot do what God has commanded us to do, God will not, it is true, hold us responsible; but he will hold that man responsible who puts the fetters upon us for the non performance of all that duty, of which he has been the cause. When the slaveholder steps in between God and the slave, and between parents and children, to prevent the discharge of the duties which God commands them as parents and children to discharge towards each other, he takes the place of both parent and child, and assumes before God the responsibility of the non-performance of the duty of both, for which God will hold him responsible.