



The Liberator.

No Union with Slaveholders! BOSTON, JAN. 9, 1852.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY. The Nineteenth Annual Meeting of this Society will be held in the Melrose, in Boston, on WEDNESDAY, THURSDAY and FRIDAY, January 28th, 29th and 30th, 1852—commencing at 10 o'clock, A. M.

Nothing fills us with greater astonishment, than that any persons, calling themselves (in good faith) the friends of impartial liberty, should see any fitness, or hope of success, in the mission of Kossuth to this country. For what is its object? It is to invoke the direct aid and interference of this Government to relieve the oppressed Hungarians from their vassalage to the allied powers of Austria and Russia.

Nothing fills us with greater astonishment, than that any persons, calling themselves (in good faith) the friends of impartial liberty, should see any fitness, or hope of success, in the mission of Kossuth to this country. For what is its object? It is to invoke the direct aid and interference of this Government to relieve the oppressed Hungarians from their vassalage to the allied powers of Austria and Russia.

Nothing fills us with greater astonishment, than that any persons, calling themselves (in good faith) the friends of impartial liberty, should see any fitness, or hope of success, in the mission of Kossuth to this country. For what is its object? It is to invoke the direct aid and interference of this Government to relieve the oppressed Hungarians from their vassalage to the allied powers of Austria and Russia.

Nothing fills us with greater astonishment, than that any persons, calling themselves (in good faith) the friends of impartial liberty, should see any fitness, or hope of success, in the mission of Kossuth to this country. For what is its object? It is to invoke the direct aid and interference of this Government to relieve the oppressed Hungarians from their vassalage to the allied powers of Austria and Russia.

Nothing fills us with greater astonishment, than that any persons, calling themselves (in good faith) the friends of impartial liberty, should see any fitness, or hope of success, in the mission of Kossuth to this country. For what is its object? It is to invoke the direct aid and interference of this Government to relieve the oppressed Hungarians from their vassalage to the allied powers of Austria and Russia.

Nothing fills us with greater astonishment, than that any persons, calling themselves (in good faith) the friends of impartial liberty, should see any fitness, or hope of success, in the mission of Kossuth to this country. For what is its object? It is to invoke the direct aid and interference of this Government to relieve the oppressed Hungarians from their vassalage to the allied powers of Austria and Russia.

Nothing fills us with greater astonishment, than that any persons, calling themselves (in good faith) the friends of impartial liberty, should see any fitness, or hope of success, in the mission of Kossuth to this country. For what is its object? It is to invoke the direct aid and interference of this Government to relieve the oppressed Hungarians from their vassalage to the allied powers of Austria and Russia.

Nothing fills us with greater astonishment, than that any persons, calling themselves (in good faith) the friends of impartial liberty, should see any fitness, or hope of success, in the mission of Kossuth to this country. For what is its object? It is to invoke the direct aid and interference of this Government to relieve the oppressed Hungarians from their vassalage to the allied powers of Austria and Russia.

Nothing fills us with greater astonishment, than that any persons, calling themselves (in good faith) the friends of impartial liberty, should see any fitness, or hope of success, in the mission of Kossuth to this country. For what is its object? It is to invoke the direct aid and interference of this Government to relieve the oppressed Hungarians from their vassalage to the allied powers of Austria and Russia.

cool the effrontery—how characteristic of the man and the nation! What 'fantastic tricks before high heaven' these two men played, at this interview! To attempt to frame any excuse for either of them is as useless as to try to make the leopard change his spots.

When the solemn prayer was ended, when the funeral hymn had pealed, When ye bore his lofty form from the moral battlefield, Sadly came upon a thousand hearts that sound of passing bell, Which told a MAX had fallen in Freedom's Israel.

Full many a year the foe has looked upon that stalwart form, Seen his face set 'gainst Oppression, his broad breast against the storm; We can ill afford to spare him from the ramparts where he warred, Hand to hand against the Falsehood, and the Wrong his soul abhorred;

Though the tall form pass not by us, and the parting words are o'er, Life was given to God and duty, he was faithful to his trust, And has left that priceless heritage, the 'memory of the just.'

His was no sounding creed, no form of hollow, heartless prayer, Nor strove he for the mastery as one who beats the air; But his cheek he gave the smiter, gave his forehead to the brand!

Which lights the rugged steepness of our gloomy mountain way, Glancing along the dizzy heights our weary feet must go, Revealing giant enemies, which we must overthrow; But he dwelleth in the pleasant ways, where angels walk abroad, And basketh in the sunshine, before the throne of God.

Which lights the rugged steepness of our gloomy mountain way, Glancing along the dizzy heights our weary feet must go, Revealing giant enemies, which we must overthrow; But he dwelleth in the pleasant ways, where angels walk abroad, And basketh in the sunshine, before the throne of God.

Which lights the rugged steepness of our gloomy mountain way, Glancing along the dizzy heights our weary feet must go, Revealing giant enemies, which we must overthrow; But he dwelleth in the pleasant ways, where angels walk abroad, And basketh in the sunshine, before the throne of God.

Which lights the rugged steepness of our gloomy mountain way, Glancing along the dizzy heights our weary feet must go, Revealing giant enemies, which we must overthrow; But he dwelleth in the pleasant ways, where angels walk abroad, And basketh in the sunshine, before the throne of God.

Which lights the rugged steepness of our gloomy mountain way, Glancing along the dizzy heights our weary feet must go, Revealing giant enemies, which we must overthrow; But he dwelleth in the pleasant ways, where angels walk abroad, And basketh in the sunshine, before the throne of God.

INFIDELITY! TREASON! HOLY WAR! DEAR GARRISON! No words in our language seem to me more elevated than INFIDELITY and TREASON. They are more suggestive of truth, of justice, of purity, gentleness and kindly sympathy, than any other words.

Intellectual, What spirit and social, moral, and the Infidel and Traitor now represent? The former is he who has ever been the defensive arm of the Government, the latter of the State. Whoever desires or commits a crime or action of the Church is denominated and punished as an Infidel; whoever disobeys its decrees and acts of the State is denominated and punished as a Traitor.

Intellectual, What spirit and social, moral, and the Infidel and Traitor now represent? The former is he who has ever been the defensive arm of the Government, the latter of the State. Whoever desires or commits a crime or action of the Church is denominated and punished as an Infidel; whoever disobeys its decrees and acts of the State is denominated and punished as a Traitor.

Intellectual, What spirit and social, moral, and the Infidel and Traitor now represent? The former is he who has ever been the defensive arm of the Government, the latter of the State. Whoever desires or commits a crime or action of the Church is denominated and punished as an Infidel; whoever disobeys its decrees and acts of the State is denominated and punished as a Traitor.

Intellectual, What spirit and social, moral, and the Infidel and Traitor now represent? The former is he who has ever been the defensive arm of the Government, the latter of the State. Whoever desires or commits a crime or action of the Church is denominated and punished as an Infidel; whoever disobeys its decrees and acts of the State is denominated and punished as a Traitor.

Intellectual, What spirit and social, moral, and the Infidel and Traitor now represent? The former is he who has ever been the defensive arm of the Government, the latter of the State. Whoever desires or commits a crime or action of the Church is denominated and punished as an Infidel; whoever disobeys its decrees and acts of the State is denominated and punished as a Traitor.

Intellectual, What spirit and social, moral, and the Infidel and Traitor now represent? The former is he who has ever been the defensive arm of the Government, the latter of the State. Whoever desires or commits a crime or action of the Church is denominated and punished as an Infidel; whoever disobeys its decrees and acts of the State is denominated and punished as a Traitor.

Intellectual, What spirit and social, moral, and the Infidel and Traitor now represent? The former is he who has ever been the defensive arm of the Government, the latter of the State. Whoever desires or commits a crime or action of the Church is denominated and punished as an Infidel; whoever disobeys its decrees and acts of the State is denominated and punished as a Traitor.

Intellectual, What spirit and social, moral, and the Infidel and Traitor now represent? The former is he who has ever been the defensive arm of the Government, the latter of the State. Whoever desires or commits a crime or action of the Church is denominated and punished as an Infidel; whoever disobeys its decrees and acts of the State is denominated and punished as a Traitor.

Intellectual, What spirit and social, moral, and the Infidel and Traitor now represent? The former is he who has ever been the defensive arm of the Government, the latter of the State. Whoever desires or commits a crime or action of the Church is denominated and punished as an Infidel; whoever disobeys its decrees and acts of the State is denominated and punished as a Traitor.

We are filled with surprise and regret on reading the following letter from Judge Jay. Who could have supposed that such a man would wish Kossuth, as the professed friend of liberty, to pass through this country untried, uninterrogated, and dumb, in regard to our great national system of slavery?

From the National Anti-Slavery Standard. LETTER FROM JUDGE JAY. MR. EDITOR: I observe from the last number of your paper, that you disapprove of the letter to Kossuth, signed by the gentlemen who presented to him the address from the Executive Committee of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

I cannot consent to accept the sentiment which you thus implicitly pay me, because no one is more responsible than myself for the attitude, whether humiliating or not, in which the letter in question has placed the Anti-Slavery cause. I did not sign the letter, because it was to bear the signatures only of the gentlemen who actually presented the address, and I was prevented from accompanying them.

I thought, and still think, that duty did not require Kossuth, in his character of the nation's guest, openly to denounce a system which, however detestable, is beloved and cherished and carefully guarded by his host. He had, moreover, expressed a desire not to be implicated in the particular views and opinions of political or other parties.

THE ETHICS OF THIS WHOLE AFFAIR ARE WORTHY OF DR. PUSEY. In plain Anglo-Saxon, William Jay, Lewis Tappan, and the Executive Committee of the American and Foreign A. S. Society, congratulate Kossuth, as a faithful and true friend of the oppressed.

LETTER FROM GEORGE THOMPSON, ESQ., M. P. IN REPLY TO REV. MR. GUTHRIE'S ANTI-SLAVERY SPEECH. 128 Sloan Street, London, Nov. 30, 1851. MY DEAR FRIEND—Two days ago, I obtained your favor of the 26th, with its accompanying letter, and I am glad to say that it was just what I required to give me an insight into the present state of the anti-slavery cause in Glasgow.

LETTER FROM GEORGE THOMPSON, ESQ., M. P. IN REPLY TO REV. MR. GUTHRIE'S ANTI-SLAVERY SPEECH. 128 Sloan Street, London, Nov. 30, 1851. MY DEAR FRIEND—Two days ago, I obtained your favor of the 26th, with its accompanying letter, and I am glad to say that it was just what I required to give me an insight into the present state of the anti-slavery cause in Glasgow.

LETTER FROM GEORGE THOMPSON, ESQ., M. P. IN REPLY TO REV. MR. GUTHRIE'S ANTI-SLAVERY SPEECH. 128 Sloan Street, London, Nov. 30, 1851. MY DEAR FRIEND—Two days ago, I obtained your favor of the 26th, with its accompanying letter, and I am glad to say that it was just what I required to give me an insight into the present state of the anti-slavery cause in Glasgow.

LETTER FROM GEORGE THOMPSON, ESQ., M. P. IN REPLY TO REV. MR. GUTHRIE'S ANTI-SLAVERY SPEECH. 128 Sloan Street, London, Nov. 30, 1851. MY DEAR FRIEND—Two days ago, I obtained your favor of the 26th, with its accompanying letter, and I am glad to say that it was just what I required to give me an insight into the present state of the anti-slavery cause in Glasgow.

LETTER FROM GEORGE THOMPSON, ESQ., M. P. IN REPLY TO REV. MR. GUTHRIE'S ANTI-SLAVERY SPEECH. 128 Sloan Street, London, Nov. 30, 1851. MY DEAR FRIEND—Two days ago, I obtained your favor of the 26th, with its accompanying letter, and I am glad to say that it was just what I required to give me an insight into the present state of the anti-slavery cause in Glasgow.

I beg leave to express my fervent thanks, in my country's name also, which, amidst the sorrows of its desolations, feels cheered by your country's generosity, and looks with resolution to the impending future, because it is confident that the time drawn near when the eternal code of the law of nations will become a reality.

I thank God that the fate of my country became so intimately connected with the fate of liberty and independence of nations of Europe, as formerly it was intimately connected with the security of Christendom.

I thank God that the fate of my country became so intimately connected with the fate of liberty and independence of nations of Europe, as formerly it was intimately connected with the security of Christendom.

I thank God that the fate of my country became so intimately connected with the fate of liberty and independence of nations of Europe, as formerly it was intimately connected with the security of Christendom.

I thank God that the fate of my country became so intimately connected with the fate of liberty and independence of nations of Europe, as formerly it was intimately connected with the security of Christendom.

I thank God that the fate of my country became so intimately connected with the fate of liberty and independence of nations of Europe, as formerly it was intimately connected with the security of Christendom.

I thank God that the fate of my country became so intimately connected with the fate of liberty and independence of nations of Europe, as formerly it was intimately connected with the security of Christendom.

I thank God that the fate of my country became so intimately connected with the fate of liberty and independence of nations of Europe, as formerly it was intimately connected with the security of Christendom.

I thank God that the fate of my country became so intimately connected with the fate of liberty and independence of nations of Europe, as formerly it was intimately connected with the security of Christendom.

I thank God that the fate of my country became so intimately connected with the fate of liberty and independence of nations of Europe, as formerly it was intimately connected with the security of Christendom.

With preparation to throw off the despot. A great crisis is at hand. And brave Hungary, whose men have been whipped and whose patriots have been slaughtered by the infamous butchers of the house of Hapsburg, will soon rise again. Is there not reason to rejoice, that Hungary has such a leader and European Republicanism such a councillor and friend, as this glorious Kossuth?

With all this before him, the editor of the Liberator comes out and openly declares "Kossuth is Fallen!" Oh, this is pitiable! Kossuth's whole life shows where he stands. In the recent debates in Congress show that slaveholders have eyes to read his language. His character stirs and vitalizes the sentiment of freedom, wherever it comes.

With all this before him, the editor of the Liberator comes out and openly declares "Kossuth is Fallen!" Oh, this is pitiable! Kossuth's whole life shows where he stands. In the recent debates in Congress show that slaveholders have eyes to read his language. His character stirs and vitalizes the sentiment of freedom, wherever it comes.

With all this before him, the editor of the Liberator comes out and openly declares "Kossuth is Fallen!" Oh, this is pitiable! Kossuth's whole life shows where he stands. In the recent debates in Congress show that slaveholders have eyes to read his language. His character stirs and vitalizes the sentiment of freedom, wherever it comes.

With all this before him, the editor of the Liberator comes out and openly declares "Kossuth is Fallen!" Oh, this is pitiable! Kossuth's whole life shows where he stands. In the recent debates in Congress show that slaveholders have eyes to read his language. His character stirs and vitalizes the sentiment of freedom, wherever it comes.

With all this before him, the editor of the Liberator comes out and openly declares "Kossuth is Fallen!" Oh, this is pitiable! Kossuth's whole life shows where he stands. In the recent debates in Congress show that slaveholders have eyes to read his language. His character stirs and vitalizes the sentiment of freedom, wherever it comes.

With all this before him, the editor of the Liberator comes out and openly declares "Kossuth is Fallen!" Oh, this is pitiable! Kossuth's whole life shows where he stands. In the recent debates in Congress show that slaveholders have eyes to read his language. His character stirs and vitalizes the sentiment of freedom, wherever it comes.

With all this before him, the editor of the Liberator comes out and openly declares "Kossuth is Fallen!" Oh, this is pitiable! Kossuth's whole life shows where he stands. In the recent debates in Congress show that slaveholders have eyes to read his language. His character stirs and vitalizes the sentiment of freedom, wherever it comes.

With all this before him, the editor of the Liberator comes out and openly declares "Kossuth is Fallen!" Oh, this is pitiable! Kossuth's whole life shows where he stands. In the recent debates in Congress show that slaveholders have eyes to read his language. His character stirs and vitalizes the sentiment of freedom, wherever it comes.

With all this before him, the editor of the Liberator comes out and openly declares "Kossuth is Fallen!" Oh, this is pitiable! Kossuth's whole life shows where he stands. In the recent debates in Congress show that slaveholders have eyes to read his language. His character stirs and vitalizes the sentiment of freedom, wherever it comes.

PRESIDENT FILLMORE'S MESSAGE.

THE WEEKS of your President Fillmore has arrived... We cannot but be pleased... We must, too, agree with the expressing... We must, too, agree with the expressing...

three meetings, in the Methodist Episcopal Church... Let me again warmly press upon the consideration of women, wherever they may be, the subject of public expressions of sympathy with the bereaved families of the prisoners, and I have done.

Let me again warmly press upon the consideration of women, wherever they may be, the subject of public expressions of sympathy with the bereaved families of the prisoners, and I have done.

there is a colored population of not quite 2000, and yet we have few colored churches... The American packet ship Theodore, from London for New York, was wrecked on sunken rocks off Caribbean Islands, Dec. 2d.

KOSSUTH'S RECEPTION BY THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES. SENATE—WASHINGTON, Monday, January 5. Long before 10 o'clock, every avenue leading to the Senate Chamber was thronged with persons anxious to witness Kosuth's reception by the Senate.

THE LIBERATOR'S RECEPTION BY THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES. SENATE—WASHINGTON, Monday, January 5. Long before 10 o'clock, every avenue leading to the Senate Chamber was thronged with persons anxious to witness Kosuth's reception by the Senate.



From the Ohio Repository.

ADDRESS TO THE NORTHMAN.

Do you ask what I think?—Do you ask what I feel? Come my thoughts from the pit? Is my heart made of steel? Does the lamb skip and play when he hears the wolf howl? Does the nightingale sing in the claw of the owl? Do the deer o'er the green hills go bounding no more? Has the eagle forgot on proud pinion to soar? Have justice and mercy deserted the earth? Love, kindness and feeling the home and the hearth? Could you think that aught else from my spirit would flow? But a dirge for my country of sorrow and woe? A dirge for my country of guilt and of wrong? A dirge for the weak, broken down by the strong; A dirge for the glory that's passing away; A dirge for our Fillmore, our Webster, our Clay? We, who to the few, who have sullied our stars; Who've forgotten our heroes, their toils and their scars! The curse of the victim shall blacken each name; The scorn of the true man shall hand it to fame As a blot, a pollution where'er it is traced, A word to be hated, dishonored, disgraced! Oh, Northman! Oh, Northman! beware of the hour When you sell yourself out to the slaveholding power! When you barter your soul for a five dollar fee, To fetter the spirit that dares to be free! Beware how you take up the shackles, to bind The limbs that have left a harsh master behind; Beware how you stand in the way of the brave, Who has manhood to feel he will not be a slave! Beware, if you covet such bloodshed and strife, How you trifle with what is far dearer than life; For hands strong and willing, from hill-top and plain, Will dash you to fasten the 'Fugitive's chain'!

The Liberator.

REPLY TO A SERMON OF DANIEL FOSTER, OF CONCORD, MASS.

Entitled, 'The Bible not an Inspired Book,' published in the Liberator of Nov. 14, 1851.

Mr. Editor:—A mutual friend of yours and mine called my attention to a Sermon preached by Daniel Foster, in Concord, Mass., Oct. 26, 1851, and published by request in the Liberator of Nov. 14, entitled, 'The Bible not an Inspired Book.' Finding it an able production of its kind—its author apparently, as well as ostensibly, an educated man—the subject it essays to discuss being of the highest possible importance to the best interests and dearest hopes of man—its doctrines being in harmony with what, for fifteen years, I have supposed to be the theological views of the Liberator, and being commended by yourself to the candid perusal of your readers, as of no small importance, and having an undoubted bearing upon all reformatory movements extant, as well as others yet to come—I say, in view of all these circumstances, I feel induced to comply with the wishes of our friend, and offer some strictures upon it, to which, in my turn, I respectfully call your attention, hoping that you will let your readers have an equal opportunity of hearing what can be said on the opposite side of the question; or, rather, of the truthfulness of what is here said. I am cautioned by your friend to be short. With this advice I shall endeavor to comply, by shunning the rhetorical Charybdis of being too lengthy, but I must also shun, with equal care, the Scylla of too much brevity on the other side—a thing not easy in the present case. The first thing which called my attention was the preface in a short letter to you, (a thing exceedingly common in the Liberator,) in which the writer gives full evidence of being a genuine convert to the theology and other teachings of the Liberator, and especially the one under discussion—'The Bible not an Inspired Book.' Making this the title of his so-called Sermon, he gives the following passages for his text: John 18: 37, and John 1: 17—'To this end was I born, and for this end came I into the world, that I might bear witness unto the truth.' 'The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.' How these texts prove the non-inspiration of the Scriptures, or what connection they have with what he calls the Bible question, is difficult for me to see; and the use he makes of them, and the method he pursues to sustain his assumption—the non-inspiration of the Bible—is also to me very strange and extraordinary. Having fixed his issues with his opponents, by giving what he calls 'a concise, candid, and just statement of the evangelical view of the Bible,' he proceeds to try this view by two standards—1st, Christ's life and teachings; 2d, by Reason. Here he states definitely the use he is to make of the selected passages. According to the statement of the first, 'Jesus came into the world to bear witness to the truth'; and, he says, 'I will bring his testimony to bear upon this question, and let his testimony decide the issue before us to-day.' To this I agree. Let us hear Christ, and abide by his testimony. He continues—'In the second passage selected as my text, John makes a distinction between Moses and Christ, or, rather, between the system which Moses established and that which Christ promulgated. Moses gave the law, truth and grace come by Jesus Christ. The contrast here presented is extremely significant, and I hope you will bear it in mind during this discussion.' To this I object, first, that John is not Christ—but the subject is to be settled by Christ and Reason, not by John; second, John was, according to Mr. F., never inspired, and, of course, as liable to err as Moses or Paul; third, I deny the inference drawn from the text, and the construction and meaning put upon it. Nothing, as it seems to me, can be more false, than to set Moses and Christ thus at variance; yes, and Christ and John himself. If Christ and Moses are at odds, the fact must be proved by the testimony of Christ himself, not by forced construction and false inferences put upon words spoken by erring men, upon subjects having no bearing on the question at issue. Our author then proceeds—I shall first examine the Bible—wherein it is mistaken and unchristian. 'I shall then give my own views of inspiration, and of the proper use of the Bible.' In the first proposition, two things are assumed, begged, or taken for granted, without proof, and dogmatically asserted, namely, that there are points wherein the Bible is mistaken and unchristian. The statement and argumentation of this proposition occupies six columns of your paper, and for caricature, misconception and misrepresentation, through the influence of blind superstition, produced by a false philosophy and a false theological education and training, or a malicious misrepresentation for party purposes, or for whatever assignable cause or occasion, I have never seen its equal in any infidel book, not excepting the 'Bible of Nature,' 'Herbert's Letters to Dr. Cooper of South Carolina,' 'Paine's Age of Reason,' 'Hume's Works,' 'Volney or Voltaire—no, nothing exceeds it. Call it Christianity, Garrisonism, Hicksitism, Quakerism or the truth,—that is, the Bible or Old Testament truly represented,—or whatever else you please, there it is, and speaks for itself; and speaks, no doubt, the views and feelings long cherished by yourself upon this subject, and by the Anti-Slavery Church, whose head and leader, father, friend and founder, you are, and whose organ and oracle is the Liberator. If in this I am under mistake, I wish to be corrected. If you, sir, as the editor of the Liberator, and father of a sect, by whatever name you please to call yourselves, as an association, society or organization, please have the goodness to say so, in plain words, and you will much relieve many who sincerely wish to be your friends and coadjutors in the anti-slavery cause, properly so called, who cannot and will not permit the Liberator, as it now is, to be read in their families, nor can they, in good conscience, bid it God-speed, or wish it success, or in any way aid its circulation, notwithstanding it contains much excellent and important matter. I, for one, view the Liberator in almost the same light that you and friend Foster do the scriptures of the Old Testament. I esteem you and your special coadjutors just as he and you do Moses, the prophets, the apostles, Confucius, Zoroaster, the old heathen philosophers of Greece and Rome, viz.: as conceiving of and saying many excellent things, and mixing therewith as much or more falsehood, absurdity and folly. Your theological ointment is full of dead flies. That the whole sum and substance of these six columns is a tissue of misconception and misrepresentation, as before said, is to me as clear as light; and to make it as clear to others as to myself, would be an easy task, all but its length. To copy and comment upon it in a manner satisfactory to myself is impossible in this communication, with the limits I have fixed to myself, agreeably to the advice and wish of my friend above alluded to; and in lieu of doing which, I will, for the sake of the argument, concede Mr. Foster to be right—to have rightly conceived of Moses, his history, his law, his political economy, the spirit of his institutions, his conception and treatment of woman among the rest. I will concede that the Old Testament is just what Mr. Foster and the Garrisonian Church conceive it to be, viz.: a mere mythology—an uninspired medley of strange notions about God, nature and man, and all their relations, connections and dependencies. That it resulted from the darkness of the ages in which it originated, when human progress was in its infancy, if, indeed, it had commenced at all, i. e., thousands of years before the sun of Garrisonism, or of the An-

ti-Slavery Church, or even the effulgent light of the science of the nineteenth century beamed upon the world. The only issue I will here make with Mr. Foster, is, first—What is the testimony of Jesus relative to this Old Testament, or, in other words, of Moses—his history—his law, as a whole—the spirit of his institutions—his reliableness as a historian—the truth or falsehood of his pretension to inspiration, or the reception of his civil, political and ecclesiastical institutions from God, as he pretends? Also, as to the perpetuity or abrogation of what is commonly called the Law, or Moral Law; or, in other words, the precepts, commandments, &c., mentioned in the 119th Psalm, and every where else in the Psalms and Prophets, as well as in the Pentateuch, or five books of Moses? Now, that Jesus ever conceived or spoke of Moses and his law, or, in other words, of the Old Testament, as Mr. Foster has done in his sermon, and as I have understood the Liberator to have done for the last fifteen years, I flatly deny, and join issue. Yet, for the sake of the argument, as above said, I concede Mr. Foster's representation to be the true view of the whole matter; and that Moses, and Ezra, his editor, and the seventy who translated the Hebrew Scriptures into what is called the Septuagint version, are to be taken, deemed and reputed to be just the kind of men as represented by Mr. Foster, and that their works are of the character he conceives and declares. Now, the question is reduced to a mere matter of fact as to what Jesus (if correctly reported) has said upon the subject:—As to Reason and Conscience, they may be wanted by and by, but they have nothing to do with the question now at issue. All we have to do is to examine the record of the four, so-called, Evangelists. First, I will call Matthew upon the stand. He, as a reporter, is my witness. He is, however, subject to the law of cross-examination and impeachment. Question. Mr. Witness, did you know Jesus of Nazareth, the reputed son of Joseph and Mary, who was first a carpenter, then a pretended prophet, or a pretended Messiah? Answer. I did. Question. Did you ever hear him speak of Moses and the Prophets, or of the Septuagint version of the Scriptures, as they were called in your day? Answer. I have heard him speak of them very frequently in public and private during the whole course of his public ministry, or from the time I left the receipt of Custom to follow him. Question. You were then one of his disciples and followers? Answer. I was. Well, let us hear what you heard him say about Moses, the Law, and the Old Testament scriptures. Witness. It would require volumes to relate all I have heard him say upon this subject, for this was almost his only theme of discourse during the time I knew him. The Scriptures were our text book, and it was the business of Jesus to teach his disciples what Moses, in his law, or in his five books, had taught concerning God, Man and Nature; the relation of man to God, of God to man, and of man to himself and to his fellow-man; the promises and threatenings of God to the righteous and the wicked, as the obedient and disobedient to God's law, which we were taught God gave to Moses, and which Moses wrote in his five books. Moses also gives the history of man, or of the world, from its beginning to his day. Question. We are well aware of all this; but we only want a few definite statements concerning Moses and his Law. What did Jesus say definitely concerning them, and especially of the Law? Answer. In his Sermon on the Mount, chap. 5, 17th, 18th and 19th verses of my Gospel, he thus spake upon the subject:—'Think not I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Who-soever, therefore, shall break one of the least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven (that is, as we understand him, shall have no part therein); but who-soever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.' Very much more (I understand Matthew to say) was said upon this subject of Moses' law in this sermon, the grand object and scope of which was, to vindicate and restore the law or scripture from the false interpretation or glosses of interpretation whereby the spirituality and glory of the law or religion of the scripture had been marred, defaced, and almost obliterated during the preceding centuries, since the days of Ezra. Question by the Court. Did you ever hear your master speak disrespectfully of Moses, or of the prophets, as though they were not reliable historians—not enlightened theologians, or in any way incompetent or false in their testimony or injunctions upon men? Answer. Never. Question. Did your master never swerve from the doctrine and statements of the Sermon on the Mount, which you have recorded in the 5th, 6th and 7th chapters of your narrative? Answer. No, never. May it please the Court—You have my whole succinct narrative of the sayings of my master; please read for yourselves, and judge if there be any discrepancies. Question by the opposite party. Have you read my sermon, delivered Oct. 26, in Concord, Ms? Answer. I have done what is equivalent. As a glorified saint, I have come to know what you preached. Question. Well, sir, did you and your master take the same view of Moses, the law and the prophets, and of the New Testament, which I took in that sermon? Answer. No! Verily, the Zenith of heav'n and the Nadir of hell are hardly farther apart, physically, than you and we are, morally. Question. But, did not your master soften the rigors and lessen the penalties of the Mosaic code, and especially of the Ten Commandments? Answer. Nay, verily. Please read my whole report of his sermon, and you have a specimen of all he ever taught upon this point. Question. Did he not abrogate the Sabbath, or make void the fourth commandment? Answer. No, verily. He corrected some of the false notions then prevalent concerning it; but no man, from Moses to his day, ever observed it more in accordance with its nature, and the law concerning it, than he did! Question. Did not Christ introduce a new law, different from and contrary to that of Moses, and make it the basis of his Church? Answer. No, verily; at least, we never so understood or so reported him—did we? Who? When? Where? Question. Well, sir, what do you, including your Master, think of such professed Christians as hold and teach such doctrine as my sermon contains? For, you observe, we profess to be Christians, not infidels. We claim to call Jesus Master and Lord, as well as you. 'What would Jesus say to us if he were here upon the earth? Answer. Just as he said to those of like character in his day. As a specimen, read the 21st, 22d and 23d verses of the 7th chapter of my narrative, which read as follows:—'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say unto me in that day, (i. e., the day of judgment,) Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them—I never knew you; depart from me, ye workers of iniquity.' That is enough. Witness may be released. Now, in like manner, I might call Mark, Luke, John, Paul and Peter; but I forbear. If you dare

call them on to the stand, do it, at your peril. They are my witnesses, and as such you may call them. I will rest my case for now on the testimony of Matthew, together with the assumption that you do not dare to call the rest for cross-examination. Should you attempt any proof to the contrary of Matthew, or should the Court demand further proof, I will call them all on, but I rest here for now. Now, admitting Mr. Foster to have given a true exposure of the Old Testament, then it was sanctioned by Jesus and all his school, and Jesus was as ignorant and as false to the truth as Moses and the prophets. Paul's testimony to this point is the sum of the New Testament.—'Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than the prophets and Moses did say should come.' This I affirm, (and who can deny it?) that Jesus and his whole school of disciples did just as Paul said he had done, viz., never contradicted, traduced, or in any manner spake evil or slightly of Moses or the prophets; but, on the contrary, with all Paul on another occasion, uniformly testified that 'All scripture was given by inspiration of God, and was profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.' 2 Tim. 3: 16, 17. And with Peter—2 Pet. 1: 19—'For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.' Now, if the Old Testament is as Mr. Foster and his coadjutors testify, then we know precisely what Jesus and all the New Testament writers adopted, confirmed, reiterated, or intended to do; but if they were such stupid blockheads as to have totally mistaken Moses and the prophets, and to have embraced a totally other thing than the Old Testament, if Mr. Foster is to be credited, then has the world been deceived, deluded, and led astray by Jesus, as no other man ever did or could do. Yes, and dear Mr. Foster himself seems to have been in the same delusion till within the last three years, during which time he has taken and read the Liberator, the sun of latter-day glory! Poor man! he sat in darkness, and in the region and shadow of death; but light, light from the Liberator, has shown upon him, and now he wants all his poor neighbors to subscribe for the 'cheapest and best publication in the United States';—and no wonder. But to return. The question is—Are Moses and Jesus at odds? I answer, No, verily! Is the New Testament at variance with the Old? I answer, No; verily, No! Has Mr. Foster represented the Bible, either the Old or New Testament, truly? I answer, No! as above. Mr. Foster justly entitled to the name of Christian. I answer, No; not unless he can prove, better than he has done, that Jesus was opposed to Moses and the prophets, and has built his church on a new foundation, distinct from and opposed to that on which the Jewish church stood, which thing I defy the united powers of the Liberator to do. According to Mr. Foster, Moses, like his age, was but partially civilized, not inspired; wrote a false history, or a history abounding with false statements; reasoned fallaciously on many subjects; was superstitious, like his age and times; enacted absurd, wicked, foolish, oppressive laws, &c., and falsely inflicted them upon God for effect. I do not give his words, but will hereafter give a few specimens. Is Mr. Foster an infidel? or is he believed when so called? I answer, if the word has any meaning, he is an infidel, and is not believed. Now, Mr. Editor, I give you this alternative: show that the Old and New Testaments are not on the same foundation; but that Christ and his apostles are as much opposed to Moses and the prophets as Mr. Foster represents them to be, and that Christ and the apostles understood and represented them as Mr. Foster does, and rejected them for the same reason; or, second, admit that Christ wholly mistook Moses, and ignorantly approved of him, without knowing what he did; (in which case, who and what is Christ? wherein lay his knowledge?) or, third, that Mr. Foster makes a mighty mistake in rejecting Moses, and yet cleaving to Jesus; for Jesus is as verily pro-Moses, pro-law, and pro-prophets, as any Northern doughface is pro-slavery—deny this, if you can; or, fourthly, you must receive Moses and the prophets, or, in other words, receive the religion of the Bible, the whole Bible—as Mr. Foster represents it, and as sanctioned by Christ; or, fifthly, you must do, as de facto, you have done, according to the best of my knowledge, judgment and belief, for the last fifteen years, reject the religion of the Bible, as such, as uninspired—a tissue of mistakes—abounding with truth and error, light and darkness, and set up a new, better, yet, a perfect standard of faith and practice. If you cleave to Jesus and to Mr. Foster both, you must have Moses and the prophets as Mr. F. has exhibited them. If you will not have Moses, you cannot have Christ. They are in a sense one and indivisible, as verily as Joshua and Moses, so made by the whole acts and life of Christ himself. Moreover, if you reject the Bible—or the Old Testament, even—and its religion, you must, in consistency, reject God himself, which probably would be no great cross to you. But, in plain language, I reject the sermon, and repel all its blasphemous, and will report the characters upon the author which he has charged upon Moses. He charges Moses with writing false history—misrepresenting the mind and will of God—with reasoning fallaciously—making false pretensions about the origin of his law, and, in a word, of all his writings; he places him on a level with Confucius, and, of course, with political and moral, &c., religious reformers, or pretended reformers, in general. Now, in my turn, I aver that he (Mr. F.) is an ignorant of Moses, of the truth of his history, of the origin, natural character and tendency of his institutions, as he supposes Moses to have been of the subjects and things of which he wrote. Mr. Foster is not a reliable historian—is a most fallacious reasoner, or ignorant or false logician, and, in truth and fact, an infidel, as before said, if that term has any meaning. He is anti-Christ as he is anti-Moses or anti-slavery. He is anti-Bible; and if he knew enough, and was conscientiously consistent with himself, he would be anti-God, or renounce all his late attainments, which he has acquired by reading the Liberator, and go back to his old position, or find a new and better one. To sustain this position, and these allegations, I need only to transcribe the sermon, and add a few notes in brackets; but this I cannot do here. The sermon occupies seven columns of the Liberator, but I must not ask for more than two and a half, or three, at most. I will, however, make a few quotations, in confirmation of my assertions. We have first what he calls 'the senseless story' about Adam and Eve, the fall and the consequences, not in Moses' words, more than in his meaning, neither of which is here; and in relation to his own caricature, he thus writes:—'If this narrative be true, then God did make an arbitrary and unreasonable law, and connected moral guilt with conduct in itself as innocent as that of looking at a flower would be, and ordained consequences to flow therefrom which should fill this world with wretchedness and death. Nor is this all. If this senseless story be true, God did actually tempt man to sin, &c.' It is manifest absurdity, whoever states it, and wherever found, that there ever was a tree of life, the eating of whose fruit would confer immortality upon the partaker. We have, then, no alternative. We are forced to conclude that the writer or compiler of the book of Genesis, in this instance, relates a myth of the dim and distant past, which accorded with the superstition of his time. But he must be mistaken in the whole matter, for if he is correct, God is tyrannical, malicious and unreasonable, &c. Where, then, stands this claim for the plenary inspiration of the Bible? We are next cited to

the story of Abraham and Isaac, in relation to which Mr. Foster says, 'In regard to this story, I affirm that the spirit of Christ and unperverted reason alike revolt from the whole statement, and stamp it as a lie.' Very modest this for a Christian minister to say of Moses, as a historian and prophet of God, equal to 'Confucius, a burning and shining light!' Again, he says of the same story, 'Here, again, the writer of Genesis has related a myth which was consonant with his general writings. In the light of Christ and of Confucius, we pronounce this statement wholly destitute of truth.' Here Moses is denounced, with an appeal to Christ and Conscience, as a liar and mythologist; of course, he must be either a fool or a knave, or both. Very reverential, truly! We are next requested to 'look at the story of Jacob and Esau.' Here, as in both the preceding specimens, we have not a word of quotation from Moses, but only his own construction of him, which I pronounce to be garbled, false and unfair. 'When finished, he calls it as above, 'a myth of a dark age,' with which God had nothing to do. 'My conclusion is,' he continues, 'that the whole is false.' What, then, shall we think of Moses? Is he a true witness for God? a reliable historian? No, verily! (Concluded next week.) AMSTERDAM, Dec. 12, 1851. DEAR SIR: Enclosed are two dollars for the Liberator. As an anti-slavery paper, it is the most reliable and unswerving in the land. Its course is honorable, dignified, and uncompromising. I have been pained that it should sometimes be made the medium for disseminating sentiments not only not congenial with, but hostile to, the great cause of freedom which it advocates with so much fidelity. I allude to the publication of Mr. Foster's sermons, and other matter of a like character. Just in proportion as we weaken the faith of the community in the Bible, we cut away one of the main supports of the anti-slavery cause. When the two dollars which I now send you is used up, you will please stop my paper, unless I forward you another payment at that time. Very respectfully, yours, &c., ELLIS CLIZBE. BOSTON, Dec. 20, 1851. MR. GARRISON: Sir,—Justice to one engaged like yourself in beating down the ramparts of error and superstition, induces me to call your attention and that of your readers, to a very worthy and deserving person now in our city. I allude to Dr. Noyes Wheeler, who has recently established himself at No. 165 Washington street, as a Practical Phrenologist. This gentleman has made himself poor by refusing to prostitute the noble science of Phrenology to the ungodly purpose of upholding the evils of the present state of society, as is done by some distinguished Phrenologists. He is as plain and outspoken as yourself in his lectures and examinations, and on that account fails to receive the professional patronage to which his talents as a Phrenologist entitle him. I would advise all our anti-slavery friends, both in the city and country, who wish to have their heads examined, to give him the preference over those who do not need patronage. He is acknowledged by all who have tested his skill to be superior in examining heads to almost any Phrenologist in the country; but as his honesty and humanity equal his professional skill, he shares the fate of nearly all those who love truth better than profit. I make these remarks without the knowledge of Mr. Wheeler, simply because I feel interested in his case, and desire that such a true-hearted man should not be allowed to suffer. He lectures on Saturday evenings, and gives public examinations, at Chapman Hall, in Chapman place, which leads out of School St., near the Horticultural Hall. Mr. Fowler himself has recommended Dr. Wheeler as 'one of the best practical Phrenologists in the United States;' and other persons, who have known him for many years, regard him as superior to any other one. Yours respectfully, C. STIBARNS. STONEMAN, Dec. 29, 1851. MR. GARRISON: DEAR SIR,—Allow me, through the columns of the Liberator, to speak of the pleasure and profit we have received by two admirable lectures from Lucy Stone on Woman's Rights. She understood her subject thoroughly, treated it candidly, and proved, by incontrovertible facts, that women are woefully degraded, both by law and the usages of society. Her manners are easy, pleasing and unassuming, her language choice and forcible, her illustrations apt and striking. She gives to the work a strong, vigorous mind, keen powers of discrimination, extensive knowledge, and a heart overflowing with sympathy for the wronged everywhere, irrespective of sect or sex, color or creed. With a lofty purpose, and beautiful self-sacrificing spirit, she is devoting herself to the great work of regenerating the race; and I hope, wherever she goes, the women will make strenuous efforts to aid her labors by that countenance and patronage she so richly merits. P. G. From the N. H. Independent Democrat. MR. WEBSTER'S POETRY. Solomon's times were not like our times, or else Solomon was not so wise as he might have been. He would certainly not now risk his reputation by writing, 'There is nothing new under the sun,' since the following original poetry, sent on by Daniel Webster to the New England Society of New York, at their recent celebration of the Landing of the Pilgrims, is 'brand-new,' and nothing else:— WASHINGTON, Tuesday, Dec. 23, 1851. We drink the health of the Sons of the Pilgrims. May Plymouth Rock Stand every shock; And Plymouth shores Maintain their fires, Till they're as old as Noah. May Plymouth's sons Eat beans and buns, Till eating days are o'er; And Plymouth wives Live all their lives, Till they can live no more. Now—INTERCOURSE WITH THE COURT OF HEAVEN.—The Washington correspondent of the N. Y. Independent tells the following anecdote: A gentleman on a visit here, and anxious to listen to the debates, opened, very coolly, one of the doors to the Senate, and was about to pass in, when the door-keeper asked, 'Are you a privileged member?' 'What do you mean by such a man?' asked the stranger. The reply was, a Governor, an ex-member of Congress, or a foreign minister. The stranger said, 'I am a minister.' 'From what court or country, if you please?' asked the official. (Very gravely pointing up.) 'From the Court of Heaven, sir.' To this our door-keeper was rightly remarked, 'This government at present holds no intercourse with that foreign power!'

IMITATIONS OF WOODS AND MARBLE. The productions of Nature in one hundred kinds... TO THE LADIES. AMONG the many improvements of the day... MRS. M. CHOATE. MIDWIFE AND PHYSICIAN. An educated practitioner, and a graduate of the Female Medical School... Phrenology. DR. N. WHEELER. WILL continue his lectures on the subject... TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN. THIS is to certify, that I have, from the date... WORCESTER. Eye and Ear Infirmary. DR. R. STONE. CONTINUES to devote particular attention... PREPARATORY PARTURIUM. OR FEMALE RELAXING EMBROCATION... JOHN OLIVER, CARPENTER. No. 33, FRIEND STREET, (BY SEARS)... SATTLER'S COSMETIC. LAST SERIES. OPEN from 9 o'clock, A. M., till 10 o'clock... CURES WITHOUT PAIN. GOUT, RHEUMATISM, BRUISES, MARKS, FLESH WOUNDS, CHAPPED HANDS, BILES, YELLOW, COBBER, SORE EYES, CHILBLAINS, INJURY BY SPLINTERS, RING WOUNDS, WOUNDS, SHINGLES. TRY IT ONCE. YOU NEVER WILL BE WITHOUT IT. THE GOOD IT DOES IS TOLD BY YOU. RUSSIA SALVE. VEGETABLE OINTMENT. EVERY HEAD OF FAMILIES. ALL HEADS OF FAMILIES. SHOULD keep a Box in the Household... CASE OF ACCIDENT. Price, 45 Cents per Box. J. B. YERRINGTON & SON. BOOK, NEWSPAPER AND JOB PRINTING. LIBERATOR OFFICE, 21 CORNHILL.