

THE  
INTEGRITY OF OUR NATIONAL UNION,  
vs.  
ABOLITIONISM:

AN ARGUMENT FROM THE BIBLE,

IN PROOF OF THE POSITION  
THAT BELIEVING MASTERS OUGHT TO BE HONORED AND OBEYED  
BY THEIR OWN SERVANTS, AND  
TOLERATED IN, NOT EXCOMMUNICATED FROM,  
THE CHURCH OF GOD:  
BEING PART OF  
A SPEECH DELIVERED BEFORE THE SYNOD OF CINCINNATI, ON  
THE SUBJECT OF SLAVERY,  
SEPTEMBER 19TH AND 20TH, 1843.

---

BY REV. GEORGE JUNKIN, D. D.,

*President of Miami University.*

---

Cincinnati:

PRINTED BY R. P. DONOGH, AT NO. 106, MAIN STREET:

1843.

45456  
104

---

Entered according to the Act of Congress, in the year 1843.

**BY GEORGE JUNKIN, D. D.,**

in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the State of Ohio.

---

---

Orders for this pamphlet addressed to R. P. DOXON, Publisher, No. 106 Main Street, Cincinnati, enclosing the Cash, and post paid, will be promptly attended to.

---

*Price, \$150 per dozen.*

President Tyler  
Washington City  
Ala

Ms. C. 5-14/11

To *Rev. Joshua L. Wilson, D. D.,*  
*Rev. James C. Barnes,*  
*Gen. Robt. B. Millikin, and C. K. Smith, Esq.*

GENTLEMEN:

You were among the first of my friends, to solicit the publication of that part, at least, of my argument before the Synod of Cincinnati, which went to shew, from the language of the Bible, that Slavery is tolerated therein; and not made a ground of excommunication from the church. The copy is now at your service. You will find it not so full as when spoken. Eight hours were expended in the delivery of the whole, and the last three parts were crowded into less than half that space. It would have required three hours more to have done justice to these. But, having conceived my plan, I adhered to it throughout, giving my principal attention to the scriptural argument. I have long believed, that if this nation is to be saved from a deluge of suicidal blood, it will be through the conservative power of the word of our God.

You will perceive, that, notwithstanding the argument is upon the whole contracted, as to space, it is expanded as to matter. I allowed myself in writing it out, in a few instances, to work into the proper place, virtual answers to arguments which were really uttered subsequently to mine: although, nearly everything had been anticipated. You may notice, for example, among the omissions, the remarks on the criticism upon 1 Tim. vi: 2, about the masters who were not masters, and about the corn and potatoes. I really thought pity to put such matter in print; and, therefore, preferred walking backward, and throwing a mantle over it.

It appeared to me best to retain the form of an address to the presiding officer, because I could call up the matter more vividly to my own mind, and I think those who were present will remember it better. Probably, also, it may increase the vivacity of the whole. Our Abolition brethren will say this is necessary; for it will, no doubt, be to them a perfect morpheum. They will be all asleep before they reach the end of the pamphlet. Close, logical discussion is so unsavory, that they become wea-

ry of it very soon. Loose declamation suits their taste much better. I have omitted personal reference to arguments, because I wish to avoid dispute with any individual. And some pleasantries, allowable in oral discussion, are also dropped.

Truth requires the public to know my general plan, lest they should suppose me guilty of not meeting the whole subject. The plan of the whole speech contained four general heads, besides the prefatory remarks against introducing the matter into ecclesiastical bodies at all.

I. The Scriptural argument; which, alone, you have here.

II. An aggressive movement upon the Abolition camp—in which I carry the war into the heart of the enemy's country. Here, very briefly, I sustained four propositions. 1. The Abolition movement occasions the riveting of the chains of temporal bondage tighter and more tightly upon the colored race. 2. It occasions the manacles of intellectual bondage, and the chains of spiritual and eternal death, to be the more firmly and durably fastened upon this unhappy race. 3. It is a treasonable movement against the Constitution of the United States. 4. It tends to, and aims at a dissolution of this Union; and there is reason to believe, on this point, that English Abolitionists and the British government are laboring and co-operating with American abolitionists in an extended scheme to divide and destroy the republic, whenever a war with England occurs, by means of black troops from the West Indies and Canada, co-operating with a slave insurrection.

III. The question of Slavery, as viewed by the eye of political philosophy, and of moral and municipal law.

IV. The Divine plan of restoring man universally to his freedom—first, *in fact*; then, *in form*: and the application of it in the splendid scheme of African Colonization. This topic I did but touch; and the great question which ought to come in here, why God *permitted* the introduction of Slavery into this republic? and what His wise designs were concerning it?—this most important question I did not touch at all. In regard to African colonization, I hastily referred to the successes in Liberia as evidence of its practicability; and especially since the noble, philanthropic and eminently successful experiment of John McDonogh, of New Orleans, has demonstrated the easy practicability of universal emancipation to real freedom.

Whether ever this plan shall be filled up is yet a contingency.

Very respectfully, your humble servant,

GEO. JUNKIN.

*Miami University, Oct, 10, 1843.*

# THE INTEGRITY OF OUR NATIONAL UNION,

VS.

## ABOLITIONISM, &c.

---

MR. MODERATOR:—

Ever since modern abolitionism developed its true character, it has been my policy to avoid all public discussions of the subject. The anger, and wrath, and bitterness, and distraction, and alienation among brethren, which have so generally attended its agitation, early convinced me, that prudence for peace's sake, required the exclusion of this exciting controversy from our church courts: and this policy has actuated the brethren generally with whom I have been called to act in my former field of labor. When it pleased God to locate me in a new field, I saw, or thought I saw additional reasons, confirming the wisdom of this course. It was early impressed upon my mind, that this brand had already kindled up a fire which had well nigh consumed Miami University. To such a ruinous degree did the fire burn within her bosom, that the Trustees took up the subject and passed strong resolutions condemnatory of this wild-fire; and commendatory of a more prudent course.\* Hence, I felt myself called upon, the more earnestly to labor for the suppression of a class of disputations that result in evil, and only evil. The consequence is, peace and kindly feeling between young men from all the States indiscriminately. And hence my opposition in Presbytery to all attempts (and they have not been few) to agitate and agitate and agitate on the subject. And hence the pertinacity with which, as a member of the Committee of Bills and Overtures, and as a deliberating

---

\* See Annual Catalogue for 1840.

member on this floor, I have opposed every movement of the kind. And it appears, even yet, to me, that this opposition is not so feeble, and this reluctance to discuss Anti-slavery in this Synod is not so small, as the vote to take off the table the paper of my venerable colleague would seem to indicate.

Sir, we have been *bantered*, into this subject. We have been told that we are afraid of the light—afraid to meet the argument—that it would soon be seen, upon the vote to take up, who were afraid of the truth. Sir, “Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as he that putteth it off.” It may appear hereafter who will flinch from the truth—who will shrink away from the sword of the Spirit. But what was the effect of this banter upon the house? A young brother, who felt that he was ready to discuss the subject; but who, before, had no wish to agitate, caught the fire; he would not be dared to a controversy and yet shrink. I saw his blood warm, I saw the fire kindle in his eye, I saw his generous bosom heave with indignant emotion at the insinuation of cowardice; and you observed how he threw back the charge in tones of firm defiance, and declared his readiness to meet the question. I admired the indignant emotions and the firm tones of the declaration; and yet, I must be permitted to think there was a mixture of feeling not entirely holy. That another man banter and dares me to a conflict, of whatever kind it may be, is not a just reason why I should enter upon it. A man should have better reason for battle, than that another has asserted his superior strength. But so it happened here. Immediately the blood of age began to course its long-worn channels, with a quicker pace; and the reverend father on my left could no longer look down with indifference upon the gauntlet at his feet. He would no longer be bantered by the boys. Thus the fire passed from bosom to bosom, and *thus* the present speaker was left in the lean minority of four, against taking up the slavery resolutions. He had been threshing his wheat by the wine presses to hide it from the Midianites, and being often urged to go forth to battle in this war, he had still declined; nevertheless he had put a flecce of wool upon the floor, to obtain a sign

from the Lord. And now, that there seems to be no longer any evasion, he takes it to be the Master's will that he should discuss this subject; and being forewarned by others than these last signs, he has not come up to this Synod wholly unprepared. Nor is it my intention to skim over the surface of things. If we must discuss, let us do it thoroughly: "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might," that is, with all thy might. Which divine aphorism is pithily expressed in another form: "Whatever is worth doing, is worth doing well." This maxim, I early imbibed, and generally endeavor to embody it in action, and shall try to do so on the present occasion. Let the plough run deep if you expect the corn to rise high. These agricultural allusions please me much—they carry me back to the days of my boyhood. I was born in a farm-house, and brought up almost to manhood at the plough tail; and can assure the farmers of Miami Valley, that if you would run the plough ten inches deep, you would gather ten bushels of corn more to the acre, than you commonly do. Shallow furrows make short corn; and shallow discussion yields a light harvest of knowledge. Let patience have her perfect work: let us take time to dig for the golden treasure, deep in the mine of Holy Scripture.

Notwithstanding all this, Mr. Moderator, I was opposed to entering upon this subject here, because—

I. Ecclesiastical courts, in a free State, have no jurisdiction over Slavery. This Synod has no original jurisdiction at all, when viewed in its judicial capacity. It can try ecclesiastical causes only on appeal or reference. And having no portion of its supervision extending over a Slave-holding population, appeals involving this question of Slavery, cannot come before it: except indeed in the case where a person may reside within our ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and yet own slaves in another State. Should such case occur, let us meet it; but let us wait until it come up in due order.

In a restricted sense, Synod has legislative powers—such as the division of Presbyteries, and erection of new ones, the devising and recommending of measures of benevolence, etc., etc., which are more legislative than judicial. But here, as

before, Synod cannot easily come into collision with Slavery, provided it keeps within its own constitutional limits. Individual ministers, indeed, in course of Scripture exposition, will treat the relation of master and slave, for it often turns up in the Bible. But this is no part of synodical business, and cannot orderly come before this court. As men, we may listen to lectures and sermons on any subject, and that whilst congregated at ecclesiastical meetings; but clearly, to hear lectures on animal magnetism, on municipal law, on geology, on moral, and political subjects, is not synodical, if common sense and our Book at all define the duties of a Synod. Why then, should we spend our time in discussing, in the abstract, a subject over which we have no jurisdiction in the concrete? If we have no business proper to us as a Synod, let us adjourn and go home: but let us not go out on a voyage of discovery, lest we encounter something more substantial than windmills or haystacks.

But some man will say, though all this be true, yet the moral force of this body is great, and her voice ought to be heard on great and important subjects. Public sentiment will be influenced by it.

I answer, is the moral force of this body great? Then, let us not diminish it by presenting a spectacle of unkind and hot discussion. If we have a heavy capital of moral force, let us not expend it in wild speculation, let us not cast it to the winds and waves of doubtful strife.

But farther, the moral force of bodies of men is not always proportional to their numerical force. And besides, what is the moral force of a body, when equally divided? If it should happen that this body, after discussing Abolition for three or four days, should come to an almost perfect equipoise, then how much is its moral force? Let it go abroad that we are divided equally in number, talent, piety, how much power for good can we operate on this subject?

But we may be told, the discussion will do good—light will be shed on a dark subject—men's eyes will be opened, and the truth will triumph.

I say, such a result may follow; still this is not synodical business; it is the business of individuals. There may be a few brethren here, who have deeply studied the subject and who may be able to illuminate the synod and the populace with their light, and to warm them with the flashes of an overpowering eloquence; let them do it in their own proper place and time; this synod, I contend is not that proper place.

II. But again, I object to this course: because, the discussion will most likely degenerate into a mere debate, dispute, or hot controversy in which more than blood will be spilt. Can any brother, who takes into view the extreme excitability of the public mind doubt it? Is it reasonable to expect that slavery, abolitionism, and colonization will be discussed here with that coolness and soul-subdued temper which their importance demands, and Christian courtesy requires? Does any man, in fact expect it? As for myself, I have passed through some stormy scenes and have learned by experience, that the more boisterous the elements become, the more perfectly all my faculties are at command. Brethren must not infer from my repugnance to this discussion, that individually I fear the heavings of the billows and the violence of the blast. I hope I shall be enabled to look the wind in the eye and always to pull the right oar. He who commands me into these troubled waters will keep me in safety. No sir; it is not peculiarly for myself that I deprecate these agitations: other men and various interests may suffer in the collision. Let us therefore not tempt the dangerous way uncalled by the voice of Providence. "Leave off contention before it be meddled with." "He that passeth by, and meddleth with strife belonging not to him, is like one that taketh a dog by the ears."—(Prov. xxvi: 17.) Let us follow peace with all men—as much as lieth in us.

III. I object to entering upon the abolition controversy here, because its advocates are an organized political party.

Here permit me to say, there is a sense in which the adage, "religion has nothing to do with politics," is true. That is, when by *politics* is meant *party wrangling* and *defamation*; then, indeed, religion is far off.

But there is also a sense in which the proverb is most notoriously and corruptly false ; viz., when by it, men mean that the obligations of religion have and ought to have no governing influence upon political conduct—that for their acts and doings in affairs of government, men are not accountable to God ; but only to the people, or rather to the party. This idea, which I fear is extensively held in *practice*, cannot be too severely reprobated.

All true Presbyterians believe that the civil government has no power over religious matters : and that religious officers, as such, have no kind of control in civil affairs. Even protection to property and persons in religious privileges, I contend, we do not ask as religious men. We claim such protection, not as *religious people*, but as *civil citizens*. Christ's kingdom is in no sense whatever dependant on the civil power. As *members of the civil commonwealth*, we have a right to hold property and to assemble for any lawful purpose : it is not because we are *religious men* that the law *protects* us this day ; but because we are *citizens*. It is not because we are *religious men*, that, associated, we hold property in the form of church buildings, but simply because we are *citizens*. We are here, to-day, using our privilege as officers of Christ's church, because He has granted it and it is not inconsistent with our duties as citizens : to-morrow we may be at the polls using our rights of a civil nature. But still, church and state are entirely distinct ; their union is anti-christian, and leads to despotism and bondage. I therefore contend peremptorily, that this synod has no right to intermeddle with political partyism. This is not the place to discuss questions of party politics. We may not here pass resolutions for or against banks—for or against a protective tariff—for or against the veto power—for or against Democracy or Whigism—for or against Van Buren, Clay or Birney. The relation of master and slave is a civil relation ; it is regulated by the civil law and always has been, ecclesiastical bodies never had, in all the world's history, any control over it. As citizens we may plunge into the party strife, but as an ecclesiastical body we may not do it. Let our church courts

throw themselves into the vortex of party politics, then farewell to peace and harmony—farewell to respectability and to public confidence. If individual ministers feel themselves called to soil their cloth in this strife—let them bear the responsibility and sink alone, under the ban of public reprobation, but let not the Synod of Cincinnati commit the suicidal deed.

It is surely unnecessary for me to dwell in proof of the fact, that Anti Slavery is a public, organized political party. True, it is a weak and contemptible political party, but assuredly it has all the paraphernalia of party organization. It has its meetings great and small—its speeches wise and foolish—its committees and sub-committees—its candidates for political office, from the Presidency of the Union, and Congressmen down, how low I cannot tell. Let the officers of God's church pause a little upon the margin of this crater, before we take the leap of Empedocles: let us calculate consequences, before we take the fearful plunge.

IV. This controversy places the peace party, as we may call ourselves in the premises, in a false position. It lays us open to the illogical and unjust, yet plausible inference, that we are advocates of Slavery. The brethren who urge this controversy upon us, delight to be called, and are every where known as *Abolitionists—Anti-slavery men*—men who labor to do away Slavery from the land and from the world. They wish to be called “the Liberty Party.” O liberty! what things have been done in thy sacred name! And some newspaper editors have been foolish enough to concede the name *liberty* to this handful; thereby intimating that the other political parties are not in favor of liberty. The popular mind is often charmed and governed by a word, and the moment, the Anti-slavery men meet with any kind of opposition, the cry of Pro Slavery is raised: the mind rushes to the opposite extreme. Here is the Anti-slavery party. But *anti* means *against*; if then they are *against* slavery, whoever opposes them must be *for* or *in favor* of slavery;—*for* and *against*—*pro* and *anti*: there it is, clear to a demonstration. All who oppose the Abolitionists are in favor of slavery. Such is the logic that actually does govern many a

human mind. Many good, honest-hearted men do not see how to escape from it. They never perceive that there are different kinds of opposition—that men may be opposed in one respect and yet not in another. Paul was a sound, clear-headed, warm-hearted evangelical preacher; but Peter was opposed to Paul; therefore Peter was a muddy-headed, corrupt and heterodox preacher. Here you have the identical argument, by which opposers of modern ultra abolitionism, are proved to be Pro Slavery men. Even learned divines, and erudite editors have been caught in this cobweb, and it is in vain you try to extricate them. The argument is so easy and so popular, they are unwilling to abandon it; thus by a pitiful fallacy, many a man is held in bondage worse than Kentuckian, whilst he glories and triumphs in his freedom. He swings his manacled hands around and shouts for liberty, whilst he is himself the slave of a little false logic. This would be amusing indeed, if we could cease to pity human weakness and to regard our own rights and privileges. But as these manacles are waved in frantic sport over our heads to their peril, we dislike the play; and are unwilling to be placed in such a false position. We are not willing that honest-hearted people, by a little false reasoning, should be led to suppose that we are in favor of slavery. We oppose the movements of abolitionists, chiefly by yielding; therefore, we are deemed and held guilty of Pro Slavery. Whereas, we are in truth opposed to slavery, and are doing as much in our respective positions to abate its evils, as our brethren are. We differ from them as to the manner of doing away these evils, whilst we suppose, we are much more efficient in the matter of meliorating the condition of the colored race. No disclaimer will avail. We tell the world—we tell our less credulous Christian brethren, our objections to Slavery. We point to Liberia, the land of the free colored man, as proof of our success. But all in vain;—you are opposed to the Anti-slavery party, and therefore you must be Pro-slavery men.

Such is the false position, in which the brethren know, we are placed by the shape of the question; and some rejoice in it. Nor can our utmost stretch of charity excuse them from

pushing the question with the knowledge of this injustice. The moment we lift our voice in opposition to their course, some sapient editor charges us with advocating slavery and deems the charge sufficient proof. We hold you to it unless you prove your innocence. All advantages are fair in war.

Such, in brief, are my reasons for opposing the introduction of this question into our ecclesiastical bodies. The peace of this Synod—the happiness and welfare of its members—its moral force and respectability will be best advanced, by leaving the whole subject of Slavery to the ecclesiastical bodies and to the civil governments, within which the providence of God has thrown that unfortunate class of the human race.

Time and opportunity have not allowed me to study and prepare for a discussion of the whole doctrine of master and slave. This relation, viewed either in the light of moral philosophy or of municipal law, is embarrassed with no small difficulties. To those who have the learning and the leisure, I leave the subject in the last named two respects; mine, at present, be the less profound, but not less important duty of opening the sacred volume and exhibiting its teachings on the relation of master and servant.

Truth is the only thing in the universe worthy of laborious research. Whatever be the field, the enlightened investigator is in quest of truth. In his labors, the analytic method is chiefly pursued. If his subject be in the field of nature, he takes it up, separates it into its various parts—resolves it into its original elements, if practicable; examines each minutely, and thus learns the laws of their influence, and the relations each sustains to the whole. Thus he discovers truths of nature. If the Bible, or any given portion of it be his subject, his method is not different. He separates sentence from sentence, word from word; weighs each part by itself, and marks its bearings and relations to the whole, and thus arrives at a knowledge of its meaning.

But now if the investigator assumes the office of teacher, he will find it most convenient to pursue the opposite method—the synthetic. He will exhibit to the learner the truth he has discovered. He will then point out its relations to other truths:

he will put part to his part and recompose the whole; thus shewing how his doctrine has been deduced from his subject. He has ascertained by analytical inspection, what the meaning of a portion of the Bible is; and now he applies the language to his doctrine, and so leads the mind on to a clear view of the whole passage. If the truths are laid down without such particular collating of the scripture language, it is dogmatic instruction, and savors of pride, and leads to faith in man. But if the language of the Bible is laid side by side with the propositions held and taught, and the coincidence clearly pointed out, then the teacher honors the intellect of the taught, and may fairly claim his belief in the doctrine, not as man's, but as God's.

This is the method I shall endeavor to pursue in the ensuing scriptural argument. Having, before I began to arrange the matter, pursued the analytic plan—having narrowly examined the language of the Bible where it speaks of master and servant, having carefully sifted its terms according to the admitted rules of interpretation, and thus having ascertained its meaning, I propose to state in a series of distinct propositions the truths I have elaborated, and to bring them into immediate connexion with the scripture language, and thus to secure the assent of the understanding and the belief of the heart.

The opposite method I will not pursue: it is, alas! not uncommon even on this subject;—viz: First to determine what the truth is—what the Bible ought to teach on any given point, and then come to it in order to make it teach the truth. Human reason sets itself to work and comes to the conclusion, that such a doctrine is true; then it proceeds to examine the Bible for proof of its truth; and, of course, what a man's reason assures him ought to be in the Bible, the same reason, with the aid of a torturing engine, called criticism, can easily discover there.—According to *this synthetic* method, one affirms, “it is contrary to reason, that three persons should exist in one Godhead.” He then proceeds to examine the Bible, not, you will observe, to ascertain what it actually does teach in regard to the mode of the Divine existence, but to interpret the Bible language so as to make it speak the language of truth, i. e. of his own precon-

ceived doctrine. Another says, "If the horrible doctrine of eternal punishment were taught in the Bible, I would kick it out of my house." Another, "If the terrible doctrine of eternal election were taught in the Bible, I would burn it." And yet another, "If I thought the Bible tolerated Slavery, I would turn infidel and trample it under my feet."

Now, all these belong to the same school of interpreters. They all form their opinions of what the sacred volume should say, and go to it, to ascertain whether it will dare to teach differently from their particular notions of truth.

But now, is not all this folly? Is it not to deal unfaithfully with the Sacred Records? Let us not come to God, to tell him what he ought to say in his Word; but let us draw near with holy reverence upon our spirits, to learn what he hath said. Let our minds be checked and chastened into subjection to the plain and simple language of revelation. Ordinarily, it is with God, as it is with honest men, the plain, obvious, simple meaning of his Word is the true meaning—the meaning which he would have us believe. If we find ourselves under the necessity of hair-splitting criticisms and abstruse distinctions, in order to make out our meaning, it is highly probable our meaning differs from God.

I do not deny, that there are obscure passages in the Scriptures, which require learned and laborious criticism. But then, this does not prove, that where the language is clear and plain, and easily understood, there the torturing power of bold criticism is needed, or is justifiable, in order to bring out another sense, quite different from what lies open upon the surface of the text.

# PROPOSITION I.

---

*Slavery existed during the period over which the Old Testament History extends.*

A VERY early testimony to this truth is recorded in Gen. xxxvi: 27, etc; "Come, and let us sell him to the Ishmaelites, and let not our hand be upon him; for he is our brother, and our flesh; and his brethren were content: and they drew and lifted up Joseph out of the pit, and sold Joseph to the Ishmaelites for twenty pieces of silver: and the Midianites sold him into Egypt, unto Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh, and captain of the guard." This event occurred about seventeen hundred and twenty-four years before the Christian era.

Here observe: 1. Joseph was sold "for twenty pieces of silver"—sold by his brethren. There is no room here for the miserable subterfuge, that he sold himself. The Midianites who paid the money, again sold him in Egypt. 2. The sale was absolute and without limitation. No hint is given of a period when he was to be freed from slavery. The assertion that such sales were for seven or six years, is wholly gratuitous and without a particle of evidence. 3. This sale was not with Joseph's consent—it was into involuntary bondage. "We are verily guilty," said the brethren, Gen xlii: 21, "concerning our brother, in that we saw the anguish of his soul, when he besought us, and we would not hear." Ah, yes, it was an involuntary bondage. 4. The whole transaction shews that such sales were not uncommon. The moment they saw the company of travelling merchants, the thought of the sale occurred—"Come, let us sell him." It was a common custom, or such thought could not have thus sprung up. 5. The Ishmaelites

must have known there was a market for such articles in Egypt, or they would not have bought. Here is indubitable evidence of the existence of the slave trade in connection with kidnapping. His brothers stole him from their own father and sold him. The Ishmaelites do not seem to have enquired how they came by him. The Ishmaelites did not steal him. Potiphar did not steal him. According to the notions of the age, they felt no self reproach at the wrong; no more than good Queen Bess, who is said to have been a stockholder in a slave-trading company.

Now, all this agrees with Thomas Clarkson's opinion, that Slavery and the slave trade originated in the wars of Nimrod, "who," says he, (Pt. I. chap. iii) "gave rise to that inseparable idea of *victory* and *servitude*, which we find among the nations of antiquity, and which has existed uniformly since, in one country or another, to the present day."

"Proud Nimrod first the bloody chase began,  
A mighty hunter, and his prey was man."

POPE.

Clarkson also quotes Zenophon thus:—"It was a law, established from time immemorial among the nations of antiquity, to oblige those to undergo the severities of servitude, whom victory had thrown into their hands."

Clarkson gives the same view of Joseph's case as I have given. "It shows, says he, that there were men, even at that early period, who travelled up and down as merchants, collecting not only balm, myrrh, spicery, and other wares, but the human species also, for the purposes of traffic. The instant determination of the brothers, on the first sight of the merchants, *to sell him*, and the immediate acquiescence of those, who purchased him for a foreign market, prove, that this commerce had been then established, not only in that part of the country, where this transaction happened, but in that, also, whither the merchants were then travelling with their camels, namely Egypt: and they show farther, that, as all customs require time for their establishment, so it must have existed in the ages previous to that of Pharaoh; that is, in those ages in which we fixed

the first date of *involuntary* servitude. This commerce, then, as appears by the present instance, existed in the earliest practices of barter; and had descended to the Egyptians, through as long a period of time, as was sufficient to have made it, in the times alluded to, an established custom. Thus was Egypt, the *first market* that is recorded, for the sale of the human species.”—(Pt. I. Ch. vi.)

Towards the close of the same chapter, he says, “Though Egypt was the first market recorded for this species of traffic; and though Egypt, and Cyprus afterwards, were particularly distinguished for it, in the times of the Trojan war; yet, they were not the only places, even at that period, where men were bought and sold. The *Odyssey* of Homer, shows that it was then practiced in many of the Islands of the *Ægean* sea; and the *Iliad*, that it had taken place among those Grecians on the continent of Europe, who had embarked from thence on the Trojan expedition. This appears particularly at the end of the seventh book. A fleet is described there, as having just arrived from Lemnos, with a supply of wine for the Grecian camp. The merchants are described also, as immediately exposing it to sale, and as receiving in exchange, among other articles of barter, “*a number of slaves.*”

“It will now be sufficient,” continues Clarkson, “to observe, that, as other states arose, and as circumstances contributed to make them known, this custom is discovered to have existed among them; that it travelled over all Asia; that it spread through the Grecian and Roman world; was in use among the barbarous nations, which overturned the Roman empire; and was practiced, therefore, at the same period, throughout all Europe.” Such is the opinion of Thomas Clarkson; and yet we have abolitionists who assert, that they have ascertained by an examination of twenty thousand pages, quarto and octavo, that there was no slavery in Asia Minor! What prodigious learning! what profound silliness!

Slavery, then, and the slave trade, existed in the world at least three thousand, five hundred and sixty-seven years ago; and Africa herself contained the first great slave market.

2. Let me carry you back one hundred and fifty-four years, viz: to the exodus of Abram from Mesopotamia, Gen. xii: 5. "And Abram took Sarai his wife, and Lot his brother's son, and all their substance that they had gathered, and the souls that they had gotten in Haran;"—Who these souls were is explained in ver: 16.—"And he had sheep, and oxen, and he asses, and men servants, and maid servants, and she asses, and camels." They are again mentioned in Ch. xiv: 14,15—"he armed his trained *servants*, born in his own house, three hundred and eighteen, and pursued them unto Dan: And he divided himself against them, he and his servants, by night, and smote them."

Here, it will be admitted, is evidence that Abram had servants *gotten* in Haran. But how *gotten*? Were they captives taken in war? Were they criminals, who had forfeited their liberty and been sold as convicts? Were they his own children begotten of his own body? Were they bought with his money? The last of these we take to be true: and the point and hinge of the controversy turns upon the force of the word *gotten* in Gen. xii: 5. Now this word—(I mean the original Hebrew word, for the English cannot determine it,) is of general signification. I shall cite Gesenius, the great German Hebraist, not as authority exactly,—for reference to Lexicons as *authority* in controversy, is a sophomoric trick. No scholar depends on Lexicons. The only true method to settle the meaning of doubtful words, is to refer to other places where the same author uses the word; and thus to make the book its own interpreter. This method I shall pursue, and so doing will enable the English reader, to comprehend the meaning and force of my verbal criticism. All the faith I shall ask of him in myself, will be simply belief in my veracity when I say, the word in the text under examination, is used, in such and such other passages. This is surely not asking much confidence in men: for if I should attempt to deceive, there are antagonists enough in this argument to expose me. To proceed. Gesenius is cited chiefly for his references. Under his fourth head of definition, of the word for *gotten*, in Haran (*ansan*) he says "To make is also, i. q. to get by labor, to acquire, as in

English *to make money*: Lat. *pecuniam facere*, Gr. *poiein bion*, to make a living, e. g. *property, wealth*. (Gen. xxxi: 1, Deut. viii: 17, 18, Jer. xvii: 11.)—*Slaves*, (Gen. xii: 5, Is. xix: 10.) Now let us look at the passages cited. Gen. xxxi: 1; Laban's sons said "Jacob hath taken away all that was our father's: and of that which was our father's hath he gotten all this glory." Here, the word *gotten* (*ansan*) means, to earn and procure by labor. Deut. viii: 17, 18; \* "My power \* \* hath gotten me this wealth. \* \* \* for it is He, (God) that giveth thee power to get wealth." These cases are both unequivocal; so is the next, Jer. xvii: 11, \* \* \* "so he that *getteth* riches, and not by right." So Stokius cites correctly Ezek. xxviii: 4, "With thy wisdom and with thine understanding thou *hast gotten* thee riches, and *hast gotten* gold and silver into thy treasures." So it is applied Gen. xi: 4, to the acquisition of fame \* \* \* "*let us make us a name.*" Is. xix: 10, \* \* \* "all that *make* sluices and ponds for fish"—all *the makers*, which may mean the operative workmen, or the proprietors who make, procure, or acquire these things.

These are surely sufficient to show, that to *get* means to *acquire*, to *procure* by labor or otherwise. But the matter is settled most decisively by Gen. xvii: 12, 13:—"And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man-child in your generations: he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed. He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised;" and ver. 23, "All that were born in his house, and all that were bought with his money."

Here, then, we have men servants and women servants in the possession of Abram, and we are told how they became his: they were bought with his money of foreigners—they were born in his house. Abram had *gotten* souls in Haran—he had procured them, precisely as he had procured his oxen and his asses, by his industry and economy—he bought them, and he bred them, and he educated them—Gen. xiv: 14, 15; *Trained Servants*.—It is the same original word as used in Proverbs:

“train up a child in the way he should go.” Abram selected these three hundred and eighteen, because he could trust them. He was a conscientious and a faithful master: and such will always have conscientious and trust-worthy servants.

Slavery did exist more than three thousand seven hundred and twenty-one years ago.

But we are told, that there was no Slavery, after all, with Abraham. He was a simple missionary of the true religion; and whenever any of the heathen around him felt inclined to embrace his doctrine, he took them into his employment and used them as herdsmen, and in other service — admitted them to his church privileges: and their children he employed in the same way: and this is all that is meant, by “souls he *had gotten* in Haran”—“born in his house”—“bought with money of any stranger!” Most marvellous interpretation!! Now, candidly, did not this interpretation result from the pre-determination not to find Slavery in the Bible? Did it ever originate from a fair explanation of the Bible language? But it is sustained by as singular a criticism on the word, *gotten* in Haran, Gen. xii: 5. It is alleged that the Hebrew word *ausau* means, sometimes, to *consecrate*—to *dedicate* to God’s service; and we are referred for proof to 2 Chron. xxiv: 4; and Ezek. xviii: 31. Let us see: “For the sons of Athaliah, that wicked woman, had broken up the house of God; and also all the dedicated things of the house of the Lord did they bestow upon Baalim.” But here, unfortunately, *the dedicated things*—*the consecrated things*, are expressed by an entirely different word, (*kaudshei*) which truly and properly means to *dedicate*, *sanctify*, *consecrate* or *make holy*—these consecrated things *they did bestow* upon Baalim—here *ausau* occurs; but is this a consecration? When the already *dedicated things*, are passed over as a possession to the idol, are we to be told that this is consecration—making of them holy! No! Mr. Moderator; the text simply affirms, that the holy things of God’s house were passed over to the possession of Baalim’s temple; just as the *souls in Haran* are described by the same word, *ausau*, as passing over from the strangers of whom Abram purchased them, when he paid the price stipulated and agreed upon.

Equally unfortunate for this strange interpretation, is the other case referred to: Ezek. xviii: 31; "Cast away from you all your transgressions whereby ye have transgressed; and make you a new heart and a new spirit." Here *make* is *ausau*; but does making a new heart mean only to consecrate, to dedicate to religious service! This construction would suit Puseyism very well. It would suit the advocates of baptismal regeneration: but surely evangelical Christians can never believe, that *make you a new heart*, means only to *consecrate* or *dedicate* to God. Not at all. This language means to renovate, regenerate, create anew in Christ. And Isai. xi: 19, informs us how this command to make a new heart is to be accomplished; viz.: by divine grace.--"I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh and I will give them a heart of flesh." Here it is then: they are to make it, and Christ is to give it. When it is given it is made, and when it is made it is given. Then it is the believer's—he hath it—it is his *possession* which he *hath gotten*, whether in Haran or in Canaan. Away then, with your mere dedication; we deny that the word (*ausau*) simply and alone, ever properly means to consecrate. We repeat it, slavery existed in Abraham's household.

3. The whole nation of Israel were reduced, in Egypt, by gradual steps, to a state, little if at all superior to the most debasing bondage. They had task masters over them, (Exodus v: 14) who were themselves beaten, because they were not sufficiently severe upon the laborers under their command, Ex. i: 13, 14; "And the Egyptians made the children of Israel to serve with rigor. And they made their lives bitter with hard bondage, in mortar and in brick, and in all manner of service in the field; all their service wherein they made them serve was with rigor." And in all subsequent history, it is referred to as a state of base bondage.

Another evidence of extreme depression was the destruction of their male children. God has provided a law in the essential constitution of human nature, by whose operation, the enslaved and oppressed must necessarily outgrow their oppressors and thus ultimately regain their liberty. It is this, that be-

ing free from the cares and anxieties of providing for their own families—these devolving upon their masters—the slaves marry early and breed fast; whereas, freemen will not marry until they see a reasonable prospect of decent living to their families. This law was at work in Egypt, just as it is now in our country. The Egyptians perceived it and attempted to check it, by destroying all the male children. Ex. i: 15, 16; “If it be a son, ye shall kill him:” this is the command of the master, the king; shewing a most deplorable state of slavery: worse than any thing known in our times.

We may be asked here, What became of the slaves of Abraham and his descendants according to your doctrine? If the seed of Abraham carried their slaves with them down to Egypt, where were they, when their very masters were thus degraded? I answer, the Egyptian tyrants who robbed Israel of his liberty and of his own male children, could easily rob him of his slaves: and so they did. The Israelites lost their slaves in Egypt, except such as chose to flee with them, and who constituted the mixed multitude mentioned in Ex. xii, 38, as going up with them.

4. The next instance, wherein slavery is recognised as a relation existing, I shall mention, is in the fourth and the tenth commandments:—“Thou shalt not do any work, thou nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates. —“Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s house; thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbor’s.”

In both these precepts, ownership in, and control over, the menservants and the maidservants, is spoken of in the same language as ownership in the ox and the ass. In the latter, it is clear that covetousness could not exist, but where real ownership existed. To covet, is to desire another’s property without a corresponding wish and design to give him an equivalent. When I desire to purchase a man’s house or his goods; this is not covetousness. There is no sin here. If I am willing to pay the full value, no strength of desire in me amounts to the sin forbidden

in this commandment. The owner wishes to sell his property, and I wish to buy; this is all without sin. Clearly, then, this sin of covetousness can be committed only in reference to the goods, property, and rights of another person. If the manservant and the maidservant did not belong to my neighbor—if he has no right of *property* in them, or in the ox, or the ass, it is impossible for me to commit the sin of covetousness in regard to them. Therefore, we conclude, that the decalogue recognises the existence of Slavery; it forbids interference with the *ownership* a man has in his servants and in his cattle; it legislates for the protection and welfare of the master or owner of the servant, of the cattle, ox, or ass.

5. The Gibeonites furnish a fifth example: (see, Joshua ix: 21—23—27) “Let them live; let them be hewers of wood and drawers of water unto all the congregation, as the princes had promised;” and Joshua said to them: “Now, therefore, ye are cursed, and there shall none of you be freed from being bondmen, and hewers of wood and drawers of water for the house of my God.” “And Joshua made them that day hewers of wood and drawers of water for the congregation, and for the altar of the Lord, even unto this day, in the place which he should choose.”

Here, note,—1. They were reduced to perpetual slavery—they and their children. 2. This was a punishment for their sin. Their lives had been forfeited. They knew that they were devoted to death, and preferred slavery to death. This of course does not justify Slavery; but it proves the position before us, viz. that this relation existed under Old Testament times.

3. This slave labor was partly employed about the house of God and the altar. It might hence be inferred, that slave labor in building a church—in cleaning and keeping it, may not be a soul-damning sin even under the Gospel. A great noise has been made about some church in Virginia which owned slaves and hired them out and appropriated the product towards paying their minister's salary. Well, I am not to apologize for such cases. Yet, it may be said, if the church trustees came honestly by them; and if they could not set them free to the

benefit of the slaves; and if they hired them to good christian masters who were kind to them and taught them the christian religion: if all these, then, I cannot see any more harm in the whole thing, than in a minister using slave labor on his farm; or in the church of God using slave labor "for the house of my God" and "for the congregation, and for the altar of the Lord."

Before we leave this proposition, it may be as well to take up an objection, which is urged with apparent plausibility from the other side. It is said, the Hebrew word, *Ebed*, translated sometimes *servant*, sometimes *manservant*, and sometimes *bond-servant*, does not mean a slave, but only a worker, one who is employed for a time, and even a relation of service of a highly honorable kind: and hence it is inferred, that the whole argument on our part is lame and inconclusive, until we show that *Ebed* means a slave. This objection deserves a full and candid answer. And I remark, I. The word *Ebed* is translated as above, and in itself properly signifies a worker, a laborer, a person who does work of any kind at all, for another person. It is very similar to our Anglicised Latin word *servant*. All scholars agree, that the Latin word *servus*, had its application to slaves, from the customs of war. The maxims of the early ages included this one, that the life of the conquered belonged to the conqueror—he might kill his vanquished foe. The soundness of this doctrine we should dispute; but we have to do with it, simply as a fact. Hence, they inferred, that the life being the victor's, if he chose to save it, it was his then, also, and he might use the life, that is, the man, as he pleased: he had saved him, he was a *servus*, a *saved thing*, and belonged to the victor, just as his sword, and shield, and helmet, and treasures belonged to the victor. Hence, he might sell the man he had vanquished and taken, just as he might sell his spoils. Such is the origin of our English word *servant*, with a modification, however, of meaning, adapting it to any kind of service. It is constantly used to describe the relation of absolute bondage for life. It is also used condescendingly, as—when even a superior, writing to an inferior, subscribes himself, "your obedient humble servant." Thus, we have, servants of the public, servants of Saul, of

David, of Louis Philippe, of Queen Victoria, etc., etc. But still, amid all these modified applications, the word properly describes a relation of subjection, with an obligation of submission to the authority of another. Now, just so is it with the Hebrew word *Ebed*, and we can no more infer from its modified applications, that it never means a bondservant for life, than we can infer from the modified uses of the English word *servant*, that it never means a slave; whereas, in all our southern country, it is most commonly so used.

The word *Ebed* occurs, according to Trommius, about seven hundred times in the Old Testament. Of these it is translated by the Greek word *Doulos*, in the Septuagint, three hundred and six times; by the Greek word *Pais*, (a boy) six hundred and twelve times; by *Oikates*, (a house servant) twenty-eight times; by *Misthotos*, (a hired servant) never once.

The evidence, to show that *Doulos* means a servant for life — a slave — will be presented when we come to the New Testament. The Greek word *Pais*, (boy) is used, as every Greek scholar knows, with the same variety of meaning, as *boy* is in English: that is, as a synonyme for *servant*. Nothing is more common, than to call waiting-men by the name *boys*, even when they are old men; and that, whether they are slaves or hired men.

Let us now take in connection with these, another Hebrew word, which is uniformly rendered in English, by *hired servant*. The word from which it is formed, signifies to procure service by offering a reward; to hire: and when applied to the person hired, to work for wages. The noun, *Saukeer*, is the name of the person so hired, and so working and wherever the Greek word, *Misthotos* — a person serving for wages occurs, it is the translation of *Saukeer*. *Misthotos* is never used as the translation for *Ebed*; nor is *Doulos* ever used as the translation for *Saukeer*. This latter named word is not used very often — only sixteen times, according to Trommius. The reason is obvious; hired labor was not much used in Israel; the work requisite, being done by slaves, the “mixed multitude,” and the Gibeonites, and others bought with money or born in the house.

Here, then, we have two distinct names for working men; both implying work to be done; but the one, descriptive of a permanent obligation to work for another person without any right to receive wages; the other temporarily employed, and to receive his wages at the end of his appointed and agreed time of labor. Now, it must be obvious, if the Bible holds up these as classes, contradistinguished from each other, representing the one, as a state preferable to the other, a faithful historian must not confound them, and a faithful exposition, is bound to mark the difference. Let us examine a few passages. And:—

1. Exod. xii: 43—45.—“This is the ordinance of the passover: there shall no stranger eat thereof. But every man’s servant that is bought for money, when thou hast circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof. A foreigner and a hired servant—*Saukeer*—shall not eat thereof.” Here most clearly, “the *Ebed*, that is bought with money” and the *saukeer*, the hired servant, are placed in contrast, with each other: the one being a permanent member of the household and under the master’s control, and being circumcised, is permitted to eat the passover; the other, being not under the employer’s control—but only temporarily, is not to eat.

2. The same is taught, and a little more in Lev. xxii: 10, 11. “There shall no stranger eat of the holy thing: a sojourner of the priest, or an hired servant—a *saukeer*—shall not eat of the holy thing. But if the priest buy any soul with his money, he shall eat of it, and he that is born in his house: they shall eat of his meat.”

Here, are several particulars;—1. The meat mentioned, is not the passover, but the shew bread and other consecrated food for the priests. 2. The *saukeer*, hired servant, may not eat; but the *Ebed*, the bought slave, may eat. Behold again the contrast. Surely the *servants*, and the *hired servants*, are quite different classes. 3. “If the priest buy any soul with his money”—Oh horrible! The very men who minister in religion, buying slaves—buying human flesh!! yea buying souls!! paying down filthy lucre for souls!! yea worse still, if you can have patience to hear God’s word, the priest has

servants born in his house. What! a servant of God, a slave breeder! Does the Bible say so? Don't be alarmed—read for yourself and be calm.

3. Lev. xxv: 6.—“And the Sabbath of the land, shall be meat for you; for thee, and for thy servant, *Ebed*, and for thy maid, and for thy hired servant, *saukeer*, and for thy stranger,” etc. The contrast between, *Ebed* and *Saukeer*, is more full and perfect, if possible, in ver. 39,40, etc; “And if thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee; thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bondservant — an *Ebed*; but as a hired servant — a *Saukeer*:” he *is* an *Ebed*, for he is bought; but he is to be treated, not as the *Ebed* of foreign birth, (see ver. 44—46) but as the *Saukeer* is treated. Now how are hired servants treated? Why assuredly, if they are not kindly treated, they will not stay, even to work out their day. Rather than be insulted, or overworked, or badly fed, they will forfeit their pay for the past time, and go to work for some one else. So the Hebrew was bound by the law to treat his Hebrew slave with kindness — “thou shalt not rule over them with *rigor*” — “they are my servants, (*Ebedim*) they shall not be sold with the sale of an *Ebed*.” They shall not be subject to the *rigorous* treatment of foreign slaves. Such are not the conditions of their sale to their brethren.

Thus again, a strong contrast is drawn between these two classes of laborers. And the same protection was extended over the Hebrew *Ebed*, when sold to heathen, sojourning in the land. Ver. 53, “as a yearly hired servant, a *Saukeer*, shall he be with him” — and he is redemable at any time; and if redeemed, the price shall be estimated, “according to the time of an hired servant.” Again is it clear, that *Ebed* means a bought slave, and *Saukeer* a hired man.

4. Job. vii: 2. “As a servant, *Ebed*, earnestly desireth the shadow, and as a hireling *Saukeer*, looketh for the reward of his work; so am I,” etc. The servant looks for rest, and so does the hireling. But the latter, looks earnestly for his wages also. How strongly marked the contrast between the two.—The *Saukeer* anxiously desires the declining shade, that he may

rest his weary limbs, and receive his money, and wend his way home to his family; but the poor *Ebed* lacks the stimulus of wages: cessation from toil is his utmost reward.

Let us now apply this distinction to the Fourth and the Tenth Commandments. The hired servant is not mentioned in either: not in the Fourth, because the householder has no control over him, except to direct his labor for the time being. He is forbidden by the law to retain his wages over night: Deut. xix: 13;—"the wages of the *saukeer* shall not abide with thee all the night until the morning." But the *Ebed* and the *Amauh* or female servant or slave, are under the control of the head of the house, and he is responsible for their good conduct.

The hired servant is not named in the tenth commandment, because he is not the *property* of his employer, and there is therefore, no room for covetousness. The *Saukaur*, or wages, must go to the servant himself, and must come from the master who employs him. Therefore, the fourth precept protects not hirelings but slaves—permanent servants; and the tenth, prohibits interference with the rights of the master, even in desire.

Here, then, is a distinct recognition of the existence of Slavery, under Old Testament times. Other scriptures—very many, might be adduced to the same purport, but the foregoing is deemed sufficient, as to direct proofs. Indirectly, that is, incidentally to the propositions following, there will be brought to view, many other texts, equally conclusive.

## PROPOSITION II.

*The law of Moses permitted the Hebrews to buy their brother Hebrews and to retain them in bondage, or slavery, six years.*

PROOF 1.—*Exod. xxi: 2.*—“If thou buy an Hebrew servant—an *Ebed*,—six years he shall serve: and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing.” This implies the fact of Hebrews, buying Hebrews; and is unequivocal, to the point in hand.

PROOF 2.—*Exod. xxii: 3.*—“if he (the thief) have nothing, (wherewith to make restitution) then he shall be sold for his theft.” This, is too plain to need comment. It goes beyond my proposition: it proves that Hebrews might sell their brethren, as well as buy them.

PROOF 3.—*Lev. xxv: 39.*—“If thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee,” etc. No crime is here mentioned—but poverty; he is sold for his debt. Such is the implication on the face of the law. Such also, appears to have been the practical constructions of it. See 2 *Kin. iv: 1.*—The widow of a prophet called upon Elisha with a most pitiful complaint; her husband, a man of God, died in debt, “and the creditor is come,” says she, “to take unto him my two sons, to be bondmen—*Ebedim.*” Most cruel and distressing: as if the creditor should come upon the widow of his pastor, as soon as he was dead, drive her from the parsonage, and take her sons and make bondmen of them. Now, Elisha does not object against the legality of this course. For ought that appears, this right and power exists in the creditor. The same presumption results from *Matth. xviii: 25*, where the master, commands the unjust servant, who had squandered the master’s goods, to be sold, and his wife, and his children, and payment to be made. The right—the abstract, legal right, to sell the

poor man, and his wife, and his children, to pay his debts, is recognized: the cruelty of a rigid enforcement of the right, all men will reprobate. On the contrary, the law (Lev. xxv: 35) commanded the Hebrew to relieve his poor brother—not to take usury from, nor to oppress him. But this law of sale, was much abused at times, and led, by its abuse, to great oppression. Nehemiah was called upon to correct such abuses. Some of the nobles and rich men, had brought into bondage their brethren: Neh. v: 1—8. He called an indignation meeting against them, and severely rebuked them. But these abuses—this rigid severity, shews that the law tolerated the sale, whilst it did not allow hard treatment of the unfortunate poor. We do not affirm, that the law *commanded* the sale, except in case of crime: we do not say it *sanctioned* it. All that is necessary for our argument is, that the law *tolerated* it—bore with it as an evil, and applied suitable remedies. The law did not *prohibit* an Israelite from buying his poor brother: and when he did buy him, it enjoined kind treatment, and liberty at the end of six years.

## PROPOSITION III.

*This state of servitude—this relation of master and slave, might, in certain cases, become perpetual for life.*

EXOD. xxi: 5, 6.—“And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children, I will not go out free: then his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him unto the door, or unto the door post; and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl; and he shall serve him forever.” Here is an official, legal transaction, in presence of the judges. The government thus recognizes the relation of perpetual servitude. The master had in this case given him a wife: v. 4.—“If his master have given him a wife, and she have borne him sons, or daughters, the wife and her children shall be her master’s, and he shall go out by himself.” Now this wife, given by the master, may be a Hebrew maidservant, or a Gentile: and it matters little which; for a Hebrew girl, sold by her father, did not go out free, at the end of six years: v. 7.—“If a man sell his daughter to be a maidservant, she shall not go out, as the menservants do.” But the presumption is, and the assumption we are entitled to, that the wife given by the master, was a Gentile or heathen slave; concerning whom there can be no doubt (as we shall see) that she is a life slave. Now, in this case the law is explicit, the children are slaves, when the mother is. We have heard a great deal said about the barbarity of the law maxim, *pars sequitur ventrem*, as containing a doctrine, too horrible, and vile, to be spoken in the English language. Brethren ought first to enquire whether a doctrine is taught in the Bible, before they allow themselves to be horrified by it. Now, Mr. Moderator, you know, and every scholar in this Synod knows, that the

Latin law maxim, is read in plain English, in Exod. xxi: 4, — “the wife and her children, shall be her master’s”—*pars sequitur ventrem*—a slave mother makes a slave child. There it is in the word of God: and our horrified brethren, dare not deny it. Thus, the *Ebed* who is free at the end of six years, drawn by love to his wife and children, consents to become a perpetual slave, and the law seals it irrevocably.

We have nearly the same in Deut. xv: 16, 17. “And it shall be, if he say unto thee, I will not go away from thee; because he loveth thee and thine house, because he is well with thee: then thou shalt take an awl, and thrust it through his ear, unto the door, and he shall be thy servant forever. And also unto thy maidservant, thou shalt do likewise.” The only difference is, that here, love to the master and his family, is the reason why the servant wishes to remain: and also, that the maidservant is to be treated in the same way.

Thus, the law of Moses makes express provision for perpetual bondage—a servitude for life. True, it is an exception to the general rule, that a servant of Hebrew blood, shall be free at the end of six years. True, also, it is at first voluntary. I say *at first*. For, should he afterwards change his mind, and wish to go free, he cannot; he is a slave for life. But neither of these at all alters the case, so as to militate against the truth of my proposition which is, that the law recognizes the relation of master and slave in perpetuity—for life.

But, we are told, that voluntary servitude is not slavery. To my utter but agreeable surprise, this was distinctly and strongly avowed on the floor of Synod, by the principal debater on the abolition side of the house. This avowal was made, to evade the force of this part of my argument. Let us look at so large a concession from our opponents. It is much more than I expected. For 1. It maintains, that the moment the man consents to be an *ebed* forever, he is not an *ebed* at all. Let slavery become voluntary, and it is no longer slavery. Well, I admit, it must be an agreeable kind of slavery, to which a man consents. Then 2. Charles Clay is not a slave. His

master said to him, when in Canada, "Charles, you are now a free man, I have no power to take you to the United States and keep you as a slave." But Charles chose to come back. He felt that American slavery, is better than British freedom. So the little servantmaid, to whom the learned Judge in Boston said, "Now, my child, you are free, you may go wherever you please; and who replied with strong emotion. "Oh! then, I'll go back to my mistress." This little slave, is not a slave. Then, 3. All that is necessary, according to the Brethren's own showing, to restore the slaves of the South to freedom, is to treat them so kindly, that they will voluntarily abide with their masters: then they are all free. Then, 4. The servants of the Devil are all free men, and not slaves of sin and Satan at all: for their service is voluntary. They are willing subjects of the prince of darkness; consequently, not slaves at all!

Indeed, another Brother distinctly admitted, that if all the abuses were removed from slavery, as it exists in the United States—if all the branches were trimmed off, the deadly Upas would be no more a tree: slavery would be annihilated: there would be only a stump, like Nebuchadnezzar's, left. Thus, has the whole argument been twice given up, in the course of this discussion; and thus it is evident, that our brethren are contending, not against slavery—not against the relation of master and slave, as a permanent obligation upon the one to serve the other, but their eyes are attracted, and their hearts are affected by the cruel abuses, which too often attend it. Take away, says one, the involuntariness—take away the compulsion; let the servant, serve voluntarily, and I deny that it is any longer slavery. Take away, says another, the cruelties that accompany it—remove the unkind treatment, the separation of husband and wife, of parent and child,—abstract the lash, and let kindness and love rule the gang; and slavery is no more: a dead stump only is left.

But now, does not every reasonable and unprejudiced mind see, that all these are *incidental* to the relation of master and slave? Can even prejudice so blind the understanding, that a man will deny the existence of such masters, and of such

voluntary and happy servants? And yet, do not all the legal claims of the master continue? And do not the slaves know that they are bound to obey? And do not all see, that no change at all has taken place upon the relation itself, its duties and its obligations. Kind treatment on the one hand, and the voluntariness and cheerfulness of service, which it naturally produces, on the other, do not annihilate the relation and cancel the obligations of law. The slave is still a slave, and the master is still a master.

But, a turn has been taken, as was anticipated, upon this argument, whereby we have demonstrated, the perpetuity of servitude, under the Mosaic law. We are told, by a brother, who did not thus argue when dealing in debate with a universalist:—we are told that *forever*, means only to the year of jubilee—the servant of the bored ear goes out at the jubilee.

To this I answer, 1. Suppose that his six years service ended a short time before the jubilee—say a month—then *forever*, means just thirty days! Is this, interpretation of scripture language; or is it gross perversion? Could Ballou himself, or Ballou's master desire any thing better? If *forever* means but thirty days, or ten days, or one day; then rejoice all ye devils and damned spirits; rejoice ye thieves, and liars, and drunkards, and profane swearers, and sabbath breakers; for behold we bring unto you glad tidings—we proclaim in hell a universalist jubilee: you shall be punished indeed *forever*; but, glory be to licentious criticism, *forever* means but thirty days, or one day! Do you believe it, Mr. Moderator? Is there a devil in hell, so foolish as to believe it!!

2. But this criticism—rather *assertion*—that the Hebrew word *Olaum*, translated *forever* and *everlasting*, means to the year of jubilee, may be most clearly disproved from a context where it is used on this very subject. In Lev. xxv: 46, speaking of heathen bondmen, it is said, “Ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen *forever*.” Does *forever* mean to the jubilee? Consult, for answer, verses 29, 30, which speak of the tenure of houses in walled towns: “And if a man sell a

dwelling house in a walled city, then he may redeem it within a whole year after it is sold : within a full year may he redeem it. And if it be not redeemed within the space of a full year, then the house, that is in the walled city, shall be established *forever*, *Le Olaum*, to him that bought it, throughout his generations ; it shall not go out in the jubilee." Here *forever* reaches beyond the jubilee. The house shall be the property of the purchaser and his heirs *forever* ; does this mean until the jubilee ? No, but the reverse. It asserts perpetuity, endlessness of title ; it shall be his and his children's *forever*—"it shall not go out in the jubilee." Going out in the jubilee and being established *forever*, are contradictories and can never agree.

The same is evident from v. 34, where speaking of the Levites' property, he says, "the field of the suburbs of their cities, may not be sold : for it is their *perpetual* possession—"for it is to them a *perpetual* (*Olaum*) possession." Here again, *Olaum*, *everlasting*, is put into contrast with temporary occupancy ; and this with the express design of excluding the idea that these lands could ever be alienated. The houses of their villages, the Levites could sell, and they would return to them at the jubilee, (see v. 33) but their lands could not be sold at all. But if *Olaum*, *forever*, means to the year of jubilee, then their *perpetual possession*, was the most short lived of all their inheritance ; it *must* cease at the jubilee !

## PROPOSITION IV.

*The Hebrews were permitted by their law, to buy servants from the heathen ; to hold them in perpetual servitude, and to transmit them as hereditary property to their children.*

This is a compound proposition, and may be broken down into three distinct parts.

I. They were permitted to buy servants, male and female, from the heathen. Exod. xii : 44,—“Every man’s servant that is bought for money, when thou hast circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof.” This is decisive as to menservants.

Second proof. Lev. xxv : 44, 45, 46, “Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of [from, in Hebrew] the heathen that are round about you, of [from] them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover, of [from] the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall you buy, and of their families, that are with you, which they begat in your land : and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession ; they shall be your bondmen *forever* : but over your brethren, the children of Israel, ye shall not rule one over another with rigor.” This passage is most conclusive as to the first subdivision. It also meets the second, viz: that the servitude is *perpetual*, “they shall be your bondmen *forever*—*Le Olaum*.” And it is equally pertinent to the third. They could transmit these slaves, as hereditary property, to their children. But here, note particular: (1) They are *property*, “a possession.” It is the same Hebrew word, as that used, in v. 41, to describe the landed estates to which the Israelites returned at the jubilee, “and unto the *possession* of his fathers shall he return.” It is the same used to describe the Redeemer’s right in his redeemed people. Psalm ii : 8,

“I shall give \* \* the uttermost parts of the earth for thy *possession*.” It is the same used to describe Abraham’s interest in the field of Ephron and the cave of Machpelah, after he paid for them, when “the field and the cave that is therein were made sure unto Abraham, for a *possession* of a burying place, by the sons of Heth.” In short, this word is invariably used, to signify ownership in landed estate—not *transitory* but *permanent* possession. Let men, therefore, criticise as their fancy directs, as to men and women being viewed and treated as property; God’s word says unequivocally, “they shall be your *possession*.”

But, it will be said, this is horrible! human beings bought as *property*, and held as a possession permanent! Well, abhor it then, if it is horrible. But, there it is on the sacred page. I have not asserted it, it is God’s assertion. I have not said it is *right*. Neither, as I suppose, has God affirmed it to be *right*. All I affirm is, that God’s law *permitted* it to Israel. If you cannot endure it, with God be your controversy; and at his word be yet more horrified. For, (2) This *possession*, is *perpetual*—*Le Olatum, forever* shall they be your bondmen. It is a bondage, durable as the life of the parties. Yea, more horrible still! (3) At the death of the master who bought the slaves, they do not go out free—they pass down as an inheritance to his children: they stand in all the legal relations of real estate. As such, the terms of the law speak of them. It is the same word as is used, Num. xxxiii: 54, “Ye shall divide the land by lot for an *inheritance*,” etc. And xxxiv: 13, “This is the land which ye shall *inherit* by lot.” And Abraham inquires, “how shall I know that I shall *inherit* it?”

Such is the condition of heathen slaves under the Mosaic Law. Most unhappy men! Awful state of degradation! Hopeless bondage to them and to their children after them!

But, now, is it not obvious, that the dreadfulness of their state depends very much upon incidental circumstances? Suppose they fall into the hands of “believing masters,” such as Paul speaks of, who will be kind to them and teach them the way of salvation through the Messiah, what is there so fearful in their condition? Look what Isaiah says, ch. xiv: 2, con-

cerning heathen people, "And the people [of God] shall take them and bring them to their place; and the house of Israel shall possess them in the land of the Lord for servants and maidens." Assuredly, when the grace of God touches the hearts of these slaves and they become God's freedmen, their condition is infinitely better than that of their brethren according to the flesh, who are afar off from God, and free in a physical sense. "I had rather be a door-keeper in the house of my God, than to dwell in the tents of wickedness."

---

## PROPOSITION V.

*A very considerable degree of severity, in the treatment of servants, was indulged in during the Old Testament times.*

PROOF I. Gen. xvi: 6—9, "But Abram said unto Sarai, Behold thy maid is in thy hand; do to her as it pleaseth thee: and when Sarai dealt hardly with her, she fled from her face.

"And the angel of the Lord found her by a fountain of water in the way to Shur. And he said, Hagar, Sarai's maid, whence camest thou? and whither wilt thou go? And she said, I flee from the face of my mistress Sarai. And the angel of the Lord said unto her, Return to thy mistress, and submit thyself under her hands."

On this remark,—1st. There is strong presumption, that Hagar was a good and faithful servant, and stood high in the confidence of her mistress, until she was seduced by her from the path of rectitude. Sarai's choice is sufficient ground for this opinion. 2nd. She was in a delicate situation when she became the subject of this severity. All the circumstances, except the unfortunate outbreak of her own pride, seemed to call for peculiar tenderness, and kind treatment. Yet,—3d. She was abused and maltreated to such a degree, as to induce her

to flee to the wilderness. "Sarai dealt hardly with her;" in the margin "afflicted her." We can form no idea of this affliction but by referring to other places where the word occurs. Isa. liii; 7, applies it as descriptive of the affliction of the Man of Sorrows. "He was oppressed and he was *afflicted*;" so Exod. i: 11, it is applied to the afflictions of Israel, "Therefore, they did set over them task masters, to *afflict* them;" and Job describes by this word the sorrows he experienced at the hand of God, xxxi: 11, "Because he hath loosed my cord, and *afflicted* me." We cannot but conclude that this affliction was corporeal, and exceedingly hard to bear. 4th. Hagar ran away from her mistress. The word describes the act of Shimei's servants, 1 Kin. ii: 39, who *ran away* to Gath. Shimei followed them at the peril and subsequent loss of his life, and brought them back. Achish, the Philistine prince, gave them up at once. It seems he had a higher sense of justice, and the comity of international law, than prevails among our modern abolitionists. Hagar's was a simple case of a runaway slave. 5th. The angel of the Lord found her. This is none other but the angel Jehovah, the mighty Redeemer. He found her alone, it seems, in the wilderness, in a desolate and exposed condition. 6th. And what was God's message to her? Like a modern abolitionist, did he give her wings to fly, and bid her be off from such cruelty and oppression? Did he hire some Vanzandt, to conceal her in his wagon, and hurry her away toward Egypt, on whose borders she then was—her native country; or toward some frozen Canada, to suffer in an inhospitable climate? Ah! no. Tell it not in Hamilton, publish it not in the streets of Cincinnati, lest the daughters of Kentucky rejoice; lest the enemies of religion triumph. "And the angel Jehovah said unto her, Return to thy mistress, and submit thyself under her hands." Such is Jehovah's command, to a poor, abused and afflicted runaway African slave. How different the counsels of infinite wisdom, from those of modern abolitionism!

PROOF II.—Ex. xxi: 20, 21. "If a man smite his servant, or his maid with a rod, and he die under his hand, he shall be surely punished. Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished: for he is his money."

This phrase, *under his hand*, may throw some light on the instruction of the angel to Hagar, when he tells her to submit herself *under the hands* of her mistress. It undoubtedly implies the use of the hands in severe correction. Here, we see extremely violent whipping; and, if death follow, immediately, the master shall be punished, to what extent, the law does not define. But, if the slave survive the beating a day or two, the manslayer goes with impunity—"he shall not be punished."

The reason of this law of impunity is stated—"for he is his money." It is presumed, that the interest of the master will be, in ordinary cases, a sufficient guarantee to the safety of his own purchased slave. An appeal is made to the same source of protection in ver. 26th and 27th, where we are told, that if a master knock out a tooth or an eye of his servant, he shall manumit him: his freedom is the master's punishment.

Thomas Clarkson, in Pt. I. Ch. iv, gives a short, and certainly not over-wrought account, of the cruelties practiced upon slaves. In all the world, until christianity ameliorated their condition, the master exercised the power of life and death with perfect impunity, and often in brutal sport. It is so at the present day in Africa, as the Landers and other travellers have fully shewn. To my purpose, however, this is of no consequence. All I want, is to make it evident, that slavery was accompanied with great cruelties, in ancient times. This has been established beyond dispute. Into the details of its brutal horrors, it is not necessary to enter: humanity shudders at the recital, and christianity alone, can apply the remedy.

Let us here sum up. Five propositions have now been demonstrated, from, and by the word of God.

I. That slavery, existed, during the period over which the Old Testament history extends.

II. That the law of Moses permitted the Hebrews to buy their brother Hebrews, and to retain them in bondage or slavery six years.

III. That this state of servitude—this relation of master and slave, might, in certain cases, become perpetual for life.

IV. That the Hebrews were permitted by their law to buy servants from the heathen; to hold them in perpetual servitude; and to transmit them as hereditary property to their children. And—

V. That a very considerable degree of severity in the treatment of slaves was indulged in, during the Old Testament times.

I now add another, which, being a negative proposition, of course, I cannot prove; but which I commend to the very special attention of our brethren in the opposition. The contradictory of it, it is necessary for their cause to prove. Should any of them adventure upon that task, it is no boasting in me to say, they will find an opponent.

## PROPOSITION VI.

*That God has nowhere in the Old Testament PROHIBITED slavery.*

*There is no command to this amount, "masters let your servants go free." The relation of master and slave is nowhere condemned as a sin, and forbidden to exist.*

THE position here taken, is expressed in three forms, to prevent, if possible, all misapprehension. If any man affirm the opposite, let him adduce the proof. If the relation of master and servant, in perpetuity or for life, be in itself and apart from all cruelties and abuses of power, a horrible sin in the sight of God, let us have the text from the Old Testament to condemn it.

Permit me here to throw out a caveat against misconstruction and misrepresentation. Although it is not our business more than our opponents, to justify the ways of God to men, yet, I remark, God has nowhere *sanctioned* slavery. To *sanction*, is to approve of and command as a thing that is right, and that ought to be. Except in cases of forfeiture of liberty, God has not commanded—has not made it obligatory upon man, to reduce his fellow to involuntary bondage. On the contrary, I take the distinction before alluded to, that the Bible *tolerates* slavery. Now, *toleration* is *bearing with*—*enduring* a thing; and it implies, that the thing is viewed as an evil. Job *tolerated* his biles, and the foolish behavior of his wife. We *tolerate* evils that cannot be instantly removed. All wearisome labor of body, or of mind is an evil. All petulant, peevish and vexatious conduct, is an evil. The perpetual harassment to which this Synod has been exposed, from year to year, by the Anti Slavery party, is an evil, hard to be endured: yet the majority of Synod have *tolerated* it—you have fought against it, as Napoleon

said of the Russians at the battle of Smolensk "with passive bravery."

But I hear our *tolerated* brethren say, how long must this evil of slavery be *tolerated*? Are we never to see the end of it? Must all the light of the New Dispensation be spent in vain? Cannot this dark spot be illuminated by it? Will you plead for its everlasting *toleration*.

Be patient Brethren! God has tolerated this dreadful evil, more than thirty centuries of years. And he has tolerated yet worse evils. He has tolerated you and us, with all our sins and corruptions upon us; with all our unkind speeches, and hard sayings, and heart burnings, and jealousies, and anger, and wrath, and murmurings against God. He has borne with us in our censures upon his Word and his providence, for this very spirit of tolerance, to which we are indebted, for an existence out of hell. Why does he not instantly, cut off all evil from the earth; either by cutting us off, or by making us instantly and perfectly holy? "Nay! but oh man, who art thou that replest against God?"

Be patient, Brethren, with me, and with God. Let us proceed to the New Testament. What are its teachings on the subject of slavery? If slavery be the master sin of our world — if all other evils sink into insignificance, in comparison of this giant crime — if this fearful and desolating sin — this soul-damning sin, as brethren in this Synod deem it, abounded under the Old Testament, surely the remedying of it will form a prominent feature of the New Economy. Surely, when the Redeemer comes to cleanse the sanctuary, and to purify the altar, which have, since the days of Gibeon's enslavement, been polluted by slave labor, he will, at least drive away all slave labor from the temple, and the altar. He will speak a plain and unequivocal language. He will make it to be clearly known, that slavery is no longer to be tolerated in the church of God. If Jesus be an abolitionist, in the modern sense, surely his new revelation, will forever wash out the foul stain of slavery. Mr. Moderator, what think you? If our opposing brethren had written the New Testament, or any one book of it, would you not expect

to find a strong, and plain, and unequivocal testimony against slavery, in it?

But now sir, on the contrary, I fearlessly affirm, that there is not a sentence in the New Testament, which, either expressly, in so many words, or by fair and just construction, forbids slavery. To avoid misconception, let me divide this compound proposition. I then declare:

I. *That there is not a sentence in the New Testament, which expressly forbids the having, and the holding of a slave.*

II. *That there is not a sentence in the New Testament, which, by fair and just interpretation according to the rules of grammar, gives ground for the logical inference, that, the simple holding of a slave or slaves, is inconsistent with christian profession, and christian character.*

The proof of the affirmative, lies on the affirmant; let the man, who elects himself to controvert either of these, present his *proof*. But lest none should be forthcoming, let us see how near an approximation may be made toward establishing these propositions in this negative form. Should any person affirm, that between the hours of six A. M. and six P. M. on the 19th of September, 1843, the present speaker had kidnapped a slave off a steamer lying at the quay in Cincinnati, I could prove a negative, by proving an *alibi*—by proving my continual presence during that period of time in this, or the adjoining village. Let us look into the New Testament for abolitionism, and see how far an *alibi* can be supported.

I. *My first subordinate proposition here, is, that the Greek word, doulos, usually translated servant, properly and commonly means a person held to service for life—a slave.*

This word occurs, according to Schmidius, about one hundred and twenty-five times in the New Testament. Of these, omitting the parallel places in the last three Gospels, the following is a general classification, viz:—

1.	It is applied to servants of God and of Christ,	34 times.
2.	To servants of men, such as the householder and the owner of the vineyard, -	34 “
3.	To the king who made the supper, and to him who took account of his servants, -	10 “
4.	To servants of sin and Satan, -	6 “
5.	To the servant of the centurion, Matth. viii: 5,	1 “
6.	To Christians, as servants to each other, Matth. xx: 27, - - -	1 “
7.	To Christ, as God's servant, Phil. ii: 7,	1 “
8.	To Judaizing Christians, Gal. iv: 7,	1 “
	In all, - - - -	<hr/> 88 “

leaving about 37 as parallels.

Let us now see, whether, in all these, the idea of continuous, perpetual servitude be not included.

The first class—the servants of God and of his Christ are life servants; bound under the most absolute authority to honor and obey and submit to his commands. They profess so to be. They have come near to the door-post, and their ears have been pierced through with the arrows of his conviction, and they are his *forever*. Moreover, they were *unwilling*, when he bought them with a price, and they were unwilling until he changed them by his law, and made them “both to will and to do of his own good pleasure.” They are servants forever, “under the yoke,”—“take my yoke upon you.”

Passing the second class, as the one in controversy, we notice the third, Matth. xviii: 23, etc., and xxii: 3, etc. The master in the former, like many in our day, had entrusted much of his property to his servants, to be employed for his advantage; and thus, one of them was found to have acted very unfaithfully—he had squandered his lord's money. His master, just as masters now do, commanded him to be sold, and his wife and children. Now, if *doulos* does not express the relation of slavery—if it mean here a *hired servant*, how can we understand the transaction? Where is the law to sell a hired servant? And if it be said, he was sold under the Law, which makes

indebtedness a crime, rendering the debtor obnoxious to sale, then we have slavery recognized. Take it either way, then, you have the relation of perpetual servitude.

The evidence is equally plain, that the servants of the king, in waiting upon the marriage supper, were not hirelings, but perpetual servants. And here we may observe, as was remarked of the Hebrew terms, the Greek word *misthotos*, means a hired person, one employed to work for wages, for a period long or short as the contract may be: such was the kind of service performed on Zebedee's fishing boat. James and John "left their father, Zebedee, in the ship, with the *hired servants*." And the Savior speaks of this kind of labor as not so reputable and trustworthy as the *doulos*; Jno. x: 12,13: "But he that is an *hireling* and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep and fleeth. The hireling, *misthotos*, fleeth because he is an *hireling*, and careth not for the sheep." It would seem that the *doulos*, the permanent servant, was the more trustworthy. Accordingly, it is universally agreed that the servants in the parable of the supper, represent the gospel ministers—permanent officers in Christ's house, who would therefore be very unsuitably represented by the relation of a hireling, a temporary servant, working for wages. Besides, the kind of service at this feast is just such as slaves, or permanent servants are usually employed at. Farther, the invited guests killed some of the servants, which it is not conceivable they would have done, had they been hired persons. These things, in connection with the fact, that the historian does not use *misthotos*—a word uniformly applied to the temporary relation of a hired person, as faithfulness to historical verity required, if the relation had been temporary—these, I say, must convince the candid, that *doulos* means the permanent relation of a life servant.

The fourth class relates to slaves of sin and of Satan, John viii: 34; "Verily, verily, I say unto you, whosoever committeth sin is the *servant*, *doulos*, of sin. And the servant abideth not in the house [the family apartment] forever: but the son abideth ever. If, then, the Son make you free, ye are free in-

deed." Here the *doulos* is contradistinguished from the son, and also from the free person. So, Rom. vi: 17, "God be thanked, that ye were the *servants, douloi*, of sin." And, 2 Pet. ii: 19, "While they promise them liberty, they, themselves, are the *servants, douloi*, of corruption: for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage;"—he is made a *doulos*. Here again, servant is contrasted with free. Besides, there is express reference to the ancient and universal custom of holding and accounting prisoners of war as slaves. Men are taken captive by the devil, and are the servants of their captor. We need not here dwell, to show that it is a base bondage under which men are held, to sin and Satan, and that it is without limit in itself—it is designed by the master and assented to by the slave, that he shall serve forever; and so it will prove in every case where our Redeemer does not interfere, and deliver by his almighty power, the poor slave from his cruel and yet voluntary bondage.

Case fifth, is that of the *doulos* of the Roman centurion or captain. That slavery prevailed all over the Roman Empire at this time, and that it was a most absolute and degraded slavery, wherein the master had the power of life and death at his own option, will not be controverted by any, whose reputation for scholarship entitles them to any notice at all. We cannot, surely, be expected to prove that the captain's servant was a slave. For a man to assert the contrary, places him *hors du combat*.

Case sixth, relates to the services required from one Christian to another, and they are undoubtedly permanent, and of perpetual obligation.

So the seventh, an insulated instance, describes the relation of Christ to God the Father. That it is permanent and for life, is obvious, and involves absolute submission in all things.

The other insulated case is, that of the judaizing Christian, Gal. iv: 7, who makes the ceremonial law a yoke of bondage, and himself a slave to it.

Thus, if there is any exception to the absoluteness and permanency of the obligation, and the servitude, expressed by this

term, *doulos*, it must be found in the second class: all the others imply entire subjection, and that without limit, as long as the related parties exist.

The servants of the householder, who had sowed good seed in his field; and of the man who delivered his talents for improvement, are so similar to the case of the marriage supper, that the same reflections are mainly applicable to these. So, also, of the owner of the vineyard, Matth. xxi: 35, etc. The only other case in the Gospels, that of the priest's servant, whose ear was cut off—may easily be understood, by reference to the laws already cited, permitting the priests to buy servants: the others, it is not my intention to go over, in the detail. It would be tedious, and would lead to the conviction, that, without one exception, in all the contexts, the idea of absolute and permanent bondage to service, would be found to harmonize best, with the drift and meaning of the passages respectively. Persuaded I am, the case never will be made out, where *doulos*, necessarily means a temporary servitude, at the option of the servant. Many of the remaining passages, will, however, come up in other connections. Meanwhile, I rest in the belief, that the great mass of unprejudiced minds, must admit, that *doulos* properly means a *slave*.

Let us, however, make this clear to a demonstration, by the argument from contrast. If we find two words, used in opposition to each other, the meaning of one being ascertained, will forcibly illustrate that of the other. Now, *freeman* and *slave* are such terms—they express opposite ideas. He who is free, cannot, at the same time, and in the same respect, manner, and sense, be a slave. In different senses, such opposite terms may agree. A man may be a slave to tobacco and whiskey, and yet a freeman, in a civil sense. Still, freedom and slavery are opposites; and if I shew that to be free means a state wherein a man is under no obligation to work or labor for another—the other has no power or claim over him, so as to compel him to work; and if I shew that this state is contrasted to another, as its opposite; then, that other is a state of slavery and bondage.

Here let me refer to the cases already cited for another purpose: John viii: 34; "He that committeth sin, is the *doulos* or servant of sin; but if the Son make him free, then he is *free* indeed." Here *doulos* and *eleutheros*—a slave and a free man are contrasted. Again, in Rom. vi: 17; "Ye were the *douloi*, servants of sin; but being made *free*;" here is the same contrast. So also, 2 Pet. ii: 19; "While they promise them liberty, *cleutheria*, they themselves are the *douloi*, slaves of corruption. 1 Cor. vii: 21, 22; "Art thou called, being a servant, *doulos*, care not for it: but if thou mayest be made *free*, use it rather. For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, *doulos*, is the Lord's freeman—rather freed man—*apeleutheros*; likewise, also, he that is called being free, *eleutheros*, is Christ's servant, *doulos*." Here, the contrast is plain and direct, and three times repeated. 1 Cor. xii: 13, "Whether we be Jews or Gentiles; whether we be bond or free, *douloi* or *eleutheroi*;" Gal. iii: 28, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, *doulos* nor *eleutheros*;" Col. iii: 11, "There is neither bond nor free, *doulos* nor *eleutheros*;" Rev. vi: 15, "And every bondman and every freeman: every *doulos* and every *eleutheros*;" Rev. xiii: 16, "And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, *eleutheros* and *doulos*." Rev. xix: 18, "And the flesh of all men, both free and bond, *eleutheroi* and *douloi*, both small and great."

Thus, by an accumulation of evidence, even to weariness, it is demonstrated that *doulos* means a slave, as certainly as *eleutheros* means a freeman. Here are twelve distinct and unequivocal instances of contrast. I take it, then, as most conclusively proved, that *doulos* properly means a slave—a person under absolute authority for life to a master.

2. *The second subordinate proposition with an inference, is, that, Paul advises servants to abide quietly in their condition. This he could not do if the relation of master and slave was in itself a sin.*

1 Cor. vii: 20—24, "Let every man abide in the same calling, wherein he was called. Art thou," etc, as above. "Ye are bought

with a price, be not ye the servants of men. Brethren, let every man, wherein he is called, therein abide with God."

Here, note, 1.—This is a spiritual call—that inward vocation of the Holy Ghost, whereby a man is made to hear and to obey the Gospel, in a spiritual sense. He who is thus called is a converted man. But there is a modified sense, in which the word is used to signify a man's employment—his state and condition in this world's affairs. And the Apostle indulges a play upon this sense. In verse 17, he settles the principle: "But as God hath distributed to every man, as the Lord hath called every one, *so let him walk*. And so ordain I in all the churches." The gospel does not come to break up the social relations. If a hired girl is converted, it does not hence follow, that she must sit at table, and her employer take turns with her in the house-work, and table-waiting. Paul was not a leveler in this respect. But let every one, pursue his business honestly. "Is any man called, being circumcised? let him not become uncircumcised. Is any called, being uncircumcised? let him not be circumcised." These outward circumstances are trifles. What a man's business is—what his condition in life, is a small matter, if only he has the spiritual vocation. 2. Among the called, at Corinth, were found some servants—*doulos*—slaves. Then sprang up the question: if I am called into the service of Jesus Christ, can I any longer be obedient to an earthly master? Can a man serve two masters? If I have taken Christ's yoke upon me, how can I be and continue a *doulos* to my old master who bought me? Now, it is easy to see, that if Paul had preached abolitionism, there would have been directly a slave insurrection at Corinth. If he had decided, that conversion to christianity nullified the master's right to control his slave, and made him free; it would have brought christianity into direct collision with the civil and domestic relations of the whole Roman world. But Paul was no abolitionist: he would not interfere, in the least, with the master's authority. He had, a little above, decided in favor of another social relation. Marriage, though consummated in a pagan state, he says, is binding, even after one of the parties

has been converted to Christianity. The question had been raised, Can I be the spouse of Christ, and also of a pagan husband at the same time. Certainly, says Paul, the one is spiritual, the other a natural—moral relation: “Let not the wife depart from her husband:” so, here, let not the servant depart from his master. This is the third remark:—The relation is not to be renounced—“Let every man wherein he is called, therein abide.” If he is a *doulos*, let him remain contented: he can be a slave in regard to temporal things; and, yet, a freeman in regard to spiritual things. There is no necessary collision between the claims of the two masters. If your earthly master acts uprightly, he will never require you to do an act forbidden by your heavenly master. But should such case occur; why, then obey God; and suffer whatever punishment man chooses to inflict. 4. Manumission was often practiced in the Roman and Grecian world. Paul advises the servant, if his master offer to manumit him, to accept his freedom with gratitude—“use it rather.” When grace touched the master’s heart, and especially if his conversion, as doubtless was often the case, was brought about by the patient and quiet obedience and manifest improvement of his converted slaves, it cannot be doubted, he often freed his servants: and this is God’s plan of abolition. A person who in the phrase “use it rather,” can find a warrant for a slave insurrection;—for robbery, theft, and murder, gives melancholy evidence, that he himself is the slave of his own pride and wicked passions. 5. Paul points out the method of the spiritual freedom—it was by purchase: “Ye are bought with a price, be not ye the servants of men.” Most violently and blindly has this passage been abused, to the encouragement of slave insurrections; “be not ye the servants of men”—this, we, Mr. Moderator, have heard the subject of song here; contrary to the obvious, plain meaning of the whole context. It has been time after time harped upon, as evidence, that slaves are forbidden to serve men; whereas, the whole drift of the context enjoins submission. “Ye are bought with a price,” now, in what sense? Is it not undeniable, that the price here is Christ’s blood? And must it not follow that the servitude into

which this spiritual purchase brings them, is a spiritual servitude? Do they not take Christ's yoke on them? And yet, these brethren insist on it, that "be not ye the servants of men," is a natural servitude! "Don't obey your masters according to the flesh; resist them, they have no right to command you, and you do wrong in obeying; 'be not ye the servants of men.'" Did you ever hear of such horrible perversion? Can this be the true meaning, when other passages so numerous, command the very contrary? "servants obey your masters." We must say, such a construction is not only violent, but it is disingenuous; and no man could for a moment allow himself in it, but that the heat of excitement, and the warmth of controversy, blinds the mind and hurries the zealot over all rules of reason and of right. No commentator ever entertained such an idea: until modern abolitionism invented it, the world, I presume, was ignorant of such a construction. But it is a fair sample of the logic of excited feeling. Paul urges the *doulos* to abide content in his condition; because, though a servant of man, he is Christ's freedman—a spiritual freeman, but a slave civilly. But he must not abide the *doulos* of man, say these brethren—must not be civilly a slave; because he has been spiritually bought with a price. The apostle may contradict himself, but he must not teach the duty of servants to obey their own masters! When he says, "be not ye the *douloi* of men," he must not mean *spiritually*, but naturally!!

3. *The Third Subordinate Proposition, with an inference.*—*The New Testament recognizes some masters as good men—true and faithful believers: therefore, the relation of master and slave may exist, consistently with christian character and profession.*

PROOF I.—Matth. viii: 9, 10; "The centurion answered and said, Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof: but speak the word only, and my servant, *doulos* shall be healed. When Jesus heard it, he marvelled, and said to them that followed, Verily, I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel." Here is a slave holder whose faith

stands above suspicion. But we have been told that every man who is guilty of slave holding, if he die without repenting of this sin, will go to hell! How differently the Savior and some of his disciples judge!

**PROOF II.**—By Eph. i: 1; we learn that the epistle is addressed “to the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus.” And by vi: 9, we learn that among these faithful brethren are masters: “And ye masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening: knowing that your Master [Christ?] also is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him. Finally, my brethren,” etc. Thus slave holders are recognised as faithful believers; and no order is given to cease to be slave holders.

**PROOF III.**—1 Tim. vi: 2; “And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit.” Here the slaves—*douloi*, are commanded to submit; because their masters are believers—faithful and beloved brethren, partakers of the grace of our Lord.

**PROOF IV.**—Phil. 5: Paul addressing this slave holder says he had heard “of thy love and faith, which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus, and toward all saints.”

So we might cite all the cases where masters are commanded to their duties; for they are in every instance addressed as *Christian* masters; and the same is true of the slaves. Clearly then, the inference follows, that this relation is not inconsistent with Christian character and profession.

4. *The Fourth Subordinate Proposition.*—*The New Testament recognises the existence of Slavery.*

5. *The Fifth Subordinate Proposition.*—*The New Testament prescribes the duties of servants to their masters, and of masters to their servants—enjoining obedience to the one, and kind treatment from the other.*

**MEANWHILE**, no injunction is laid upon masters to liberate their

slaves; nor is there any hint given to slaves, to run away from their masters. All this I shall prove by plain and direct Scriptures, and then shall deduce some legitimate conclusions.

PROOF I.—Titus ii: 9, 10; “Exhort servants—*doulous*—to be obedient unto their own masters—*despotais*—and to please them well in all things; not answering again, not purloining, [stealing] but shewing all good fidelity; that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Savior in all things.”

It is important to remark that this, and most of the subsequent proofs, are found in the midst of contexts where the leading social relations of life are dwelt upon, and their duties pointed out. Here “the aged men,” and “the aged women;” “the young women,” and “young men” are exhorted. In some of the following cases, husbands and wives, parents and children, magistrates and subjects are mentioned—and just among them, servants and masters; recognizing it as an existing relation.

On this passage, note 1.—The servants, *doulous*, are exhorted to be obedient to their own masters, *despotais*, *despots*, *absolute masters*. It is the strongest term the Greek language knows, to express absolute and arbitrary power.

2. That this obedience should be cheerful and hearty—not with an ill grace, a surly, and dissatisfied, and hesitating manner.

3. They are commanded not to steal their master’s property; but to feel an interest in his welfare, and to be faithful in looking after it.

How different in all three respects this, from the teachings of modern anti slavery doctors! They teach that slaves may, and ought to disobey their masters—to run off, to steal their master’s, or any person’s horse, saddle, bridle, food, clothing, anything that may be necessary to facilitate their escape. Such morality may be found in the abolition journals of the day.

4. The glory of God is promoted by the cheerful obedience and faithful conduct of christian slaves. Such conduct adorns the doctrine of God our Savior. Now, we put it to our Brethren, whether this course of conduct, in christian slaves, is not much more likely to win their masters, and all others to embrace the

doctrine from which it springs, than the stealing and running off, which they recommend. Are those who engage in running negroes to Canada, "adorning the doctrine of God our Savior in all things?" We put it to your consciences, Brethren!

Proof II.—Col. iii: 22. iv: 1.—"Servants obey in all things, your masters according to the flesh; not with eye-service, as menpleasers; but in singleness of heart, fearing God: And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ. But he that doeth wrong, shall receive for the wrong which he hath done; and there is no respect of persons. Masters, give unto your servants, that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a master in heaven."

1. Here, strict obedience is enjoined to masters, "according to the flesh"—that is, masters in regard to worldly things. 2. This obedience is not merely outward, but inward; sincerely, and truly rendered. In which he shews how obedience in carnal things is consistent with spiritual obedience to the Lord. In obeying your earthly masters, in all things, [lawful, that is] you obey your heavenly master too—"ye serve the Lord Christ." 3. The servant, *doulos*,—the slave that does wrong—that withholds due service from his master—that purloins, or is in any way unfaithful, shall be punished for his wrong doing. If he obey the counsels of modern abolitionists, God the Redeemer will judge him. 4. As injustice is forbidden to the servants; so injustice is forbidden to the masters. Wrong is prohibited on both sides. For wrong, the master will be punished as well as the slave.

But the question arises, what is just and equal? Our Brethren will say, that it means, among other things, liberty. But this text does not say so, nor any other. On the contrary, it is implied that the relation continues. The masters are masters still; and the slaves are slaves still; and it is to the *existing relation* the whole context applies. If the relation is annihilated, the duties of obedience, here enjoined, can no longer exist. This then is mere subterfuge. What is just and equal? Undoubtedly, kind treatment; comfortable food and

raiment, and instruction in all the blessed doctrines of the Bible. These things, good, believing masters do; and in so doing obey God, and give more than is commonly given to hired servants. We are often told that they ought to set them free and pay them wages. Well, perhaps they ought to free them. But this will depend upon circumstances. As to paying wages, it is notorious, and the abolitionists have shewn it a hundred times, that the slaves are often paid higher wages, than the free blacks or whites: using the term wages in the strict sense of political economy. "We must be careful, says Prof. Vethake, (p. 33) not to confound the real wages of the laborer, with his money wages. The latter, as has been before stated, are only instrumental in procuring the former. The laborer who receives money for his services, exchanges it again for the necessaries and comforts of life, both of a material and immaterial nature, which he is enabled by means of it to obtain; and the money is only transitorily in his possession." The real wages of labor are food, clothing, houseroom, education—all the necessaries and comforts of life. But now it is proverbial, that many slaves devour their masters—they consume more than they produce—they receive more wages than they earn—they get more than is just and equal. And this constitutes an argument, not on moral or religious grounds, but simply on the ground of political economy, against the whole system; which I think entirely unanswerable. It has been demonstrated ten thousand times, that slave labor is upon the whole the dearest, and cannot compete with free labor. Would you, Mr. Moderator, or any of these brethren, take a common laborer, with a family, and obligate yourself to feed, clothe, house and educate them as laborers and christians at your own cost, making yourself, and your heirs liable for them, for the space of forty years? I mean, all moral considerations aside, and receiving the question as a mere dollar and cent matter—would you? Where is the man that would do it? Still, the deficient production results from the system; and combined with a law before mentioned, constitutes the physical necessity, whereby the Creator provides for removing the evils of oppressive bondage. But we may not run out in this direction.

PROOF III.—1 Pet. ii: 18.—“Servants, be subject to your masters, with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward.” This is part of a context, where the relative duties of social life, are enjoined—magistrates and subjects, servants and masters, husbands and wives, are addressed.

1. The term servant, is different; it is, *oiketes*, a house servant. But that it implies here, a slave, is evident, from the treatment to which they were exposed—“they suffered wrongfully”—“were buffeted”—“endured grief,” and are commanded to submit and bear it patiently, out of conscience toward God. Now this is inconceivable, in regard to hired servants, or any temporary engagement.

2. The subjection enjoined is to *despotais*, absolute masters.

3. The term by which he expresses the subjection, is also strong: it means the absolute, rigid subordination of military government; where not the least hesitancy, or delay, or demurring, is tolerated.

4. The fear with which they are to submit, also shews the relation of master and slave.

The whole drift of the passage is plain and easy. It enforces the duty of submission, in all things not sinful before God, upon the slaves; even in extreme cases of harsh and cruel treatment; and that from the consideration that the God whom they serve, will be glorified by it, and the religion they profess, will be commended to the hearts of all men. Could Peter, moved by the Holy Ghost, have done all this, if the very relation of master and slave, was, in itself, and independently of all contingent abuses, a sinful relation?

PROOF IV.—Philemon was a slave holder, at least, if owning one slave, makes a man a slave holder. Onesimus his slave, had fallen under the influence of bad counsel; whether the dictate of his own heart, or of some ancient anti slavery partizan. He ran off from his master, who resided at Colosse, a city in the interior of Asia Minor. See Col. iv: 8,9.—“Tychicus have I sent unto you \* \* \* with Onesimus, a faithful and beloved brother, who is one of you.” This may shew a

special reason, why Paul, in this epistle to the Collossians, which was undoubtedly carried by Tychicus and Onesimus, presses, as we have seen, the duties of servants to their masters, according to the flesh. The letter was carried by a runaway slave, now returned to his sound mind, and hereby commanded to obey his master.

This runaway found himself at Rome, and came to hear Paul preach in his chains, in his own hired house; and was through grace, converted unto God: after which Paul sent him back to his master. Let us note particulars. 1. The apostle recognizes Philemon's right to Onesimus' service—ver. 13, 14, "Whom I would have retained with me, that in thy stead he might have ministered unto me in the bonds of the gospel. But without thy mind would I do nothing; that thy benefit should not be as it were of necessity, but willingly." Paul lived in his own hired house, yet he was in chains, and needed some person to do his errands, lay in and cook his food, wash his clothes, etc., etc., These kind of services, Philemon had done, or caused to be done, for the apostle, when at Collosse, as is most likely, from this verse and the 22, where he requests him to "prepare me also a lodging." But, however much Paul needed Onesimus, and however assured he felt, that did Philemon the master, know the situation of his beloved friend the apostle, he would have most cheerfully consented, to let Onesimus stay and attend upon him, yet could he not consent to keep him, without his master's *expressed will*.

2. Onesimus was a slave. Paul urges Philemon to receive him "not now as a *doulos*, but above a *doulos*, a brother beloved, especially to me; but how much more unto thee, both in the flesh, and in the Lord."

"Not now"—*oukete*—*not any longer*, as a *doulos*. Here is the distinct implication that heretofore, he had been treated as a slave—a *doulos*—but now, no longer is he so to be treated. This alludes to the Levitical law, already explained. Lev. xxv: 39—42. The Hebrew is to treat his brother Hebrew, now his *Ebed*—his *doulos*—his slave—not like slaves are commonly treated, *with rigor*, but as *saukeers*—hired men are usually treated, *with kindness and lenity*. Now, says Paul, this *doulos*

is a brother, and our law requires such, to be kindly treated, and "I know that you will do even more than I say," ver. 21.

3. In this last expression, there is a hint at emancipation. It is highly probable, that Philemon not only treated him kindly, but set him free and assisted him to some farther education, and thus enabled him to enter the ministry. Such things have been done, and are continually doing in our own day, in regard to indented apprentices and even to slaves. Several talented and efficient preachers now in Liberia were thus manumitted. But now, this very thing, which I understood to be admitted by some of our Anti Slavery brethren, contains the whole for which I am here contending, viz: that slavery existed, and obedience was commanded, in the New Testament.

4. Paul does not *command* Philemon to *liberate* Onesimus. He does not even *command* him to receive him and treat him kindly. But he does say he might do this latter—he has authority to *enjoin*—to *command*—ver. 8: yet he prefers to put himself in the position of an equal with Philemon, and entreat him. From this it has been argued—rather assumed, that he had power to order Philemon to *emancipate* him, but forbore to exercise it. This is wholly gratuitous, groundless and false. The *power* which, in verse 8, he asserts he has, he turns into an *entreaty*, and it is, that the master would receive his slave and treat him no longer as a slave, but according to the law, with lenity, as a brother.

5. Another point illustrated here, is the pilfering character of runaway slaves. Onesimus had taken the precaution, in our day given as advice by some Abolitionists, to supply his pockets, from his masters stores, before he left him. Ver. 18, "If he have wronged thee, or oweth thee ought, put that on mine account, etc." So punctiliously regardful is he of the master's rights, that he renders himself liable, as a surety, for all the property the slave may have stolen from his master. Again, Mr. Moderator, let me call your attention, to the strong contrast between the morality of the New Testament, and that of modern Abolitionism. This encourages the slave to disobey, to steal, to run off; that commands him to return, to be honest, to be obedient.

But a recent discovery has been made in the laboratory of Greek criticism. It is now ascertained, that Onesimus was merely the younger brother of Philemon — that he did not like the vigilant and close treatment of his older brother, who was his legal guardian — that he went off, and Paul sent him back. Now Mr. Moderator, you must not smile at this. It is, indeed, ludicrous; but then, laughable as the thing is in itself, we must not always treat things with that contempt, which their merits demand. This criticism is advanced, in serious earnest, and we must bite in our lips and seem to be grave in our reply.

Well, on what is this new theory founded? Why simply on the phrase *in the flesh*, ver. 16. It is asserted that Onesimus was a brother of Philemon both “in the flesh and in the Lord.” Ah! but does the text say this? Or does it say that Onesimus was *beloved* — “both in the flesh” — that is in regard to civil and temporal affairs “and in the Lord” — that is in regard to spiritual things? It needs not Greek spectacles to see, that there is a comparison drawn between, Paul and Philemon, in reference to the measure, or degree of attached feeling towards Onesimus. Paul says that Onesimus is now a brother — to whom? To Philemon and to Paul too — tho’ he calls him his son: — but he is a *beloved* brother — *beloved* to whom? — “to me;” yes and “unto thee.” But in what degree, is he beloved to them respectively? Why, “especially.” But *especially* what? Is it especially *beloved*, or is it especially a *brother*? Which word does the adverb *especially*, qualify? — *beloved* or *brother*? Most assuredly it cannot qualify *brother*; but it can, and does qualify *beloved*: he is *beloved* in a high degree — especially to me; but in a *higher degree* — “how much more to thee” — *beloved*, both in the flesh, and in the Lord. Clearly, if the thing were possible that the adverb, *especially*, and the adverbial phrase, *how much more*, could qualify *brother*, then we would have the ludicrous idea presented, of Onesimus being a brother german to Paul and to Philemon both; but that he was more a brother to Philemon, than to Paul!!”

There are two other objections to this novel criticism. It requires proof that the older brother was a master and the younger his slave, *doulos*. We doubt much whether any sane

man will undertake to prove this historically. The other is, that the phrase, *in the flesh*, is the same in its meaning, with *according to the flesh*, which we have seen used in the epistle to the Colossians, written at the same time with that to Philemon, and sent by the same messengers. The sense is not equivocal—*in the flesh*, or *according to the flesh*, is simply, *as to worldly affairs*; and *in the spirit*, or *in the Lord*, or *according to the spirit*, *as to spiritual affairs*.

PROOF V.—Eph. vi: 5—9, “Servants be obedient unto them who are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart as unto Christ. \* And ye masters, do the same things unto them; forbearing threatening,” etc.

Here again, all the points are sustained. The relation exists. The duties of servants—slaves, are prescribed, in peremptory language. The distinction is noted between the master, as to the flesh—as to worldly affairs, and Christ, the spiritual master, and the general consistency of their service to both; and the reward of faithfulness is held out as motive. The masters are commanded “to do the same things,” i. e. to carry out the same spirit of good will toward them, in gentle and kind treatment, which the servants are commanded to practice, and with an eye to their own accountability to God. Not one word can here be found, encouraging servants to steal a horse and run away; not one hint to masters about the sin of slavery, and the duty of repenting of it, and no command to manumit their slaves.

PROOF VI.—1 Tim. vi: 1—5, “Let as many servants as are under the yoke, count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God, and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren, but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved—partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort. If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing; but doting about questions, and strifes

of words; whereof cometh envy, strife, railing, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself.

We are to bear in mind, that these are among the instructions given by an aged and experienced minister, under the spirit of inspiration, to a youth in the service. When we connect with this the very brief space covered by the whole epistle, we must conclude that Paul thought the subject of slavery a delicate and important one, that he could afford it so much space. Let us carefully analyze the context.

1. The persons spoken to are slaves, *douloi*, and the correlate term is *despotoi*—masters—absolute in authority over them.

2. But the spirit of inspiration, foreseeing the mischief which misguided zeal would occasion in the premises, and the twisting and wrenching of scripture, which would attend its efforts, has appended a phrase, which cuts off the possibility of plausible cavil. These *douloi* are *under the yoke*, a phrase which undoubtedly signifies bondage, deep and degraded slavery. This phrase does not again occur in the New Testament. The term yoke, however, does occur five times: rather the Greek word *zugos*. Matth. xi: 29,30, it is used to signify that perpetual, perfect, absolute, un murmuring and everlasting subjection, under which God's redeemed are laid to serve him. "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me \* \* for my yoke is easy, and my burden is light." In Acts xv: 10, it signifies the slavery into which some labored to bring the Gentile converts, to the ceremonial law. \* \* "Why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear." In Gal. v: 1, the same is called "a yoke of bondage." In Rev. vi: 5, the word is correctly translated a pair of balances."

Let us inquire how the same Greek word is used, in the Septuagint—the old Greek translation of the Old Testament. Its meaning there may assist us here. If it is there a symbol of bondage—a type of slavery, it creates a strong presumption that it is so here also.

It is used some fifteen times as the translation of a word that signifies a pair of balances, *mozanayim*, as in Lev. xix: 36, Job vi: 2, and xxxi: 6, Ps. lxii: 9, Prov. xi: 1, etc.

Again, it is used for *Ol*, a word that means the instrument by which oxen or beasts of burden draw. This is the natural and proper sense: as in Num. xix: 2, "bring thee a red heifer \* \* upon which never came yoke." So, Deut. xxi: 3, I Sam. vi: 7, 10.

Again, it is used in the figurative sense as the symbol of oppressive bondage. Isa. ix: 4, and x: 27, "Thou hast broken the yoke of his burden," "his burden shall be taken away from off thy shoulder, and his yoke from off thy neck, and the yoke shall be destroyed, because of the anointing." And xiv: 25, the same; and, xlvii: 6, "upon the ancient hast thou very heavily laid thy yoke." So Jer. ii: 20, and v: 5, and xxvii: 8, 11, 12, and xxviii: 2, 4, 11, 14, and xxx: 8, Lam. iii: 27, Ezek. xxxiv: 27.

Again, Isa. lviii: 6, the Greek word is used, for one which means the *bows* of the yoke—the bands, or whatever fastens the yoke on the neck; and thus is very suitable to express the idea of bondage. Thus, it is clear, that *to be under the yoke*, is to be in a state of *slavery*. To have the *yoke broken off* is to be *made free*. This will be admitted by all abolitionists: for they use Isa. lviii: 6, very constantly in their prayers, and I suppose, in their arguments: "Is not this the fast that I have chosen? to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens; and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke."

Mr. Moderator, it has been argued on this floor, from this very passage, that we are bound to manumit all the slaves. We have here an admission, which might have saved me the preceding labor. However, it is performed, and you have it. You have also the concession of the opposite side, that to be under the yoke means, to be *slaves*. Let us keep this. The *douloi* of whom Paul here speaks, our abolition brethren admit, *were slaves*. But then what will we do with Isaiah? We will take his language for just what it means. And it is obvious,

at a glance, that the prophet is correcting abuses, in the context referred to. As in the days of Nehemiah, the Hebrews had gradually disregarded the laws relative to the treatment of their slaves: they did not release at the end of the sixth year, nor even at the jubilee—they treated their Hebrew servants with rigor, contrary to law. These illegal exactions he would correct. The law forbid the Hebrew to make his brother serve with rigor, this Isaiah would restore—"to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens." The law ordered the servant to be set free, of whom the master had broken a tooth, or destroyed an eye: this, the prophet enforces, "and to let the oppressed—the broken, as it signifies, go free;—i. e., for his eye's or his tooth's sake. The law made all Hebrew slaves free at the end of six years; and here the prophet, like Nehemiah, enforces the law: "Let every man, who is entitled by the law, to his freedom, go free—break ye off every yoke." To infer from the general term "*every yoke*," that those who were not by law entitled to freedom, must obtain it, is not to interpret, but to pervert the prophet's language. "Servants obey your masters in all things," is Paul's injunction. Now, to infer that they are to do things in obedience to man which God has forbidden, is to pervert, and not to interpret Paul. So here, exactly. To infer from the general term, *every yoke*, that the prophet means to oblige the Israelite to manumit those servants, whom the law expressly says he may keep as servants forever, is not to explain Isaiah, but to pervert his obvious intent and meaning.

Again, the servants in this context are "exhorted to account their own masters worthy of *all honor*;" hence, according to the mode of interpretation we refute, the inference must be, that they should account these masters worthy of divine worship, for this is included in *all honor*; if *every yoke* necessarily means *all slaves* absolutely, and all absolutely are commanded by Isaiah to be set free; then *all honor* must include divine reverence and adoration, and so these slaves must worship their masters as gods. Such absurdities follow from neglect of that canon of interpretation, which sound criticism and common sense have for ages established and deemed incontrovertible, viz: that general terms

must be subjected to such restrictions, as the nature of the subject and the scope or drift of the writer require. In the present instance, by this rule, *all honor*, means all honor properly belonging to the relation of master and servant, as regulated by the laws and reputable usages of the community. So in Isaiah, *all yokes* or *every yoke*, means every one, which according to law and reputable use, required to be broken off.

3. My third remark on this passage of Timothy is, that these *douloi under the yoke*, are exhorted to account their own masters worthy of all honor. The word for masters is *despotos*—absolute lords. It was before stated that this is a strong term. It is used in Simeon's prayer, Luke ii: 29, "*Lord*, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace." In Acts, iv: 24, \* \* "*Lord*, thou art God." Rev. vi: 10, "how long, O *Lord*;" Jude iv, "denying the only *Lord* God," etc. The term properly signifies absolute lord or master, and this has its proper correlate in *doulos*, a slave. Now, these despots are to be accounted worthy of all honor; and christian slaves are commanded not to despise their believing masters, but to serve them—to perform the part of slaves to them—*douleuctosan*. Here is the very contradictory—the exact opposite of abolitionism. Instead of contemning, and despising, and purloining, and running away from their masters, as some teach they ought; these slaves are exhorted and commanded to respect and love, to abide with and faithfully to serve their despots.

4. We may observe again, the reason enforcing this obedience and respectful demeanor. It is, that the religion of these christian slaves may be commended to their masters and to all men. Christianity is not a religion of violent civil and political revolutions: it never organizes a political party. Its interference—rude and violent interference with civil arrangements, would cause its author's name to be blasphemed, and his doctrines to be abhorred and rejected.

5. Timothy is not left at liberty to teach or not to teach this doctrine, of the subordination of slaves to their own masters. Paul lays it on him peremptorily. "These things teach and exhort." It is quite possible that the colonizationists, the only true

and efficient friends of the colored race, have fallen behind the line of duty in this thing. For love of peace—from an earnest desire to avoid violent excitement, we have neglected Paul's injunction. We have so held back, as to produce the impression upon the minds of the opponents of Paul's doctrine, that we felt ourselves at a loss for anything to say in his defence. You have seen them in this Synod, daring, and braving, and bantering us.

“I am for peace, but when I speak,  
For battle they are keen.”

6. The apostle points out the origin of the opposite teaching. And here, Mr. Moderator, I am sorry I shall be obliged to say some things extremely unpleasant—unpleasant to our brethren; hard for them to endure, because they will come with blistering severity—unpleasant for me to utter, only because of the pain they may occasion; the alienation of affection, the heart-burnings and jealousies that will probably follow; not because they are uncalled for and avoidable. They are become imperiously necessary. These very brethren have made the issue and forced us upon it. Faithfulness to God's word will no longer tolerate mincing and mouthing with great caution. We must expound it according to its plain and obvious truth and meaning. If the two-edged sword meet with matter to cut, let it cut. If a festering ulcer fret and fatten on the body ecclesiastical, let the scalpel reach its core, and let the probe search its depth.

I say then, that Paul finds the origin of abolitionism, in the vanity, self-conceit, and puffed up pride of the human heart. “If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words,” etc. Now, to teach otherwise, is to teach other and opposite doctrine, to that which he teaches, viz: that slaves should respect, love, and serve their own masters. If any man teach opposite to these doctrines—if he teach modern anti-slavery doctrines, such as abound in their publications and speeches, he is *tetuiphotai*—*proud* we have it translated. But I appeal to every Greek scholar, if it do not mean *vain, puffed up, self-conceited*. But I will not trust to Greek scholars only. I will refer you to better authority—I Tim. iii: 6. Speaking of the qualifications

of a bishop, Paul says, he must be, "Not a novice, lest *being lifted up with pride—tuiphotheis*—he fall into the condemnation of the devil." The word in our text, then, translated "he is proud," means such a lifting up with pride, as greatly endangers the person's falling into the condemnation of the devil.

Again, 2 Tim. iii: 4, speaking of the last days—the days in which we live, Sir, and of the perilous times that shall come, he says, "men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud \* \* traitors, heady, *high minded, tetuphomenoi*." Does not this mean, puffed up with vain pride and contemptible self-conceit?

This form of the word, does not again occur in the New Testament; but nearly the same we have once, Matth. xii: 20, "the *smoking* flax he will not quench," *tuphomenon linon*. The primary idea is taken from the thick vapory smoke, which ascends from damp straw or weeds, when they are kindled with fire, but before the flame acquires strength to consume the foggy smoke. How forcibly does this describe the state of a self-conceited mind, which supposes itself the origin of light, and truth, and wisdom; and wrapping itself round and round in the fog and smoke of its own vanity, and ascending amid the cloud of its own incense, looks down with pity or with scorn, upon the ignorant world below!

The history of modern abolitionism, as to its origin, will be found to tally with this picture. A vigorous young man was refused promotion in the service of the American Colonization Society; he became offended, removed to a neighboring city, set up an opposition paper, and thus became the father of the modern anti-slavery movement. Who the mother may have been, it is now difficult to tell. That honor may, perhaps, by a little slip of chronology, be conferred on Abby Kelly—at least she is laboriously discharging the duties of a dry nurse.

7. Let us mark, in the last place, the consequences of a system of movements, which has such an origin. Could they be expected to be characterized by meekness, wisdom, humility, brotherly kindness, charity? As well might the lamb and the kid claim paternity from the hyena and the wolf. But see what

Paul says:—"Whereof cometh envy, strife, railing, evil surmings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds and destitute of the truth." To this charge, Mr. Moderator, our brethren, of this Synod, on behalf of the original abolitionists—now the Garrison and Abby Kelly party—have pleaded guilty. They have distinctly admitted the correctness of Paul's prophetic representations. But for themselves—and thus far we gladly admit the plea—and for the great body of abolitionists, they plead not guilty; and attempt to wash their hands of all the infidel party's doings. But we must not—whilst we let off our brethren individually, and as ministers of God, from the weight of this charge—we must not, and we cannot, in faithfulness to Paul and to truth, let the abolition movement escape. We contend, that the *infidel abolitionists—the no government men and women—the anarchical party*, are the real, true, and only consistent anti-slavery men and women. They are the sound logicians, who have fearlessly followed out the fundamental principle of the movement. It were easy to show, that if you once admit the simple relation of master and servant, irrespective of cruelty and abuses, to be in itself sinful, then you must deny the morality of a temporary existence of the relation; for if it is a sin in itself, it must be so whether it be of long or short duration. Surely, if to hold a man in bondage for life—say thirty years—is a sin; to hold him ten, five, one year is a sin too. But the relation of parent and child involves obligations of the latter to obey the former; hence, this too, must be abandoned. Next goes that of husband and wife. Next, that of civil ruler and ruled. The original abolitionists have clearly seen, that all these relations are spoken of in the same scriptures that speak of master and servant; and they have logically inferred, that the arguments which go to make the simple relation a sin, in the one, will equally nullify the whole. The infidel abolitionists are the sound reasoners in this case. We therefore hold the *movement*, as a whole, responsible for the horrible results, which our brethren here deplore, equally with us.

Thus, by six plain passages of Scripture, have I proved the Fourth and Fifth propositions—that the New Testament recog-

nizes the existence of Slavery; and that it prescribes the duties of servants to their masters, and masters to their servants; and yet, in no instance, does it forbid slaves to obey, or masters to retain their slaves: no text commands masters to liberate their slaves.

Let us now hear the conclusion of the whole scriptural argument. I have demonstrated five distinct propositions, in regard to the Old Testament, which see, pp. 41, 42.

As to the New Testament; I have laid down two distinct general propositions, and supported them by five distinct subordinate ones:—

I. THERE IS NOT A SENTENCE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT WHICH EXPRESSLY FORBIDS THE HAVING AND THE HOLDING OF A SLAVE.

II. THERE IS NOT A SENTENCE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, WHICH, BY FAIR AND JUST INTERPRETATION, ACCORDING TO THE RULES OF GRAMMAR, GIVES GROUND FOR THE LOGICAL INFERENCE THAT THE SIMPLE HOLDING OF A SLAVE OR SLAVES IS INCONSISTENT WITH CHRISTIAN PROFESSION AND CHRISTIAN CHARACTER.

The five which go to prove the truth of these, are:—

I. *That the Greek word, doulos, usually translated servant, properly and commonly means a person held to service for life — a slave.*

This was proved by a reference to all the cases of its occurrence in the New Testament, by classes; and by its contrast with the opposite term, *eleutheros*—this means *free*; *doulos* is the opposite and must mean a *slave*.

II. With an inference. *Paul advises servants to abide quietly in their condition. This he could not do, if the relation of master and servant were, in itself, a sin.*

This was proved and the inference was sustained.

III. With an inference. *The New Testament recognizes some masters as good men—true and faithful believers. Therefore, the relation of master and slave, may exist consistently with christian character and profession.*

IV. *The New Testament recognizes the existence of Slavery.*

V. *The New Testament prescribes the duties of servants to their masters, and of masters to their servants — enjoining obedience to the one and kind treatment from the other.*

As to these propositions, both relative to the Old and New Testaments, I am aware the practiced logician, may take exception on the ground of *form* and *arrangement*: he may say, they are not always distinct — they overlap in some places. This is admitted, and was, perhaps, not wholly avoidable, in an argument, designed not exclusively for the practiced reasoner, but mainly for the popular mind. Their truth, however, is the main matter; and to this I invite the attention of any who may choose to reply. I hope the brethren will not flinch. If any man chooses to controvert any one of them, let him do it; not by declaiming against the horrors of slavery, or the impiety of asserting that the Bible tolerates it. Let us not have popular appeals, but logical, scriptural argument. Let no man content himself with a tirade against my inferences; let him come up fearlessly to my propositions: if he can refute them, or any of them, then, he may shake public confidence in the inferences. Until then, they will stand unmoved, in the solid judgment of thinking men, whatever excitement may be raised by pathetic appeals to human sympathy, and the weaknesses of men and women.\*

The inferences which I deduce from the preceding propositions, are two, viz: —

I. *According to the Bible a man may stand in the relation of a master and hold slaves, and yet be a fair, and reputable, and consistent professor of the religion of the Bible.*

II. *There is no power on earth — no authority in the church to make the holding, or the not holding of a slave, a term of communion, or condition of admission to the privileges of the church.*

---

\* It is worthy of remark, that although every effort was made, in the delivery of this speech in Synod, to invite attention to the above propositions, and every thing done which the speaker could think of to *provoke* the opposition to deny them, or any of them; and to bring plain Scripture command to

For cruelty to their slaves, in any form — for unkind and harsh treatment — for violent and abusive language, even masters may be censured, and if such offences against the Word of God be persevered in, may be suspended and ultimately excommunicated. But if a master treats his servants as the Bible commands him to do, there is no power in church officers, to censure or excommunicate him, simply because he is a master — because he holds slaves. Hence, the *Corollary*; Whoever assume and exercise such power, do therein usurp the prerogative of the King and Head of the Church, and expose themselves to the penalties of such as lord it over God's heritage. Such, violate a plain precept of God's word: — "Be not many masters;" "neither as being lords over God's heritage." They thrust themselves into the throne, and exercise a power, which Christ has not granted to the officers of the church; but which he has forbidden to be exercised. They become, themselves, the usurping despots and make the freemen of God their slaves.

You see, Mr. Moderator, I proceed upon the principle, that the King in Zion, only, can settle the terms or conditions of admission to membership in his visible kingdom. If any man deny this, I cannot here enter into controversy with him. But, assuming this as indubitably true, the corollary follows, by an inevitable logical necessity.

What then have we gained by this whole argument? Simply this — *that slavery — the relation of master and slave — not, you will observe, any violence; not any cruel treatment; but simply the relation, is tolerated in the Holy Scriptures.* I have not said, the Bible sanctions it — the Bible commands it, except in the case of forfeiture of liberty by crime. But the

---

masters, to liberate their slaves, not one of the propositions was denied by any speaker, and no man ever asserted that the Bible commands masters to free their slaves. A speech of about six and a half hours was delivered, chiefly in direct reply to this, yet no attempt was made to disprove one of the points taken, nor was one of them directly denied; nor was it pretended by any of the speakers that the Bible commands masters to manumit their slaves, nor was their inability to do any of these things manfully acknowledged by any of the brethren.

Bible *permits* it: no where does it command masters to manumit their slaves.

This, Mr. Moderator, some of our brethren have found themselves too honest hearted to deny. Some have fully admitted it. One excellent brother, seeing no room for denial, proceeded to argue thus against me, admitting the position I have elaborated, as true. What if the Bible of old did tolerate slavery? Does it hence follow that it must be tolerated now? The Bible tolerated polygamy. Here is a parallel case, and you will be obliged by this argument to tolerate this evil. The Hebrews held slaves, and were, notwithstanding, members of God's church; hence it is inferred, christians may hold slaves, and yet be, and continue members of God's church. But, said our good brother, the temper of whose steel I understand, and can therefore make free to try its edge, if this argument is good for the toleration of slavery, it is also good for the toleration of polygamy. For the Hebrews often had a plurality of wives and concubines, and were, notwithstanding, accounted reputable members of the church: consequently, christians may indulge in polygamy and yet occupy a reputable standing in the church.

Such was the brother's argument, as I think every one in the house must have understood it; and, I admit, it is very plausible and would be conclusive; if he would prove one thing, viz: that polygamy is *tolerated* in the New Testament. Then the cases would be exactly analogous. But exact similarity is indispensable to truth and safety, in an analogical argument: and therefore, until it shall be shown, that polygamy existed and was not forbidden, in the New Testament; as I have shown that slavery existed and was not forbidden, the argument is not a tripod; it is only a biped; and a stool cannot stand on two legs. But this *postulatum necessarium*—this indispensable point, cannot be sustained; for it is the reverse of truth. The New Testament prohibits polygamy. Mark x: 6—8, "But from the beginning of the creation, God made them male and female. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh: so, then, they are no more twain, but one flesh." Here is a prohibition.

not only of causeless divorce, but of polygamy. A man can have but one wife, says the Redeemer; and this is the original law of man's creation. Moses tolerated your departures from this law "for the hardness of your hearts;" but now the original law is placed before you. Accordingly, wherever the duties of husbands are spoken of, there can be found no recognition of two or more wives to one husband, "for the husband is the head of *the wife*. Let every one so love *his wife*, even as himself, and *the wife* see that she reverence her husband"—Eph. v: 23. Always, one only is implied. But again, 1. Tim. iii: 2, describing the qualifications of a bishop, Paul says, he must be "the husband of one wife"—and so, ver. 12, "Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife." So Tit. i: 6. \* \* "the husband of one wife." Now these show, that polygamy had, been tolerated, but now is no longer to be tolerated. It is censured as a disqualification for any office in the church. No matter what qualifications otherwise, a man may have for office, if he have more than one wife, he is excluded from office. Now, let our Anti-Slavery brethren produce us a declaration of Our Redeemer, to this amount, that Slavery, which Moses tolerated, is not any longer to be *tolerated*, that no slave holder shall be a deacon, a presbyter, or a bishop. Let them do this and their analogical argument is good, and we will abandon the defence. Thus, we shut them in.

But some brethren in the opposition, seem to me, Mr. Moderator, to have gone somewhat farther toward giving up the ship. Did not your ear catch an argument to this amount? "It is not slavery in the abstract we oppose—we disregard abstractions. We oppose slavery as it exists in these United States. This we say is a sin, and against this we lift up our voice, and would have this Synod to condemn it. Let abstract relations go to the wall, but let us attack the actual, living reality." Surely sir, you heard this. Well, what is its concession? Does it not concede their inability to occupy a foothold on the ground of the civil, social relation of master and slave? Does it not concede that they are able only to assault the abuses, "the cruelty, and tyranny, and oppression, so often connected with it."

I think one prominent debater admitted, in so many words, that he would not, or could not contend against the abstract relation; but against the practical system, he felt able and determined to contend. Well, if they abandon the principle in dispute, let us for a moment look at the practical argument.

Allow me to state it in full logical form, viz:—All things which involve many great and crying moral evils, ought immediately to be abandoned and abolished.

But slavery, as it exists and is practiced in the United States, involves many great and crying moral evils.

Therefore, Slavery, as it exists and is practiced in the United States, ought immediately to be abandoned and abolished.

Is not this the pith and substance of all their arguments? And who will point out one logical defect about it? Notwithstanding its plausibility, let us apply the argument to other social relations, and see how it will work.

Marriage, or the relation of husband and wife, as it exists and is practiced in the United States, involves many great and crying moral evils; therefore it ought to be immediately abandoned and abolished. Is not this identically the same argument? Does it not rest on the same major, viz: all things which involve great and crying moral evils, ought to be immediately abandoned and abolished. \* Do you not admit the expressed minor? Can any man deny that husbands and wives, in the United States, do often quarrel and wrangle in the very matters of duty belonging to the relation? Is there no hellish jealousy, no open abuse of power, no violent treatment, no abandonment, no horrid murder committed? Clearly the minor is true and the conclusion inevitable.

Again, the parental relation as it exists, and is practiced in the United States, involves many great and crying moral evils; therefore, it ought to be immediately abandoned and abolished. Most assuredly, harsh, unkind treatment, violent beating, resulting in death sometimes—lessons of impurity, even to compulsory prostitution; and all the natural results—lying, swearing, stealing, quarrelling, drunkenness—all these

are involved in, and brought about by the parental relation: the conclusion is logical, it ought to be immediately abolished.

Yet again, civil government, as it exists and is practiced in the United States, involves many great and crying moral evils; therefore it ought to be immediately abandoned and abolished. Does any man deny the minor? Will any man say, there are no moral abominations practiced in our government and our politics? Are fraud and villany no moral evils? Are perjury and falsehood no moral evils? Are slander and defamation no moral evils? Are stabbing, and dirking, and shooting men,—with all the blasphemous language which usually accompanies such things—are these no moral evils? You see, sir, the conclusion closes in upon us:—our civil government ought to be immediately abandoned and abolished.

Examine every one of these, and see whether there be any difference in their construction. Persuaded I am, no man, who understands what an argument is, will deny their exact similarity—their logical identity. But will our brethren take the conclusions? If not, will they be so good as to point out the fallacy, in their own argument? or so candid as to admit its existence?

The fallacy here, is in one term, and springs from the accident. “All things which *involve* moral evils.” Slavery *involves* moral evils. Things may be involved *necessarily* or *accidentally*. Blue paper involves arsenic; not *necessarily*, but only *contingently*. Arsenic *involves* a poisonous quality, not *contingently* but *necessarily*. Anger involves moral evil, not *necessarily*, but only *contingently*. “Be ye angry and sin not.” Murder involves moral evil, not *contingently*, but *necessarily*. Thus you see, that before you can draw the conclusion, that our civil government ought to be immediately abolished, you must prove that it *necessarily involves* villany, perjury, falsehood, etc. But that these evils are separable, at least in a high degree, from it, must be admitted, and therefore the conclusion is not correct.

Before you can infer, that the parental relation ought to

be immediately abolished, you must prove, that it *necessarily* involves the evils of cruelty, etc.

Before you can infer, that marriage ought to be immediately abolished, you must prove that it *necessarily* involves jealousy, angry contention and murder.

Before you can infer, that slavery ought to be immediately abolished, you must prove that it *necessarily* involves many great and crying moral evils. If these are contingent and avoidable, the inference is illogical; it springs from the fallacy of the accident.

But there is another question to be met, before you can infer that our government ought to be abolished. Be it even conceded, that all the evils enumerated are not avoidable, that some cannot, in the present state of human nature, be entirely remedied; will it even then follow, that civil government ought to be abolished? Certainly not. The previous question is, would the abolition of our government, because some evils involved in it are unavoidable, be a removal of these evils and involve fewer? Unless this can be answered affirmatively, clearly the inference against it is illogical. So, were it proved, that all the evils involved in American Slavery, are not avoidable, but some are necessarily involved; still it will not follow, that it ought at once to be abolished, unless it can be shown that this abolition would remove the remaining evils, and not introduce greater.

We have been told, the golden rule, "love thy neighbor as thyself—all things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them," makes directly against the very existence of slavery, and leads to immediate abolition. But the direct reverse of the latter is true. The golden rule will not suffer immediate abolition, except in the special cases, where the slaves are at the time in a capacity and circumstances in which freedom would be a real benefit to them. To turn out slaves into the kind of freedom which they enjoy—rather which they endure and suffer in our Free States, of Ohio, Pennsylvania; New York—with the habits, the education, the ignorance of men and business which they mostly labor under, would

be to act a cruel part, directly in opposition to the Savior's golden rule. No man but a fool would wish to be thus set free. No, Mr. Moderator, the man into whose hands Divine Providence has thrown any of his fellow men in this form, is bound by every tie that can bind the soul of man, not to set them free, until he can do it to their advantage. He may feel them a heavy burden—a charge weighty and difficult to manage; but he is bound, by God's authority, to sustain the charge, to endure the labor of caring for them, making them work, feeding, clothing and instructing them, and thus fitting them for the use of freedom, and so leading on to that result, whenever it can be done consistently with the highest interests of the community. The opposite doctrine is radicalism and leads to the subversion of all order and law. We have a sample of it often in the treatment of children. Some parents take no control over their children. They are too indolent, and have too little conscience to feel the obligation to rule their household. Their children enjoy a vast amount of liberty—that is, of reckless criminality—freedom from all restraints; and of course they become the pests of society, and ultimately the inmates of penitentiaries and candidates for the gibbet. But God's law requires and commands parents to rule their children. They have no right to set them free, until they are first educated and fitted to provide for themselves. So masters are bound to keep their servants in bondage until they are fitted to be free. Immediate abolition would be, in almost all cases, a gross violation of the universal law of love.

But let us return to the conclusion furnished by the scriptural argument. Slavery is tolerated in the bible—it is not made a term of communion by the King of Zion. Consequently, the officers of his church have no power to make it a term of communion. Here is the doctrine for which we contend, and by this we hope to save this fair land from being deluged in the blood of its inhabitants, and this free nation from the chains of servitude to European despots.

Should the opposite doctrine prevail—should the holding of slaves be made a crime, by the officers of the churches; the

non-slaveholding States, should they break communion with their Southern brethren, and denounce them as guilty of damning sin, as kidnappers and menstealers, as worthy of the penitentiary, as has been done here in this Synod—should this doctrine and this practice prevail throughout the Northern States, can any man be so blind as not to see, that a dissolution of the Union—a civil, and perhaps a servile war, must be the consequence? Such a war as the world has never witnessed—a war of uncompromising extermination, that will lay waste this vast territory, and leave the despotic powers of Europe exulting over the fall of the Republic? All the elements are here—the physical, the intellectual, the moral—elements for a strife, different in the horribleness of its character, from anything the world has ever witnessed. Let the spirits of these men be only once aroused; let their feelings be only once chafed up to the fighting point; let the irritation only be kept up until the North and the South come to blows on the question of slavery, their “contentions will be as the bars of a castle,”—broken only with the last pulsations of a nation’s heart.

On the contrary, let the opposite doctrine prevail and the practices which necessarily flow from it—let the north pity their Southern brethren who are afflicted with slavery; let the churches of the North deal kindly and truly with the South; let them continue to recognize and treat them as christians, and entreat them, and urge them to give unto their servants that which is just and equal, to treat them as christian brethren; let them aid them in the splendid scheme of colonization; let them seek union, and peace, and love, and they will not seek in vain. Thus, the integrity of the nation will be maintained. The happiness of the colored race will, in the highest degree, be promoted, in the land of their fathers. God will be glorified in the triumphant success of free, republican America.