

A
REPLY TO BISHOP HOPKINS'
VIEW OF SLAVERY,
AND A
REVIEW OF THE TIMES,
BY JOHN R. BOLLES.

O dark, sad millions, patiently and dumb
Waiting for God, your hour, at last, has come,
And freedom's song
Breaks the long silence of your night of wrong!
WHITTIER.

PHILADELPHIA :
J. W. DAUGHADAY, 1308 Chestnut Street.
NEW LONDON:—C. PRINCE.
1865.

REPLY
TO
BISHOP HOPKINS'
VIEW OF SLAVERY, &c.

WHEN a meteoric body, formed in the void of space, or struck off from the moon, falls to the earth and is buried by its fall, shall it be disinhumed? Yes. Not on account of any intrinsic value which it possesses, but as an object of curiosity. It is in this light that we take up for inspection the work of Bishop Hopkins, of Vermont, entitled, "*View of Slavery*," in which he appears as the avowed advocate of American Slavery, and the antagonist of the Right Reverend Alonzo Potter, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese of Pennsylvania. A prior work of Bishop Hopkins, entitled, "*Bible View of Slavery*," had called forth a protest from Bishop Potter and some two hundred of his clergy, wherein they say:—

"This attempt not only to apologize for Slavery in the abstract, but to advocate it as it exists in the cotton States, and in the States which sell men and women in the open market as their staple product, is, in their judgment, unworthy of any servant of Jesus Christ, as an effort to sustain, on Bible principles, the States in rebellion against the Government, in the wicked attempt to establish, by force of arms, a tyranny under the name of a Republic, whose corner-stone shall be the perpetual bondage of the African, it challenges their indignant reprobation."

To this protest, Bishop Hopkins replies in the work before us. Premising a few thoughts, we shall exhibit the main points of his argument to the reader.

That Slavery has ever laid at the foundation of the rebellion, is now an admitted fact. From Slavery it has derived its sap and nourishment. Its soul and body has been Slavery. Hence, wherever there has existed a love for the institution, an element of disloyalty to the National Government has existed to the same extent in the same mind. In other words, an honest avowal of one's sentiments in respect to Slavery, would have been at any time a sufficient indication of the loyalty or disloyalty of the party making it. The wretched assassin of our lamented Chief Magistrate need not have left it on record that he was a friend of Slavery. "I for one, have ever considered it the greatest of blessings," are his words. Again, boasting of the part he had acted in the arrest of John Brown, he says: "I thought then, *as now*, that the abolitionists were the only traitors in the land, and that the entire party deserved the same fate as poor old Brown." A curse from such lips will surely be accounted praise. And is it too much to hope that this vaunted sympathy of the assassin with "*the sum of all villanies*" will startle some, at last, into their propriety whom reason and conscience have hitherto failed to move? We can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth. So says St. Paul. Truth is living, victorious, immortal. Temporary defeat it may and sometimes does suffer at the hands of its foes; but it revives. Like the fabled Phenix, it rises again, even from its own ashes.

"Truth crushed to earth shall rise again;
The eternal years of God are her's;
While error, wounded, writhes in pain,
And dies amid her worshippers."

And though the advocate of error, for a time, may seem to be successful, pluming himself as an angel of light, or clad in bishop's robes, his folly shall be made manifest to all. The assassination of our beloved President, though meant for evil, will, we believe, be overruled for good. He who was thus laid low, will be raised to the highest honor—*cut off, but not for himself*, he will hereafter be regarded as the saviour of his country

"Who never bowed to kings, to thee may bow."

The author of the "*View of Slavery*" declares that he stands forth as the "honest and conscientious advocate of the slaveholder." Why does he say this? Is it because there is something in such advocacy repugnant to the better instincts of human nature? To his own instincts? He admits there is; for he says: "If it were a matter to be determined by my own personal sympathies, tastes and feelings, I should be as ready as any man to condemn the institution of Slavery." So the Bishop would condemn what he labors so zealously to show that God approves!

Is he better than the Almighty? If *he* is right, his *argument* must be wrong. But we do not question the Bishop's honesty. Saul, before his conversion to Christianity, thought he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth, and our Saviour says: "Yea, the time cometh that whosoever killeth you shall think he doeth God service." But his efforts to justify Slavery will prove, we think, as fragile to the touch of truth as cobwebs to the eagle's wing.

The Bishop "loveth to have the pre-eminence," even if it be in folly, as will be seen. Citing the Declaration of Independence "That all men are created equal, that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," he says:

"These statements are here called self-evident truths; but with due respect for the celebrated names which are appended to this document, I have never been able to comprehend that they are truths at all."

But will the Bishop's inability to comprehend them be regarded as an evidence that they are not truths? Speaking of these "propositions," again he says: "I hold them to be altogether fallacious and untrue." "Where," he exclaims, "is the equality in body?" "Where's the equality in mind?" "Where's the equality in social position?"

Contending thus with the figment of his own brain, he deals out his blows as lustily and as blindly as old Polyphemus at "the airy nothing." That men may be created equal in respect to their *natural rights*, without being equal in size of body, strength of mind or social position, a child may understand; and if the Bishop is willing to be enlightened on this point, we will bring to his aid his distinguished brother in

the same church—the Rev. Samuel Seabury, D. D., who says :

“Like the variegated grass, no two blades of which are exactly alike, while all have a general resemblance, so men, while distinguished from one another by infinite varieties of body and mind, are yet all of one and the same kind. * * They are created equal, and in all the essentials of their nature they must remain forever equal.”

The Bishop proceeds : “Neither am I able to admit that all men are endowed with an inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness,” &c. And he adds : “Our original rights are forfeited and gone ; and since the fall, mankind have *no rights* to claim at the hands of their Maker.” Thus in his zeal to show that the *slave* has no rights, he as clearly shows that the master has none, and, of course, no right to hold another in bondage. Does the Bishop know there is such a declaration in the Bible as this?—

“*And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth.*”—Acts 17 : 26.

If so, why does he attempt to find a parallel between the various *orders* of creation, and the “manifest inequality in the condition of *mankind*?” We quote the following on this point, that it may be seen how nearly the ridiculous borders upon the stupid as well as upon the sublime :

“We behold,” he says, “the system continued in the animal creation, from the lordly lion down to the timid mole ; from the eagle to the humming-bird ; from the monster of the deep to the sea-star in its shell.”

We will give the Bishop another lesson from Dr. Seabury, as we think he will be likely to accept the truth from him :

“From this equality of nature results an equality of rights. The Maker of mankind has given life to them all. He has granted the earth to all of them in common, and to each of them in particular, a property in his own person and labor, and he wills the happiness of them all. Hence all men have by nature an equal right to life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness.”

These just words of Dr. Seabury present a happy contrast to the views of the Bishop, who concludes his tirade upon the Declaration of our Independence thus :

“I have no more to add with respect to this most popular dogma of social

equality, and shall therefore dismiss it as fallacious in itself and only mischievous in its tendency."

We have quoted so largely from this portion of the Bishop's work, for the purpose of showing the natural antagonism of Slavery to the principles upon which our Government is based, and also to show that these principles must be carried out to their legitimate political results, or the ghost of Slavery departed, will haunt its grave forever. But let us see how the Bishop continues his defence of an institution against which it is apparent that not the declarations of man only, but the bolts of Omnipotence are contending: "Because the spoiler is come upon her, even upon Babylon, and her mighty men are taken, every one of their bows is broken, for the Lord God of recompenses will surely requite."—Jer. 51: 56.

Awaking from his Rip Van Winkle sleep, and in order to justify the corporeal correction of slaves, he pays homage to the whipping-post as a "fixed institution" of former times, and bewails its abolition in the following strain:

"Stripes not exceeding forty were appointed to offenders in Israel, by Divine authority. The Saviour himself had a scourge of small cords when he drove the money-changers from the temple. Are our modern philanthropists more merciful than Christ, or wiser than the Almighty?"

Note, it was the "money-changers" that the Saviour scourged, but hence the Bishop deduces an argument for the whipping of *slaves*!

How the Bishop personates *Justice*, will be seen by the following. Speaking of cruelty to slaves, he says:

"On the whole, indeed, I see no reason to deny the statements of our *Southern friends*, that the slaves are the happiest laborers in the world."

But when he comes to speak of a slave escaping from his master and *telling his story*, what does the Bishop say then?

"These good and kind-hearted people (the Abolitionists) believe it all implicitly, without ever remembering the rule about *hearing both sides* before they form an opinion."

And he adds:

"Of course they sympathize largely with the poor *oppressed African*."

Though the author of this ironical sneer may have much in

common with his fellow-countryman, the notorious John Mitchell, he can be said to have but little with the liberty-loving sons of Erin.

The Bishop vindicates Slavery because of the assumed adaptation of the negro race to that condition, and the superiority of the white in intellect. He speaks of negroes as "an inferior race which the laws did not presume to be fitted for freedom at any age." Again, he says :

"Every candid observer (those who do not agree to this, it would seem, are not candid,) agrees that the negro is happier as a slave than as a freeman, and no individual belonging to the Anglo-Saxon stock would acknowledge that the intellect of the negro is equal to his own."

What, we might ask, has equality of intellect to do with the question? If, as the Bishop has before said, no two persons are precisely equal in intellect, some one must be superior, and, according to the logic advanced, might rightfully enslave all the others. Would that one be the Bishop? If not, would he consent to be enslaved? Or would he deny the rule when he came to feel its application? But we will relieve the Bishop's mind on this point by another quotation from Dr. S. :

"The superiority of bodily or mental conformation gives the one race no more right to lord it over another, than one man's strong habit of mind and body gives him a right to domineer over his feeble neighbor."

And who will not say the *feebler*, the less chivalry and the more cowardice in oppressing them? But when the Bishop comes to justify the enslavement of the African on account of the curse pronounced upon Canaan by Noah, as it then suits his purpose, he pays the negro a very high compliment. Speaking of the Canaanites (page 180), he says :

"Their commercial activity and enterprise gained them the distinction of being '*merchants by excellence*,' so that in common usage the land of Canaan was understood to be the land of the merchant, or the land of commerce, and their property and wealth became manifested, as in all similar cases, by their splendid cities, walled around and fortified."

And in order to maintain the identity of the African with the Canaanites, he adds :

"That the Canaanites were builders of great cities and active promoters

of commerce, so that, as we have seen, the name of *Canaanite* became synonymous with the business of a merchant, there is no difficulty whatever. For I have never denied that the negro race is capable of attaining a high degree of skill in the ordinary branches of human knowledge, under proper circumstances."

Here we have a distinct admission that "the negro race is capable of attaining a high degree of skill," &c. But it was needful to say as much as this in order to identify them as the posterity of Canaan, (which the Bishop signally fails to do, as we shall see,) that the curse, which he admits "had long been forgotten," might light upon the negro's head at last!

Hear him confound himself again, in the following passages (page 349) of his work :

"The position which I occupy (as to the rightfulness of Slavery) is impregnable, for it is defended by the word of God, the voice of the Church, and the Constitution of the Country. * * To Slavery (addressing Bishop Potter) under the domination of any human master, I am as much opposed as you or any of your clergy, by birth, education, and the habits of a long lifetime."

The Bishop seems to be in a condition similar to that of the man who prayed good Lord and good Devil alternately, as it was uncertain into whose hands he might fall.

The Bishop appeals to the history of the world and of the Church, and he calls on ecclesiastics of the dark ages to show that Slavery was tolerated in their day. He tells us "that large numbers of *freemen* became voluntary slaves to the *churches and monasteries* of Europe, and that *the clergy were zealous to encourage the practice*—a very decisive proof," he adds, "that no sin was attached to the relation in their judgment." Of how little value was the opinion of Popes, Bishops and Clergy combined, any one acquainted with the history of the times referred to, need not be told.

He moreover says, and apparently without a twinge of moral horror at the fact disclosed, that "Pope Benedict VIII., A. D. 1022, directed that the *children* of the clergy are serfs to the church in which their parents officiated, even if their mothers were free."

Thus THE CHURCH, which had shown its apostacy by forbidding its clergy to marry, and which made slaves of their

illegitimate children, is cited by the Bishop as an umpire by which questions of Christian morality and duty are to be determined, and as serving "to demonstrate the universal judgment of christendom that there was *no sin* in holding slaves." With characteristic fondness for a curse, he adds that the decree "pronounces an anathema upon the judge who should decree the contrary."

The following taunt at "tender sensibilities" and "pious Puritans" might have been spared with credit to the author. He says :

"The tender sensibilities so fashionable at the present day, will probably be shocked to find the Bishops in the ninth and the Pope in the thirteenth century authorizing the punishment of the whip and the prison, but I hope they will remember how the pious Puritans," &c.

He quotes liberally from the decision of councils, the writings of commentators, philosophers and historians, to show that Slavery has had its defenders in every age. But as this is a fact not questioned, we make no reply, choosing rather to confine our thoughts to the merits of the case, and to the Bishop's own argument, as to the justice and right of Slavery.

First and foremost, and as the corner-stone lying at the very foundation of the institution of Slavery, he places the curse pronounced upon Canaan by the patriarch Noah : "Cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be to his brethren." On this curse the Bishop stands, and adorns his position well. But with what fallacy he maintains his ground it will be seen. In order to prolong the effect of the curse through an indefinite number of ages, he cites with approval the following from Bishop Newton, (page 70) :

"Not that this (the curse) was to take effect immediately, but was to be fulfilled in process of time, when they should forfeit their liberties by their wickedness. Ham at first subdued some of the posterity of Shem, as Canaan sometimes conquered Japheth."

The reader will please note how the next witness which he summons contradicts the first. He cites Bishop Patrick to say :

"There hath never yet been a son of Cham that hath shaken a sceptre over

the head of Japheth. Shem hath subdued Japheth, and Japheth hath subdued Shem, but Cham never subdued either."

Which of the Bishops shall we believe? Or, following the example of Bishop Hopkins, shall we believe them both? The Bishop proceeds:

"The prophecy of Noah has been fulfilled and is still in progress of fulfillment upon the posterity of Canaan, the negro race, according to the letter of Scripture."

In what the Bishop here says, the wish is no doubt "father to the thought." But let us see what evidence even he can find that the negroes are the descendants of Canaan, or that the curse pronounced upon Canaan more than four thousand years ago "is still in progress of fulfillment upon the posterity of Canaan, the negro race, according to the letter of Scripture," as the Bishop asserts; and if he finds none, what are we to think of the moral obliquity which thus

"Tortures the pages of the hallowed Bible
To sanction crime, and robbery, and blood,
And in Oppression's hateful service
Libels both man and God"?

We will follow the Bishop in his remarks and his reasonings on the point now under consideration. While he admits that "we hear no more of the Canaanites after the conquest of Palestine by ancient Israel," and so of course are unable to trace the curse as falling upon them subsequently to that time, (and prior thereunto we have seen that they were "*merchants by excellence*," having "*splendid cities walled round and fortified*,") he strives to avoid the difficulty, by attempting to show that the curse, which was apparently limited to Canaan, took effect upon Ham, the father of Canaan, and upon all his posterity. In this way, claiming that the present race of Africans are the descendants of Ham, he brings them all under the curse, and for the purpose of thus *lengthening its cords and strengthening its stakes*, he summons Bishop Newton again to testify, who says:

"Nothing can be more complete than the execution of the sentence upon Ham as well as upon Canaan."

In proof of which he continues :

“Egypt was the land of Ham, as it is often called in Scripture, and for many years it was a great and flourishing kingdom ; but was subdued by the Persians, who descended from Shem, and afterwards by the Grecians, the descendants of Japheth.”

It might be asked, Were the descendants of Shem and Japheth never subdued ? The Apostle speaks of a class who, *professing themselves wise, became fools.*

Our author next quotes from Josephus in confirmation that Ham and all his posterity were included in the curse. But Josephus asserts exactly the contrary, for he says, “When the rest of them (the posterity of Ham) *escaped* the curse, God inflicted it on Canaan.” To this, however, Bishop Hopkins replies, saying that Josephus was “evidently alluding to the fact” that Egypt, “which was pre-eminently called the land of Ham, had become great, and thus *seemed* to have *escaped* the curse.” But he adds : “If he had lived in our day, he would have seen abundant proof that the *rest* of Ham’s posterity had *not escaped* the curse at all.” With this *comforting* assurance we think the Bishop ought to be satisfied. But he is not ; for, evidently doubting his own conclusions, he falls back again upon Canaan as the true object of the curse. And while he admits the fact that “we hear no more of the Canaanites after the conquest of Palestine by ancient Israel,” he says :

“This, on reflection, will be seen to amount to nothing. Nations, as such, are liable to many changes. They rise, decline, and disappear from the page of history. * * The various races may intermingle. Their old nationalities may undergo many mutations ; language, manners and customs may change ; but all this does not imply the *extinction of the people*. So far, therefore, as we have evidence to guide us, we have full authority for saying that no race which existed since the time of Noah has ceased to exist in their posterity, although their former landmarks may have been all obliterated, and their old appellations have long passed away.”

Be it so. But who, it might be asked, will be able to trace to the fountain-head of the curse, the drops of Canaanitish blood dispersed and mingled, as it may be, among all the nations of the earth ? And who, at this period of the world’s existence, shall presume to tell upon whose head the curse

shall fall? But we forget. Bishop Hopkins presumes to do so, and tells us that it falls upon "the negro race, according to the letter of Scripture"! And he further shows his aptitude for tracing a curse, when he tells us that "*Sodom and Gomorrah*, indeed, must have been planted by the Canaanite." And speaking of those who "probably" *might* "have escaped from the sword of Joshua," he remarks, "These *may* have been the founders of *Tyre and Sidon*"! But he adds, "The most natural course for many of them would be to *betake themselves to Africa*!"

Well done, Bishop! But what next? These very people of whom the Bishop has just said that they would naturally "*betake themselves to Africa*," are next spoken of by him as *actually* in Africa! Such an easy way has the Bishop of getting them there; and although he had said (page 164) that the "attempt to trace their course amounts to nothing, because there is no history to guide us beyond the outline given by Scripture, and all that can be done must be limited to *probable conjecture*."

He brings the Canaanites into Africa, colors them black, and dooms them to slavery. Thus, (page 186):

"It is the only race which it has pleased God to mark by such strong characteristics. Their doom of servitude in its lowest form, *their location in Africa*, their wonderful adaptation to the state of slavery, for which the mercy of Providence seems to have qualified them beyond any other race of people in the known world, and, lastly, their peculiar color which distinguishes them so manifestly from the rest of the human family—all these must serve to identify them beyond the possibility of mistake."

We will now amuse the reader by showing him what the Bishop said on a previous page, in which he acknowledges that he knows nothing about what he here asserts. He says:

"With respect to color, we all suppose that Noah and his sons were white men. * * At what time and in what manner the change of color was accomplished, it is *impossible to ascertain*. Three thousand eight hundred years have elapsed since the time of Abraham, and more than two thousand since the fall of Carthage. What color *then* marked the Canaanite *no man can tell*."

And yet the Bishop presumes to say, "Their peculiar color" distinguishes them "manifestly from the rest of the

human family," and this, too, notwithstanding he avers on the same page (186), as the only argument for the existence of the posterity of Canaan at all "after the conquest of Palestine by ancient Israel," that "the various races may intermingle." And so the Canaanites, he reasons, though they have no existence as a people, are probably not extinct, but continue to exist in the blood of other nations. And since he quotes, as an evidence of the wide diffusion of Canaan's descendants, Gen. 10 : 18—"Afterwards were the families of the Canaanites spread abroad"—we may suggest, without any invidious intent, whether the Bishop himself may not possibly have some of the blood of Canaan running in his veins. And he will pardon us, as his chance for a nearer relationship to the great Melchisedek, King of Salem, will thereby be greatly increased.

The negroes' claim, too, in this respect, will be strengthened by any evidence that they belong to the ancient Canaanitish race, although if they rely upon arguments which the Bishop has adduced, we think their claim will not amount to much. But our author anticipates the honor thus descending upon the race of Canaan, and attempts to wrest it from them in the following style. He says :

"We read of Melchisedek, King of Righteousness, in Salem, the principal city in Palestine, whom we cannot reasonably suppose to be of the race of Canaan."

But the record says, He was King of Salem.

At last the Bishop cuts the Gordian knot of Prophecy, and attempts to relieve himself from the web of his own argument, thus. He says :

"It is an established rule among theologians that nothing proves the true sense of prophecy so conclusively as the fulfillment. I may claim the application of the maxim to these indisputable facts, that up to this period of modern history, no race but theirs has been subject to slavery, and *perfectly contented under it* for thousands of years."

Mark : the Bishop assumes that the negro race are "perfectly contented" as slaves, which is not proved. But what if it was? It would only show that they had learned to exercise, to a high degree, the Christian virtue of contentment. "For thousands of years," he adds, when it is well

known that the enslavement of the negro race by other nations commenced during the first part of the sixteenth century. Mr. Hargrave, the lawyer engaged in the celebrated "case of the negro Somerset," (State Trials,) will be sufficient on this point. After describing the gradual decay and disuse of the "ancient species of slavery" in Europe, he says :

"Such was the expiring state of domestic Slavery in Europe at the commencement of the sixteenth century, when the discovery of America and of the *Western* and *Eastern* coasts of Africa gave occasion to the introduction of a new species of Slavery. It took its rise from the Portuguese, who, in order to supply the Spaniards with persons able to sustain the fatigue of cultivating their new possessions in America, particularly the islands, opened a trade between Africa and America for the sale of negro slaves. This disgraceful commerce in the human species is said to have begun in the year 1508, when the first importation of negro slaves was made into Hispaniola from the Portuguese settlements on the western coast of Africa. In 1540 the Emperor Charles V. endeavored to stop the progress of the negro slavery by orders that all slaves in the American isles should be made free; and they were accordingly manumitted by Lagasca, the governor of the country, on condition of continuing to labor for their masters. But this attempt proved unsuccessful; and on Lagasca's return to Spain, domestic slavery revived and flourished as before. The expedient of having slaves for labor in America was not long peculiar to the Spaniards, being afterwards adopted by other Europeans as they acquired possession there. In consequence of this general practice, negroes are become a very considerable article in the commerce between Africa and America; and domestic slavery has taken so deep a root in most of our American colonies, as well as in those of other nations, that there is little probability of our seeing it generally suppressed."

"The law of England," continued this eminent lawyer, "never recognized any species of domestic slavery, except the ancient one of villenage, now expired, and has sufficiently provided against the introduction of a *new slavery*, under the name of villenage or any other denomination whatever."

It will be perceived that the Bishop's "thousands of years," in which he claims the African race has been subject to slavery, "and perfectly contented under it," finds no answering fact in history, and if it did, it would confirm no prophecy. But the Bishop says again :

"All history proves how accurately the prediction has been accomplished, even to the present day."

"All history"! Among the sixty millions of slaves in the Roman Empire, which reached its grasping hand toward every corner of the then discovered world, the Bishop does

not know that there was an African. Speaking of Roman slaves, he says (page 267);

“Descended as they were from all the nations with whom the Romans had been at war, there were doubtless *some Africans*, but the greater part were Asiatics and Europeans; and Greeks, Germans, Gauls and Britons were in abundance among them.”

But not a negro, so far as the Bishop can show. With a gladiatorial stroke, he thus takes the head off from his argument as completely as though he intended to do so. As we have shown before that the enslavement of the negro race commenced in the sixteenth century, what has become of the Bishop's “thousands of years,” and what has become of the curse?

But after such an effort to show that the *curse* of Canaan is “still in progress of fulfillment upon the negro race,” according to the letter of Scripture, who would have looked for the Bishop to stultify himself, and turn his entire argument into foolishness, as he does by saying?—

“To the negro race, Slavery in the hands of their Southern masters has been a BLESSING.”

And perhaps the kindest thing that can be said for certain advocates of Slavery is, that a mental as well as moral obscuration seems to have passed over their vision. Confounding alike the plainest precepts of morality and the commonest rules of reason in their defence of Slavery, they remind one of the chaotic condition of the world before “the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters,” before He said “let there be light,” and before He “separated the light from the darkness.”

And has the Bishop yet to learn that the prediction of an event does not justify the actors in its fulfillment? He cites the Tenth Commandment as proof of the lawfulness of Slavery. The juice of what flower has dropped upon the Bishop's eyelids that he so madly dotes on Slavery? that it follows him

“Through bog, through bush, through brake, through briar”?

We are almost tempted to say to him, in the words of Shakspeare :

“What do you see? You see an ass’s head of your own.”

Not Balaam’s, for that knew enough to stop when “the angel of the Lord stood in the way with his sword drawn in his hand.”

The Bishop is as much enamored of Slavery and his defence of it, as Titania was of the animal referred to in “Midsummer Night’s Dream”:

TITA—“Come, sit thee down upon this flowery bed,
While I thy amiable cheeks do coy,
And stick sweet roses in thy slick, smooth head,
And kiss thy fair, *large ears*, my gentle joy.”

The Bishop says :

“Proof that Slavery was authorized by the Almighty occurs in the last of the Ten Commandments, delivered from Mount Sinai, and universally acknowledged by Jews and Christians as the MORAL LAW: ‘Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s wife, nor his man servant, nor his maid servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbor’s.’ Here it is evident that the principle of *property*—anything that is thy neighbor’s—runs through the whole.”

Thus the Bishop reduces the wife’s estate to that of a slave! “Wives of our day,” he says, “may take umbrage at the law which places them in the same sentence with the slave.” And adds: “The truth is none the less certain.” We need only say, that if the slaveholder has no other right of property in his slave than the husband has in his wife, he could not convey title to them by any deed which would be worth the parchment on which it might be written.

There are minor points in the Bishop’s work to which we have not time nor space to reply. He quotes “the celebrated Augustine,” whom he styles “the prince of the Fathers,” and endeavors to enlist him in the advocacy of slavery. But he fails, as we shall see. As quoted by the Bishop, Augustine speaks thus :

“Thou (the Catholic Church), in consideration of that Supreme God, who is their common Lord, makest the masters to be placable to their slaves, and more inclined to consult than coerce them.”

And again :

"The slave fears to offend his master lest he should order him to be beaten, or to be put into the stocks, or to be shut up in prison, or committed to the workhouse. Fearing these things, the slave does not sin."

The above from St. Augustine is a mere statement of facts, with some very kind and benevolent expressions toward the slave. But in another part of his works his condemnation and abhorrence of slavery appear fully as strong as that of any modern abolitionist. In that celebrated work of his, the "City of God," which was written after Alaric had taken Rome, as a reply of the Christians to their pagan adversaries, St. Augustine says :

"For the manifest deterioration of Roman manners, and for the impending dissolution of the state, paganism itself is responsible. Our political power is only of yesterday; it is in no manner concerned with the natural development of luxury and wickedness which has been going on for the last thousand years. Your ancestors made war a trade; they laid under tribute and *enslaved* the adjacent nations; but were not profusion, extravagance, dissipation, the necessary consequence of conquest? Was not Roman idleness the inevitable result of filling Italy with slaves? Every hour rendered wider that bottomless gulph which separates immense riches from abject poverty. Did not the middle class, in which reside the virtue and strength of a nation, disappear? * * Was there not in the streets a profligate rabble living in total idleness, fed and amused at the expense of the state? We are not answerable for the grinding oppression perpetrated on the rural populations until they have been driven to despair. * * We did not crowd Italy with *slaves*, nor make those *miserable men* more degraded than the beasts of the field, compelling them to labors which are the business of the brutes. *We have taught and practiced a very different doctrine from that.* We did not nightly put into irons the population of provinces and cities reduced to bondage. We are not responsible for the inevitable insurrections, poisonings, assassinations, vengeance. * * Can you really wonder that all this should come to an end? We do not wonder; on the contrary, we thank God for it. It is time that the human race had rest; the sighing of the prisoners, the prayers of the captive are heard at last."

So much for the authority of St. Augustine, whom the Bishop invokes to his aid; nor is he the first one who has been asked to curse and who has pronounced a blessing instead.

The Bishop seizes upon a passage from Tertullian, "whose writings," he says, "were held in such esteem by the martyr

Cyprian, that when he called for them he was accustomed to say, "give me the master"; and here is what Tertullian says :

"For what can be more unjust, what more iniquitous, what more shameful than an attempt to benefit the slave in such a way that he shall be snatched from his master; that he shall be delivered to another; that he shall be suborned against the life of his master while he is yet in his house, living on his granary and trembling under his correction? Such a rescuer would be condemned in the world no less than a man-stealer."

To snatch a slave from his master, *to deliver him over to another person, to suborn him against the life of his master, &c.*, would certainly be no better than man-stealing, in the opinion of every one.

We will now hear from Cyprian himself, whose testimony the Bishop keeps out of sight. But we give it to the reader. The letter of Cyprian, from which the following extract is taken, was accompanied with "*a hundred thousand sesterces* (equal to between three and four thousand dollars) contributed by the churches under his charge to ransom some unhappy slaves. Here follows the extract :

"I read over, my dearest brethren, the letter which you sent me concerning the captivity of our brothers and sisters, with a compassion and concern equal to what you wrote it with; for who can withhold his tears from flowing out upon such dreadful calamities? Or who would not consider the misfortune of his brethren in some measure his own, especially when he shall reflect upon what the Apostle St. Paul hath said upon this subject, 'whether one member suffer all the members suffer with it, or one member rejoice all the members rejoice with it'? And again, 'who is weak, and I not weak?' We therefore should look upon the captivity of our brethren as a state of bondage to ourselves, since we are all incorporated together as one body; and not only the motives of *humanity*, but those of our *holy religion*, ought to excite and quicken our endeavors for reclaiming our brethren from *slavery*; for the Apostle St. Paul having in another place put the question, 'Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?' If the rules of *charity* did not oblige us to assist our brethren in such extremity, yet we ought to consider here that they are the temples of God. * * Wherefore we should behold Christ in the persons of our captive brethren, and redeem Him from His *slavery*."

Thus the views of the martyr Cyprian, to whom the Bishop so encomiastically refers, presents a striking contrast with his own.

It is said that bees gather honey from substances where we should least expect it to be found. So the Bishop derives an argument in favor of slavery from the following. He says :

“The superiority of advantage to the negro is sufficiently plain, if the reader considers the immense amount paid yearly in our Northern States for the support of the poor, and then remembers that among the *four millions of Southern slaves* there is not one pauper dependent upon public charity.”

If the Bishop was ever clothed and in his right mind, it would seem that he had gone back to dwell among the tombs. Is it not fair to presume that many masters lack the kindness or ability to care properly for their decrepit slaves? For such, no provision of “public charity” is made, and this is accounted a “superiority of advantage” by the Bishop. What, we might ask, more distinguishes enlightened from barbarous nations than the institutions of public charity, which are found in one and not in the other?

We come to another part of the Bishop’s argument on which he very much relies, viz: That slavery was permitted in the Old Testament and not forbidden in the New.

It is not necessary that we should discuss the various sorts of servitude spoken of in the Old Testament, as they have no special bearing upon the case in hand. Before Abraham received the promise of a son, one born in his house, he said, was to be his heir. His servant Eleazer, charged with a most important errand, might easily have left the service of Abraham. But he had no such inclination; for there was no such thing as slavery, in its modern sense, for him to escape from. The relation which Abraham sustained to his servants was no doubt of a patriarchal nature—one of mutual benefit and affection.

But that some things were tolerated, and even commanded in the Old Testament which were not expressly forbidden in the New, but which the advancing light of Christianity would not allow for a moment, no one will deny. Therefore the Bishop makes nothing by his argument, unless he insists on the stoning of disobedient children, &c., which, though sanctioned by the law of Moses, and not forbidden by the New Testament, would find but few advocates at the present day. If, then, this and other questions are left to be decided

by the pure and perfect principles of the Christian religion, why should not slavery be thus left? And why ask for a specific command in the one case and not in the other? But we will see if slavery, as it has existed in the United States, is not condemned by the principles and precepts of the New Testament. And first, we would ask the Bishop whether he thinks the enslavement of the children of Israel by the Egyptians was justifiable? If so, why did God say, "The cry of the children of Israel is come unto me, and I have also seen the oppression wherewith the Egyptians oppress them." And why were the most stupendous miracles wrought in Moses' day, not to say in our own, in vindication of the oppressed and in the punishment of oppressors? And Miriam sang, "Sing unto the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea." But in the light of the Gospel, every part of slavery is condemned; and can a thing be condemned in all its parts and not be condemned as a whole? To have said more than the Bible has said would have been superfluous; for moral truth, like light, possesses a reflective power, illuminating objects upon which its rays do not directly fall. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and thy neighbor as thyself." "Upon these two commands," says our Lord, "hang all the law and the prophets." Had every particular act of duty received a special command, and every shade of crime a special prohibition, the world itself would not have contained the books which must have been written to contain the law. "It is not," says Robertson, "the authority of any single detached precept in the Gospel, but the spirit and genius of the Christian religion which hath abolished the practice of slavery throughout the world. The temper which Christianity inspired was mild and gentle, and the doctrines it taught added such dignity and lustre to human nature as rescued it from the dishonorable servitude into which it was sunk."

The command says, "Thou shalt not kill." Is it, then, right to maim and leave half dead? Our Saviour dispels the idea that we are not to employ those powers which He has bestowed, of thinking and judging, when he says, "And why of your own selves judge ye not what is right?"

With the forms of servitude which have prevailed among the nations of the world in former ages, we have at present nothing to do. For if we should show that they were morally wrong, it would not necessarily follow that American Slavery is so; and if they were shown to be right, that fact could not be pleaded in justification of a system in many respects unlike them all.

It is *American Slavery* that is in question. The Bishop confuses himself on this point, and mixes ancient and modern slavery together. And in order to hide from our view the obnoxious features of the latter, and to keep out of sight the legalized ignorance in which slaves in the United States have been held, he discourses as follows (page 161):

“Now this is a fair specimen of the rhetoric which has become so common of late years on the subject of slavery, taking it for granted that the slave must be made a brute, without mind, soul, will, or right, a mere *chattel*, although these gentlemen must know that among the ancients the slaves were highly educated to be instructors of youth; that Esop was a slave, and Terence was a slave, and Epictetus was a slave.”

How does this compare with slavery in our own land, where laws have been enacted in the States in which slavery has flourished, inflicting the severest penalties on any one who should teach a slave to read? But the Bishop, in support of the views advanced by him, quotes from *Gibbons' Decline and Fall*, as follows:

“The youths of a promising genius (among the slaves) were instructed in the arts and sciences, and their price was ascertained by the degree of their skill and talents. Almost every profession, either liberal or mechanical, might be found in the house of an opulent senator.”

The silence of the New Testament concerning such slavery or servitude as that here described, could not well be construed into a justification of American Slavery, in which these happy qualities were never found. But the New Testament is silent with respect to no wrong. A single command, “Be ye holy, for I am holy,” obeyed, would remove all moral evil from the world.

And now the Bishop, with a volatility of movement common to clerical advocates of slavery, changes his position again, and presents the horrors of Roman slavery. He says:

"The slavery of the old Roman Empire was more severe than Southern slavery;" and "the Roman master was allowed to kill his slaves," &c. This is true. They crucified their slaves. They threw them into their fish-ponds, to be food for fishes; they practiced all manner of cruelties upon them with impunity, and often for the most trivial offence, and even for no offence at all. In such monstrous wickedness, does the subjugation of one class to the arbitrary will or whim of another culminate! Says the Rev. H. H. Millman in his notes to Gibbons' Rome; "It would be easy to accumulate the most frightful, the most agonizing details of the manner in which the Romans treated their slaves. Whole works have been devoted to the description."

And here we will ask the Bishop to say, whether he thinks the kind of slavery which existed in our Saviour's time, was right, even though it were not specially condemned by Him? And we beg the reader to mark his answer:

"The system of Roman slavery *was allowed* to Christians in the New Testament."

Allowed to Christians to kill their slaves! "His watchmen are blind."—Isa. 56 : 10. But he goes further, and says:

"I have proved by many indisputable witnesses that the rule (belief in the Holy Catholic Church) recognizes the *lawfulness of slavery* as it existed in the *old Roman Empire*. * * Hence, if there could be any doubt as to the *meaning of the Bible*, the voice of the Holy Catholic Church must be decisive on this question."

If the Bishop will tell us what sin this Holy Catholic Church, as he calls it, has not justified, we should be glad to know its name, since it has graduated its scale of prices at which absolution could be had, for every crime, from the foulest murder downward, whether already committed, or to be committed in future. *Holy Catholic Church!* There is a Holy Catholic Church, but it is not that to which the Bishop refers, and to which he asks us to pay homage. It is not a corporate body, claiming to dispense salvation, and to be the only medium through which the grace of God is communicated to mankind. It is the Church Universal, the "holy and humble men of heart" in all ages; "in every nation they who fear God and work righteousness." It is a "holy nation, a royal priest-

hood;" the Church which Christ "loved" and "gave himself for, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing." It is not the great red dragon spoken of in the Revelation, "having seven heads and ten horns, and which stood before the woman to devour her child as soon as it was born." THE CHURCH is "clothed with the sun and the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars." In some countries "saint's days" have blotted out Sabbaths, and in the worship of "saints" the worship of Christ is forgotten. The Church and not the Bible has paramount authority. "I would not extinguish one taper," said the French priest, "though it were to convert all the Huguenots of France." But the clear lights of the Bible they more readily extinguish. And they do not fail to eat the pass-over who "persuaded the multitude that they should ask Barabbas, and destroy Jesus" the Lord of the passover. It is not with "the Church which is the pillar and ground of the truth" that we are contending. The Bishop has attempted to block up the pathway of truth by putting that which is the "hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird," in its way, and we would remove the stumbling-block out of the way. Henry the VIII had his "six articles" which, without Bible authority, must be believed and obeyed, in order to secure salvation, while preachers of the Bible doctrine, "justification by faith in Christ," were sent to the stake and to the block; neither the murder of wives nor a holy life was of the least account in the sight of this grim-visaged church; but a punctilious regard to its unauthorized requirements, opened wide the flood-gates of salvation to those whose lives would blacken the darkest page in history. The most bloated monster of human wickedness, which, perhaps, the world ever saw, was its Gorgon head, "*the defender of the Faith!*" And this was the Church, *outside* of which, and without the gracious intervention of which, the mercies of God could not flow; salvation could not be obtained! One of the Popes said:

"We declare and determine it a principle absolutely necessary to salvation, that all human beings are subject to the Pope."

Now, some read *church* instead of *pope*. But always the ecclesiastical grasp tightens, as its force becomes less vital. We

say to the Church which thrusts its "corporate body" between us and the Bible, between us and the Saviour of the world; we say to it as Diogenes said to the King, "Stand out of our sunshine!" Deprive us not of that which you have no power to bestow. Such a Church may behold its "natural face in a glass." Isa. 14: 13, 14—"For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation in the sides of the north; I will ascend above the clouds, I will be like the Most High."

To the extent that the infallibility of the Church is conceded, it becomes necessary to justify all it has ever done or can do, good or bad. And this accounts for that serpent twist, cunning and concealment, by which minds of the Jesuit School are marked. The crawling reptile that lied and deceived our mother Eve in the garden, trails its labyrinthine folds through all the shuddering ages. But its head shall be bruised at last. While Truth with open face and cheerful mien, is direct and luminous as the rays of the sun. The Bishop of Vermont asks us to take counsel of a Church whose locks are hoary with crime, whose voice is hoarse with anathemas, whose robes are scarlet with blood. "The satyr shall cry to his fellow, and the screech owl also shall rest there, and find for herself a place of rest. There shall the great owl make her nest."—Isa. 34: 13, 14.

The great owl of Rome, which from its dingy roost in the dark ages has flaunted down and settled on the head of the Bishop, he would have us accept as the sign and seal of heavenly inspiration. But it is where Truth, with hallowed wing,—where the "Holy Dove" descends and lights, that a voice from Heaven is heard saying, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

"Hence sprang the Apostles honored name.
Sacred beyond heroic fame;
Hence dictates the prophetic sage,
And hence the evangelic page."

But when divine truths are eclipsed by a train of overshadowing evils, the longer the succession the darker the night! There are those who appear to think they have a call to

preach the *Church*, and not Christ Jesus; as with the Jews "in the reading of the Old Testament, the veil upon their heart" seems to be "untaken away;" the church is made "visible" indeed; the king in his beauty is not seen. The host is exalted, but Christ is not there. To the watchmen, "I said, saw ye him whom my soul loveth?"—Cant. 3: 3.

Such teachers should give us a new Bible. Instead of saying, with holy David, "I have set the Lord always before me," we should say I have set the *Church* always before me; and instead of saying, "In God is my salvation and my glory, the rock of my strength and my refuge is in God," we ought to say "In the *Church* is my salvation and my glory, the rock of my strength and of my refuge is in the *Church*;" and for the sweet words of the Apostle, "looking unto Jesus," we should read "looking unto the *Church*." If any prefer the latter version they can use it, we shall not. The words of the Bishop are:

"If there may be a doubt concerning the *meaning of the bible*, the voice of the holy catholic church must be decisive."

The VI Article of Religion reads:

"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatever is not *read* therein, nor may be *proved* thereby, is not required of any man."

We stand by the article.

Let us note a distinction which the Bishop overlooks between an institution, right in itself, though attended with abuses, and one evil in itself, *malum in se*, and which brings forth evil fruit. He says:

"But it is said that the poor slaves are treated with *barbarity*, and doubtless it may sometimes be true, just as soldiers, *and even wives and children*, are shamefully abused among ourselves."

Now these are lawful relations. To speak of marriage only. Marriage was instituted by God in the beginning, and whatever abuse may be practiced in it springs not from the institution which is not calculated to foster evil, but from the depravity of the human heart, and for it the relation itself is in no way responsible. But it is otherwise with slavery; the very being of which demands at the outset the destruction

of the marriage bond; and this alone writes its condemnation on all just minds. Bishop Hopkins admits that there is no marriage among slaves. He says :

“With respect to marriage of slaves, the law of slavery is silent. So was the ancient law of Rome.”

Not so silent is the law of American Slavery, but that it renders “null” every marriage which slaves may enter into. And when they attempt to seize the blessings of “holy matrimony” to which they are as rightly entitled as their masters, do they promise to love, cherish, obey, &c., “until death do them part?” No; but “so long as circumstances will permit.” No minister stands over them to pronounce the impressive words, “What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.” The whole thing is a mockery; a mockery of marriage; a mockery of “Christ’s religion.” The Heaven-ordained relation guaranteed to man in the very charter of his existence, is expunged by slavery. And priests justify the sin!

In the case of *Merlinda vs. Gardner*, 24, Alab. 719, the law record stands thus :

“Slaves cannot contract marriage, nor can they confer any legal rights on their children.”

Will it be said that as slaves are not legally married the relation of husband and wife does not exist among them, and therefore there can be no separation of them as such? But does not the greater include the less? If it be wrong to rob *individuals* of the blessings of “holy matrimony” what must it be to rob a *race*? If it be a crime to sunder the marriage relation in a single instance, what must it be to destroy *marriage itself*? The Bishop admits the hardship, but he denies the wrong. He says :

“There is no doubt that this feature of the Southern institution is liable to much occasional hardship.”

But he adds :

“We have no right to censure it as inexcusable.”

Thus are the words of Christ set at naught.

With another quotation we will leave this part of the subject. He exclaims :

"How many, even of the better class, have left their homes to seek their fortunes in the gold regions? How many in Europe have abandoned their families for Australia, or the United States, or the Canadas."

What such talk has to do with the destruction of marriage, or the forcible separation of husbands and wives, and this too, in the face of an express Divine prohibition, the Bishop fails to inform us, and we fail to perceive.

There is another point upon which the law of slavery is not silent, but the Bishop is, and his silence demands our attention. We allude to the laws making it a high crime, in some cases punishable with death, to teach a black child to read the alphabet; and this is vindicated on the ground that the ignorance of the slaves is essential to the perpetuity of the institution. The Scotch minister said "My dear brethren, here is a difficult text, so considered by all commentators; let us look it full in the face, and pass on." The Bishop passes on, without even looking this question "in the face."

The slave is denied the right to read the word of life, which is able to make wise unto salvation. Tried on this point alone, slavery, like Dagon, falls before the ark of God, so that not the stump of it is left. And who are they that scoff at the slaves' ignorance? They who have taken away from them the key of knowledge.

The family relation, like that of marriage, which sanctifies and blesses it, is destroyed by slavery. "God setteth the solitary in families," but the slave is permitted to have no family, no children whom he may call his own, or for whom he can make the least provision. He may not teach them to read the record of the Saviour's death, who died for them. He may not read it himself. He is liable at any moment to be separated from those he holds most dear. The crack of the slave-trader's whip, is the "crack of doom" to his ear. The wife, the child, so well beloved, are seized, chained in his presence, and sent away from him forever.

Does any one think that this ruthless sundering of holy ties by slavery was not a common thing? Virginia alone, that "abomination of desolation," and centre of the rebellion, under the rule of slavery, has sold forty thousand of her children in a single year, driving them like cattle to the cotton States. And this is chivalric! This is Christian! This is *authorized*

by the Bible! What respect is paid to the Bible? What to the image of God in man? And what shall we say of the *Golden Rule*? “Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them, for this is the law and the prophets.” Mat. 7: 12.

In this one text slavery finds its sentence. The Bishop says the Rule must be received with this qualification, viz: “provided it be just and reasonable.” We accept the qualification, and ask the Bishop to accept it too, and to say whether if his own children were to be thus sold, he would not think it very *unjust* and *unreasonable*? If he says no, it shows that he is without natural affection, as well as without reason. If he says yes, it closes the argument against him. But perhaps the Bishop might say, that though he would not like to have *his own children* thus sold, he would have no objection to the sale of other people’s children, and we should believe that he told the truth. The Bishop cannot be made a slave himself, so he tells us, and for the following reasons: “In that case,” he says, “I should have been born of the negro race, bred up in bondage, surrounded by the associations best adapted to my lot, accustomed to its necessary toils, &c.

A robber might say to his victim, “If I were to have been robbed, I should have been in your place.” The Bishop shows great fondness for the word *slave*, rolling it as a sweet morsel under his tongue. He reads Scripture thus, “He that is called being a *slave*, is the Lord’s freeman, and he that is called being *free* is Christ’s *slave*.” Thus he debases the service of Christ. For slavery, in its proper sense, is a compulsory servitude, while the service of Christ must be of choice. An involuntary Christian would be a solecism. We cannot but remark with what singular tenacity the Bishop dwells upon certain texts of Scripture, as the curse pronounced upon Canaan, &c., while others, scattered upon almost every page of the inspired word, and in which the judgment of slavery is depicted as by a lightning flash, he disregards entirely. He gives the slave trade his sanction, and pities any one who can “denounce as a sin the means which *Divine providence* has chosen, to save them (the slaves) from their former state of barbarism”; while he regards “abolitionism as an *interference* with the plans of Divine providence.” Have right and wrong

changed places in the Bishop's mind? In his final summary, he says :

"I have maintained and shall always maintain that the relation of the master to the slave in the Southern states involves no sin. * * * That by necessary consequence, the modern doctrine of the ultra abolitionists is an impious error, because it opposes the bible, and the church."

Such are the sentiments of the Bishop, reduced to their lowest terms. But, startling as they are, they are not the sentiments of the Bishop alone. There are others in clerical robes, who persist in advancing similar views. Recently, in a public discourse we heard it said, "The Bible deals very gently with slavery," and that "to hold a slave is no sin;" at which utterance we cannot but greatly wonder, especially at this time, when the nation is coming up from its baptism in a Jordan of blood, washing away its sins; when its whole soul is aroused to throw off "the sum of abominations," under which it has so long bowed and groaned; when "the roll of the book" is spread before us, on which is written, within and without:—"Lamentations and mourning and woe," and while,—may we speak it with hallowed lips:

" While at hell's altars sacrificed,
God's martyred Son forever,—
Lies the clear life, which crystalized
Our kingliest endeavor."

While the great panorama of God's providence is passing visibly before us, on every side of which is portrayed in characters as of living fire, the condemnation and doom of slavery.

Does the Bible deal *very gently* with slavery, we ask? How much more gently does it deal with gambling, concerning which it says not one word; and is gambling therefore *no sin*? Or with polygamy, for which a much stronger Bible argument can be made, vile as it is, than for American Slavery? And shall we open our arms wide to receive that sink of moral pollution and death, Utah, the realm of Brigham Young, and his 300 wives? Do we owe nothing to the enlightening and sanctifying influences of the Christian religion? or are we still tenants of the world before the flood, while every thing is progressing around us? The learned Dr. Landner, it has been said, after having written a book to show the impossibility of

crossing the Atlantic by steam, held to his old theory long after steam vessels were plying their trips between the two continents.

Does the Bible, we again ask, deal very gently with slavery?

"Therefore thus saith the Lord, ye have not hearkened unto me in proclaiming liberty every one to his brother, and every man to his neighbor; behold I proclaim a liberty to you, saith the Lord, to the sword, to the pestilence, and to the famine." Jer. 34: 7.

Very gently! How was Pharaoh and his hosts dealt with, because they kept the children of Israel in bondage? Did not God visit them with all his plagues? And when they attempted to reenslave Israel did he not bury them in the sea? "*There remained not so much as one of them.*"

And what shall we say of His goings forth among us? The Bible had said—but its words were accounted a dead letter—"Hear this, O ye that swallow up the needy, that ye may buy the poor for silver, and the needy for a pair of shoes; shall not the land tremble for this, and every one mourn that dwelleth therein?" Amos, 8. And His word has not returned unto him void. Against what sin does the Bible fulminate its warning more vividly than against oppression? Jefferson could say that "God has no attribute which would take part with the slaveholder in a controversy with his slaves;" and John Randolph—both slaveholders—could utter such words as these: "I envy not the head or the heart of that man who attempts to justify slavery on principle." And well did our late lamented President, bearing the weight of the nation upon his shoulders, and in the sacred discharge of his duty to his God and to his fellow-men, say, "If slavery is not wrong, nothing is wrong." But how slavery can be *no sin*, and the "sum of abominations," as it was styled in the discourse referred to, we leave for those who can, to explain. Any thing may be both justified and condemned by such logic.

We think we have some rights in the Bible. That holy book has been too long travestied in the service of slavery. Does the "sum of abominations" find any justification in its pages? It does not.

"The just and pure shall ever say,
Thou art more just, more pure than they."

Some things were "suffered" by Moses for the hardness of men's hearts; but our Saviour does not say they were *no sin*. "The times of this ignorance God winked at," but under the clear light of the Gospel's noonday sun, shall we still grope on in darkness—in darkness that may be felt? Or shall we be followers of Him—

"Following whose footsteps came the light,
While beauty blossomed as he trod?"

We bring no railing accusation against any one. Michael the Arch-Angel has taught us a higher lesson by setting us a higher example. We aim to speak the truth in the love of it,

"Nor hope for payment
In fame or gold,
But just to wear
Unspotted raiment."

Happy, most happy, if we may pitch the tune of our life to the Divine key; if we may raise its notes to angel melodies.

Friend of Slavery! Take with us a retrospective glance. We had prepared a sepulchre for *four millions* of slaves, in which we thought no resurrection trump could reach their ears. We had rolled the great stone of the fugitive slave law to the door. Every citizen was commanded to watch. "All good citizens are hereby commanded to aid and assist in the prompt and efficient execution of this law, whenever their services may be required." So reads the law. Chief Justice Taney seals it with the seal of the United States, inscribing these words thereon, "The negro has no rights which a white man is bound to respect." Could infamy descend lower than this? It could. When priest and Levite, that were accustomed to pass by on the other side, not caring for him who had fallen among thieves, who had been "stripped," and left half dead—not binding up his wounds and pouring in "oil and wine," as did the Samaritan—when these openly take part with the thieves themselves "that they may do evil with both hands earnestly."—Micah, 7: 30—and hurl the insult at the Almighty's Throne, that he

is the Author and Justifier of such deeds—the iniquity was full. “Then the Lord awaked as one out of sleep, and like a mighty man that shouteth by reason of wine, and he smote his enemies in the hinder parts; he put them to a perpetual reproach; Ps. 78: 65, 66. We made the sepulchre as sure as we could, “sealing the stone and setting a watch,” little regarding that Christ was within. But he that is higher than the highest, regardeth. “The angel of the Lord descended from Heaven, and rolled back the stone from the door and sat upon it. His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow, and for fear of him the keepers did quake and became as dead men; and the angel answered and said, “He is not here, for he is risen.” Christ is risen indeed!

Of the cruelties induced, of the immoralities fostered by slavery, we shall not here speak. They are written with a pen of iron. But the secrets of that prison-house will not be known till the judgment is set and the books are opened.

“And many in the dungeons have died for you and me,”

Breasting the waves, that the proud waters of treason might not go over our souls. Such are the natural fruits of a system whose “root is as rottenness, and whose blossom shall go up as the dust,” and from which, in the words of St. Augustine, “It is time that the human race had rest.”

Concerning Onesimus, whom St. Paul sent back to Philemon, so much is said by the Bishop and others as furnishing not only a justification of slavery, but of the return of fugitive slaves, we will say a word. Onesimus, it is supposed, had been the slave or servant of Philemon, which it is not known, for the word indicating the relation of Onesimus to Philemon is the same in the original with that which the Apostle uses, in reference to himself, when he speaks of his being the servant of Jesus Christ, and which the translators have rendered *servant* in both instances. But for the argument's sake we will accept the interpretation given by the Bishop and admit that Onesimus was Philemon's slave. Under the preaching of St. Paul at Rome, he embraces the Christian faith. And what does St. Paul do? Why, he gives him a letter to Philemon,

his former master, who also had become a Christian under the Apostle's preaching, certifying his conversion to Christianity, and asks Philemon to receive him, as a *servant*? No, "*not now* as a servant, but above a servant—a brother beloved." He says also, "If thou count me as a partner, receive him as *myself*;" and he proceeds to cancel every claim which Philemon might have, or might suppose he had, against him. "If he hath wronged thee or oweth thee ought, *put that on my account*," adding, with emphasis, "I, Paul, have written it with mine own hand. I will repay it;" and still more completely if possible to discharge Onesimus from any obligation to Philemon, he tells him, "Having confidence in *thy obedience* I wrote unto thee knowing that thou wilt also do *more than I say*." Had it been the aim of the Apostle to give Onesimus a perfect bill of freedom, he could not have done so in more effective words. Besides, the letter was sent by the hand of Onesimus. He might have returned to Philemon or not, as he chose. We hear of no guard, no band of soldiers, to prevent his escape; but we do hear, according to some ancient writers that he afterwards became Bishop of Colosse, which precludes the idea of his remaining with Philemon as a slave.

The Bishop's comment on this epistle will amuse the reader :

"Onesimus, having either embezzled his master's goods, or robbed him, ran away, &c. Now, the design of this epistle is to reconcile Philemon to his servant, and to entreat him to receive him, not only as a servant, but as a brother in Christ."

The Bishop says, *not only*; the Bible says, *not now*. We will pursue this no further, but we will say, and we challenge reply: That to forbid men to read the word of God, to destroy the marriage and the family relations, to make merchandise of the bodies and souls of men,—in the language of the protest, "to sell men and women in the open market, as their staple product;" to use the laborer's "service without wages, and give him not for his work," is an ineffable meanness, a crime against God and against man, and whoever shall justify such acts—and they are parts of slavery—Bishop, priest, or whatever he may be called, he is not a preacher of righteousness, nor a minister of the blessed gospel of the Son of God.

We turn from the Bishop to our country, just now emerging

from the blackness of night, to behold the glories of a risen morn. The veil of the temple is rent. The image of God in man is seen. The word has been spoken—"Proclaim Liberty throughout all the land, to all the inhabitants thereof!"

"Abra Ham Lincoln, may his tribe increase—
 Awoke one night—for wonders ne'er will cease—
 And saw amid the gas-light in his room
 Looking as dark as the great day of doom,
 A grinning negro, black, grotesque and old;
 Long thoughts of war had made our Abra bold—
 'What wantest thou?' he to the phantom cried;
 'I want to know, old mars,' the form replied,
 'What you be gwine to do with this ere chile?'
 Abra Ham frowned, then said, with serious smile—
 "'Tis written in Heaven; and this is my decree—
 Both you and yours henceforward shall be free;
 My word is given. And now, old man, depart."
 But why upsprings he with a sudden start?
 No more he sees a negro, black and old,
 But a fair angel, with his locks of gold,
 Radiant as Morn, and gladsome as the Spring.
 'I am the soul of that soiled earthly thing,
 Thou sawest just now. Oh, man of honest heart
 And steadfast purpose, thou the better part
 Hast chosen for thyself and for thy land!
 For this one deed, *stand thou at God's right hand!*"

And now, also, the axe is laid at the root of the tree—the axe of the Constitution and of Law. Slavery is cut up by its roots. Let it be cast into the fire:

"For God ordains that we
 Shall eat its bitter fruit,
 Till we dig up the tree,
 And burn its every root."

Slavery is a felon, arraigned and tried at the bar of Heaven and of the world. The infant's wail, the mother's cry, the father's deep-toned curse, are witnesses against it. It is convicted of high treason. It meets a traitor's doom. "And I heard the angels of the waters say, Thou art righteous, O Lord, which art and wast, and shall be, because thou hast judged thus. For they have shed the blood of saints, and of prophets, and thou hast given them blood to drink, for they are worthy." Rev. 16: 5, 6.

“ O, wherefore come ye forth in triumph from the North,
 With your hands, and your feet, and your raiment all red ;
 And wherefore do your rout send up a joyous shout,
 And whence are the grapes of the wine-press that ye tread ?
 O, evil was the root, and bitter was the fruit,
 And crimson was the juice of the vintage that we trod,
 For we trampled on the throng of the haughty and the strong,
 Who sat in the high places and slew the saints of God.”

And what was American Slavery ? whose dead carcass, like that of its fit exponent and defender, *The Assassin*, is to be buried where it can never be found ! What was it ? we repeat. It was a system by which four millions of our fellow-men have been denied the right to read the word of God, in impious, atheistic defiance of Him who has said, “ Search the Scriptures.” It was a system by which the marriage relation—fairest flower of Eden, planted in the world’s earliest dawn, by the hand of God himself, fresh with the dew of His blessing, and blooming under His smile, ere earth by sin was cursed, or clouded by His frown,—and which, not even the malice of the arch-traitor and adversary of our race, could uproot or destroy,—type of that glorious union which subsists between Christ and his Church,—lily of Paradise decking the earth—this is trodden under foot by slavery, as if it were not a holy thing ! And the words of Him by whose word the worlds were made, are utterly contemned—“ *What God had joined together, let not man put asunder*”—while the tender relations of parent and child, the dearest rights and holiest affections are by it accounted as nothing worth !

Slavery, false to man, is false to government, false to God. How has it laid its traitorous hand upon the flag of our Union, spurning its glorious folds, draggling them *low, low* in the dust, trampling them under its gory feet ! It has conspired to take away the nation’s life.

“ What whets the knife
 For the Union’s life ?
 Hark to the answer,—Slavery.”

But its days are numbered.

“ When lo ! a strong angel stands wingèd and white,
 In wonderful raiment of ravishing light !”

The angel of Liberty !

"Take your harps from silent willows,
Shout the anthems of the free."

And let each one be prepared to swell the jubilant chorus—
Slavery's discordant notes no longer heard,—and to march to
the music of a regenerated Union. A Union now established
on a broader, firmer, holier foundation.

"The union of lakes, the union of lands,
The union of states none can sever,
The union of hearts, the union of hands,
And the flag of our Union forever."

A union in which the song of liberty, like the song of the
lark, let loose heavenward, in the eastern skies, shall greet
the morning sun of our nation's glory, now rising in uncloud-
ed splendor to brighten the world with his beams.

"With hosanna, shall our banner
From the house-top be unfurled,
While the nation takes its station,
Foremost, mightiest, in the world."

For a little time, and we saw not the bright light which is
in the clouds. The wind passeth and cleanseth them. *Fair
weather cometh out of the North. With God is terrible majesty!*
In Him is our hope. For what God doeth, it shall be forever.
No longer shall the uncircumcised Philistine, morning and
evening, defy the armies of Israel. He is smitten in the fore-
head. The stone sunk into his forehead. He is fallen upon
his face to the earth. The people arise and shout.

Wherefore, O ransomed people, shout!
O banners, wave in glory!
O bugles, blow the triumph out!
O drums, strike up the story!
Clang, broken fetters, idle swords!
Clap hands, O States, together!
And let all praises be the Lord's,
Our Saviour and our Father,

And lo! The dove of Peace, tempest-tossed, and finding no
rest for the sole of her foot, returns with an olive leaf in her
mouth, to the window of the ark, now opened to receive it—
the Ark of Liberty, long assailed, and buffeted by the waves,
and out-riding all the storm, and which—the black, ill-omened

raven of treason thrust out, never to return, but like the author of all evil, to go to and fro through the earth,—now rests upon the top of our American Ararat; from whence, at the bidding of God, Truth, Liberty and Justice, shall go forth to sway the destinies of the world. And now, from altars reared by grateful hearts, ascends sweet incense to the Throne of Heaven; and now is seen the bow in the cloud, the token of the promise while the earth remaineth, that the seed-time and harvest of our national prosperity shall not cease, and all nations shall flow unto it.

In conclusion, we would say, that we have been an avowed opponent of slavery, for many years, but since it has met its fate, and the cry of those “who cry day and night unto Him,” has been answered, we give glory to God; and with all true-hearted men, “with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of Heaven, we laud and magnify His glorious name, saying, Heaven and Earth are full of thy glory. Glory be to thee, O Lord, most High!” and gladly do we turn from the “sum of abominations” which has passed away, to behold the Fair Light, and to breathe the pure air of our country’s Resurrection Morn!