









The Liberator.

DESULTORY REMARKS ON DANIEL FOSTER'S SERMON, ENTITLED, 'THE BIBLE NOT AN INSPIRED BOOK.'

MR. GARRISON: ESTEEMED FRIEND.—A short time after Rev. Daniel Foster's sermon with the above title appeared in the Liberator, November 14, 1851, we penned some desultory remarks on the sermon, but deferred sending them on for publication, lest it might be a means of preventing others from replying, who were better qualified for the task. However, on reflection, we said, 'We will do our part, we will show our opinion. God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the mighty.' And, encouraged by your former liberality to us, we now send them on, hoping you will give them an insertion in the Liberator.

We will not promise any logical acumen of the schools, but our wish is to make our remarks free from personal abuse, or dogmatic assumption without proof. Notwithstanding, we consider it our duty to speak plainly, as a dying person to dying persons, on a question of such momentous importance. Mr. Foster says he 'gives a concise, candid and just statement of the evangelical view of the Bible,'—which view is contained in the second paragraph of his sermon. For brevity's sake, we omit quoting it; we admit it to be correctly stated. He says, 'I shall try this view (evangelical view) of the Bible by the standard of Christ's life and teachings, and by that reason which God has given to man, the possession of which alone justifies the statement, that man was created in the image of his Maker.' Where did Mr. F. get the information that 'man was created in the image and after the likeness of his Maker,' but on the first page of the very Book which he is endeavoring to stomp as 'a lying, fallacious production' (!!) We deny that reason alone justifies the statement, that man was created in the image of God, without the moral attributes of God being connected with the intellectual.

Mr. F. begins his attack on the Bible by giving the history of the fall, and, animating upon it, he says,—'We are told God planted a tree, laden with beautiful fruit, the eating of which would give to man a knowledge of good and evil. Another tree by its side bore fruit, the partaker of which would thereby be endowed with power of endless life. We are informed that our first parents were told that they might eat of all the fruit of Eden, save that which grew on these two trees.' Now, this is not a correct history. It was only one tree, the fruit of which were forbidden to partake of, not two. Gen. 2:16, 17; 3:3. Mr. F. says,—'If this senseless story be true, God did actually tempt man to sin, by placing within his reach a fruit pleasant to the eye, fragrant to the nostrils, palatable to the mouth, and forbidding him to taste of that fruit.' Now, here is another incorrect statement. There is not one word said of the fruit being 'fragrant to the nostrils,' and they could not tell it was 'palatable to the mouth,' until they had tasted it; nor does it appear that they were attracted by its beauty, until the lying serpent deceived them. A person who takes upon himself dogmatically to assert, that the history of the fall is a 'senseless story, a myth of the dim and distant past,' (Christ says, 'Cast not your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet,') should at least be able to give a true history of the transaction, which 'senseless story' has been believed by millions, with at least reasoning powers equal to Mr. Foster's, the first one of whom has never yet been found who repudiated his belief, or signed a 're-creation' of that creed at a dying hour. God did not tempt Adam and Eve to sin; they were tempted 'when they were drawn away with their own lusts and enticed.' Did they not enjoy the whole world and its fullness, with the exception of one tree? Talk about the old toper, with his corrupt nature and vicious habits, being tempted when he 'sees the wine red in the cup.' But it is too puerile to talk of such pure intellectual beings as were Adam and Eve, to be tempted by such a deplorable gratification. Granting that Mr. F.'s exaggerated history of the transaction is true, and that the tree had all the attractions he represents, and that eating the fruit was not in itself intrinsically wrong, would it constitute God 'tyrannical, malicious and unreasonable' to make it a test of man's obedience? We shudder at the idea! If man would not withstand such a small temptation, would it be supposed he would resist other temptations, arising from the propensities of his nature, when the time should arrive when he would have temptations unavoidably presented to him? We ask, is there any thing unreasonable in God, thus testing man's obedience?—a dependent creature, thus manifesting his obedience and gratitude to his Creator and bountiful Benefactor? Could man have had his standing permanently secured on easier terms? Reason answers no. And where is there any thing in the history of the fall opposed to the spirit of Christ's life and teachings? True, Mr. Foster's comment on it is opposed to Christ's life and word, but his comment is not Christ's word and teachings.

The history of the world and mankind directly corresponds with the history of the fall. It is manifest that human nature is not now as God made it, either morally or physically, and he who affirms the contrary, dishonors God. One convincing proof of the truth of the Bible history of the fall is the unnatural, wicked oppression of woman, and her servile acquiescence in her own degradation. The prediction—Gen. 3:16—'Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee,' has been fulfilled to the letter, in all countries and ages.

The next thing we will notice in the sermon is Mr. Foster's remarks on the Mosaic code. He begins by passing high encomiums on Moses, and on 'the institutions and great principles he established.' But, behold, what a summerer he makes! He says, 'The law which was given by Moses is based on the sectarian idea. It makes a distinction between the Jew and the Gentile, and which rests on religious forms and descent alone.' Here is another mistake. The law of Moses makes no distinction between Jews and Gentiles. One law governed the stranger and the home-born Israelite.—Ex. 12:49; Num. 9:14; Lev. 33:34. They were particularly told to be kind to the stranger, to love the stranger, &c.—Deut. 10:18, 19. Strangers and Israelites had equal protection by law—had equal access to the cities of refuge.—Num. 35:15, with numerous other passages.

Mr. F. says,—'The law, as given by Moses, sanctioned and enjoined the principle of retaliation. Its language is, An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. The Old Testament writers nowhere teach the sublime duty of forgiveness, and love towards enemies and persecutors.' The Old Testament writers did teach 'the sublime duty of forgiveness and love to their enemies'; and the Mosaic code had a particular statute on this subject. Ex. 22:24, 5.—'If thou meet thine enemy's ox or ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again; or if he be lying down under his burden, &c. &c. Was this law made for the special benefit of the ox or the ass, or was it intended to teach the duty of doing good to our enemies? For people nowadays to leave off their business, and take home their enemy's ox or ass, would be considered an incident worthy of record. The sublime duty of doing kindness to enemies is specially enjoined, Prov. 25:21, 22.—'If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat; and if he be thirsty, give him water to drink; for thou shalt reap coals of fire on his head, and the Lord shall reward thee.' And the evangelical spirit is specially rebuked, Prov. 17:5-24, 17, 18; Job 31:29. Christ says, 'Search the Scriptures; for an injunction very much fear Mr. Foster has neglected, or he would not make so many wrong statements. Let the Bible have a fair hearing, before casting it to the moles and to the bats.' The law did say, 'eye for eye and tooth for tooth'; that is, the punishment would be in proportion to the crime. We have no idea that law was intended to be literally executed; Christ did repeal that law. The Jews probably considered that it should be literally executed. It is not an inflexible test; that because a law is repealed, it was wrong when it was enacted. The Mosaic law was perfect in kind, but not in degree. God saw proper to govern, under the Old Testament, by physical penalties, executed by the hand of man. The world was then in a state of minority. No wise parent would govern adult children as those in minority. God in his providence often visits the same kind of calamities on people which they inflicted on others—or, as Christ says, 'Whoever measure you mete, it shall be measured to you again.' Hear Christ's opinion of the law. He settles the matter, Matt. 7:12.—'Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets.' Mr. F., your own witness bears testimony against you. You cannot suborn Christ's testimony.

Mr. F. says,—'The law given by Moses enjoins aggressive and exterminating war, and then follows a most appalling picture of their blood-thirsty cruelty and slaughter, which (he says) would have justly 'cgled down on the head of a Tamerlane, or Nero, the executioner of mankind.' And he adds, 'Who can wonder that the nations around never embraced the holy religion of the Jews, (astonishing!) and the Jewish institutions, and their established great principles so far in advance of the age, which were to exert an important influence in securing human progress.' He further says, 'We are told that God commanded all this, and that He aided them in this diabolical work; and we are denounced as infidels when we disprove this blasphemous claim.' Well, surely this is very calumnious to be denounced as an infidel! Mr. F. feels very sore under this charge, and calls his opponents infidels back again. Is not that 'returning evil for evil'? Let us see if Christ does not prefer the same charge against you, Mr. Foster. John 5:4-6.—'Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me.' Now, the converse of this is true; if ye believe Christ, you will believe Moses. Christ confirms this view, Luke 16:31.—'If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.' Now, Mr. F., Christ does not call you an infidel, but he calls you an unbeliever, 'who would not be persuaded though one rose from the dead, because you do not believe in Moses and the prophets.' Christ, in the first passage here cited, John 5:44, confirms the encomium you passed on Moses. You say, 'He was one of the remarkable prophets of God, a burning and shining light, as was Confucius.' Christ here says,—'Moses wrote of me'; that is, he predicted his coming, some thousands of years before the event transpired. Now, this proves your statement, that 'he held communion with God,' for he could not have predicted Christ's advent in the flesh, had he not been inspired, in the evangelical sense of that term. Whether ever Confucius predicted any prominent future events, that entitle him to the character of a prophet of God, we leave you to show, as we are not acquainted with his prophecies.

Mr. Foster, you have drawn a most horribly diabolical picture of the moral character of Moses, the honored lawgiver of Israel, the friend of Christ, who descended from heaven in bodily shape to 'talk' with him.—Ezek. 9:3, 10. You have represented Moses as a lying, hypocritical, pusillanimous knave—as a legislator, a partial, sectarian bigot—a malicious, revengeful, unforgiving enemy. 'Moses's law sanctioned and enjoined the principle of retaliation. The Old Testament nowhere teaches the sublime doctrine of forgiveness; consequently Moses was a malicious, revengeful, unforgiving enemy; this aggravated by his enjoining this wickedness by law.'

You charge Moses, by implication, as being 'a bloody, cruel, unjust, diabolical monster, the author of 'merciless, bloody, cruel, unjust, infernal and diabolical laws; justifying, or, indeed, enjoining, cold-blooded, exterminating slaughter, which would justly lay down upon the head of Tamerlane or Nero, the executioner of mankind.' You say, 'Moses's laws oppressed women by partial, unjust and oppressive laws. There is no doubt of the existence of slavery under the Mosaic law. Moses's law legalized and regulated slavery.' The above are legitimate inferences from what you have said against Moses and his laws, and, indeed, what you have labored, with Herculean effort, to make appear, and, in most instances, your language.

If your representation of Moses is true, he was a hypocrite of the worst stamp. You dogmatically assert that God never commanded the Israelites to make war on the inhabitants of Canaan; nay, that it is 'blasphemous to believe it.' Now, if this assertion is true of Moses, he must be a hypocritical liar in saying, 'Thus saith the Lord'—although you say in this, 'he was honest.' It is impossible he could be mistaken, considering the preceding chain of circumstances connected with taking possession of the land of Canaan. Could Moses be mistaken about God speaking to him out of the bush, where he received his commission to conduct the Jews from Egypt, on which occasion, God promised to give them the land of the Canaanites, Perizzites, &c.—Ex. 34, and throughout the chapter. Moses could not be mistaken as to the judgments inflicted on Egypt, one of which was the first-born of every family being slain by the hand of God—the Passover being instituted to commemorate the Israelites' preservation from that calamity; the Red Sea opening to give the Jews a passage, and waters returning again and overwhelming the Egyptians; the Jews being fed by manna from heaven, and the different miracles, which were performed to sustain them through the wilderness; the thunderings and lightnings of Mount Sinai at the giving of the law, at which time Moses 'brought the phrase, Thus saith the Lord'; and the ten commandments, written by the finger of God on tables of stone. He could not be mistaken as to these matters. And you say, 'He had not the moral courage, as a legislator, to enact wholesome laws, consequently, he was a pusillanimous, lying hypocrite, if what you affirm is true.'

This Moses is the monster in human shape which Mr. F. says he 'regards with much reverence and love'; whom he eulogizes as 'a remarkable prophet of God, a burning and shining light, who founded institutions and established great principles which were far in advance of his age, which were to exert an important influence in securing human happiness.' Truly, Mr. F.'s love and reverence are unbounded. We protest against such sentiments, as most contaminating to the morals of community, to say that a person continuing in the habit of committing such heinous crimes as Mr. F. charges on Moses, nay, establishing wickedness by law, and at the same time, be a true child of God. Who is it that may not be 'a remarkable prophet of God, a burning and shining light, (as Mr. F. says) as moral character is concerned,' whom we may regard with much reverence and love? Mr. F. breaks down all partition walls with a vengeance; makes no distinction between the good and the evil; the slaveholder may still hold his grasp on his victim, &c. &c.

Mr. F. says,—'I receive Christ's teachings as infallible; give me the words of Christ, and I receive them as wholly true.' Let us hear what Christ has said respecting a chain of preceding circumstances, immediately connected with the Jews invading the land of Canaan. Christ mentions it as a matter of fact, that 'God spoke unto Moses in the bush,'—Mark 12:26; at which time and place, God commanded Moses to conduct the children of Israel from the land of Egypt to the land of Canaan; and God told him that he would give unto the children of Israel a land

flowing with milk and honey, the place of the Canaanites and the Hittites, &c. &c.—Ex. 3:2. Christ speaks of the Jews being fed with manna from heaven.—John 6:32. Christ observed the ordinance of the Passover, which commemorated the coming out of Egypt, because the night before their departure, the destroying angel put to death the first-born of the Egyptians, and passed over the houses of the Hebrews, without entering therein. Now, where were the children of Israel going, on leaving Egypt, but to the land of Canaan? Could God give them that land without dispossessing the former inhabitants? Christ has testified to the truth of a chain of circumstances immediately connected with the Jews invading the land of Canaan, which proves, beyond cavil, that God commanded them to make war on the Canaanites, and take possession of their land. God manifestly showing his approbation, by miraculous interposition. 'He thus aided them' in what you are pleased to call 'a diabolical work.'

Now, Mr. F., your principal witness, Christ, has testified against you, on the question under consideration, and has justified the history of Moses, and Christ is your only witness. You have barred your second witness, Reason, by your own asseveration. You have acknowledged that 'you receive Christ's testimony as infallible, that you receive it as wholly true.' There is no such thing, according to your showing, as an unperverted reason, and you have especially shown the 'pernicious effects of relying on the opinions of fallible men; and that even the Divine Spirit in man does not, and cannot, insure you against mistakes of faith, of judgment, of practice.' Consequently, you have barred reason from giving testimony against Christ. But reason and Christ do not disagree. Reason says, God has a right to punish man for his wickedness, and does punish him. There is no person, so far as we know, who denies that God does at least punish in this life; and reason says, God has a right to choose the instruments by which He will punish man. He may do it by the hand of man, if he sees proper. The inhabitants of Canaan were dispossessed of their land, and were 'slaughtered,' on account of their wickedness. As they had forfeited their land by crime, God had a right to give it to whomever He pleased. But, under the Christian dispensation, God has taken the punishments out of the hand of man into his own hand exclusively. 'No man has now a right to imbrue his hands in his brother's blood, nor ever had a right, except when God commanded him so to do. Christ was the end of the bloody code. Nor does this show that God is changeable, more that it shows Him changeable, because He destroyed the world once by a flood.—Luke 17:26, 27.—And He has promised He will never destroy the world by a flood again.—Gen. 9:11. We are told he destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah by raining fire and brimstone from heaven.—Luke 17:29;—and we hear of no other cities being destroyed by the same means. This does not make God changeable. He is unchangeable in one thing, namely, in punishing sin; but not unchangeable as to the means. Mr. F. himself says that God will punish the wicked. He says, 'He (God) is the father and friend in whom you may trust with unshaken confidence, that your destiny is secure, if you seek to know and obey his righteous law.' Who denies this? But does it not imply that our destiny is not secure, if we do not 'seek to know and obey his righteous law'? We would have supposed, when Mr. F. was speaking of God in connection with the Mosaic law, that he considered him a being all love, smiling as complacently on the wicked as on the righteous. But now he speaks as if God will punish the wicked. He speaks pointedly of Christ's punishing both for sins of omission and commission. Those who omit doing acts of kindness to those who are suffering, if they have it in their power so to do, and recompensing the crime of those who oppress and wrong Christ's brethren, as if done to himself. Mr. F., in speaking of Christ in contrast with the Mosaic law, represented him as all love and affection, inflicting no punishment, but enclosing all good and bad, in a fraternal embrace, with the exception of the Jews. So it seemed to us.

In dishonoring the Jews, Mr. F. dishonors Christ. Christ was a Jew, and had 'the bloody and cruel rite of circumcision' performed on himself by his parents; a lineal descendant of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and David; was greeted with hosannahs to the son of David! Christ did not consider himself insulted by being called the son of the 'bloody Jewish warrior.' He was obnoxious, according to Mr. F.'s theory, to the charge of Jewish sectarianism, when sending out his disciples to preach, he commanded them, saying, 'Go ye into the way of the Gentiles, and into any cities of the Samaritans enter ye not, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.'—Matt. 10:5, 6. To the woman of Canaan he says,—'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. It is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to dogs.'—Matt. 15:24-28. Christ's personal ministry was specially intended for the Jews. He did not break down the partition wall which Moses built up during his personal ministry. It was Paul who said the middle wall of partition by the death of Christ was broken down between Jew and Gentile.—Eph. 2:14; and it was Paul who said there was 'neither male nor female in Christ Jesus;—that 'Jewish, prejudiced, sectarian Pharisee.' The Jews were a highly favored people, 'chiefly because unto them were committed the oracles of God,' which, according to Mr. F.'s showing of the fallibility of man's reason, are indispensable. But God did not, on account of their privilege, allow them to go unpunished for their sins. He told them, by the prophet, 'You only have I known, of all the families of the earth; therefore, I will punish you for all your iniquities.' Amos 3:2. On entering the land of Canaan, the Jews are told not to follow the abominations of the former inhabitants, lest the land would spew them out also. And when the Jews became wicked and rebellious, they were also dispossessed, and were visited with awful calamities, worse than the Canaanites, who were instantly destroyed. The Jews were also 'slaughtered' by thousands, the residue diminished by lingering judgments, and were scattered through every nation under heaven, persecuted by all; a scattered and peeled people, and they are at the present time a distinct people, dispersed over the world—which is a most extraordinary circumstance, indeed, miraculous. What Moses told them has been literally fulfilled. The Lord will 'send a nation of fierce countenance, which shall not regard the person of the old, nor show favor to the young.' Deut. 28—throughout. God says, Jer. 25:47, 'That he would send Nebuchadnezzar his servant against them, who would make them a desolation, an astonishment, and a hissing.' What is the reason you say nothing against the judgments inflicted on the Jews? Did not God also punish them for their sins by the hand of man, and denationalize them, as he did the Canaanites?

We fear if the United States, as a nation, does not repent of its oppressions, pride and vain boasting, it will likewise perish. Oppression was one special sin God charged on the Jews, for which he said he would punish them.

We must bring our remarks to a close. We would have been very glad to have had space to make some remarks on the Old Testament servitude, but we have already transgressed on Mr. Garrison's columns, for which we hope he will pardon us.

It is our earnest desire to disabuse the Bible of slanderous charges preferred against it, as far as God has given us ability. The Old Testament is the foundation, the New the superstructure. If the foundation is sound, the superstructure will be sound also.

Mr. Foster asserts that the Mosaic law oppressed women. Our opinion on this question is before the public, in our work entitled, 'A Scriptural View of Women's Rights and Duties, of which work, on its first appearance, Mr. Garrison was proper to say, 'Its Scriptural vindication of the equality of woman is triumphant.' For which commendation, we hold him in grateful remembrance.

ELIZABETH WILSON.

THE NEW LIQUOR LAW.

The following is a summary of the provisions of the new liquor law introduced into the Senate of Massachusetts recently, and now under discussion in that body:—

Sec. 1. Prohibits the manufacture or sale, directly or indirectly, by principal, clerk, servant, or agent, except as provided in the act.

Sec. 2. Selectmen of any town, or the Mayor and Aldermen of any city, may appoint agents to sell spirits, wines, or other intoxicating liquors, to be used for medicinal, chemical or sacramental purposes. To serve one year, unless sooner removed.

Sec. 3. Bonds of selling agents prescribed to the amount of \$500. The names of agents to be returned to County Commissioners, &c. Regulations to be prescribed.

Sec. 4. The County Commissioners and the Mayor and Aldermen of Boston may appoint agents to manufacture, or for exportation out of the State, and for mechanical and chemical purposes, in quantities of not less than thirty gallons. Term one year, unless sooner removed.

Sec. 5. Bonds of manufacturers fixed at \$500.

Sec. 6. Record to be kept of manufacturers and names.

Sec. 7. Penalties for selling by a person not an agent.—First conviction, \$10 fine, and \$1000 bonds for one year; second conviction, \$20, and \$1000 bonds for two years, same fine, &c. Imprisonment in Jail or House of Correction from three to six months. No relief allowed under the poor debtor law. Applies to clerks, servants, &c.

Sec. 8. Prosecutions, civil and criminal, provided for. Selectmen and Mayor and Aldermen shall prosecute.

Sec. 9. Bonds to prosecute appeals shall cover an obligation not to sell ad interim.

Sec. 10. Selectmen and Mayor and Aldermen shall hear charges against an agent reported for selling contrary to the regulations prescribed.

Sec. 11. County Commissioners shall hear charges against agents to manufacture.

Sec. 12. First conviction for one not an agent manufacturing, fine \$100, and bonds of \$2000 for one year; second, \$200, &c., or four months' imprisonment; third, same fine, together with four months' imprisonment. Applies to clerks, servants, &c.

Sec. 13. No person engaged in violating the law shall sit on a jury in any case under the act. If a juror declines to answer, when interrogated on the point, he shall be removed from the panel. If he answers falsely, he shall be incapable of serving as a juror in the State.

Sec. 14. The prosecuting officer cannot enter a nol prosequi without the concurrence of the Court.

Sec. 15. Search warrants to issue upon the complaint of any two voters, under oath, that they have reason to believe liquor is kept, or deposited, or intended for sale, contrary to this law, in any store, shop, warehouse, steamboat, or other vessel, or in any building or place, not used as a dwelling; and if used as a dwelling, a search warrant shall issue upon oath of one complainant that he believes liquor has been sold therein within one month, stating facts and circumstances. The liquor and implements of the traffic to be used as evidence. Not to apply to imported liquors in the original packages, but the custom house certificate or proof marks on packages or casks not to be removed, seized, or destroyed, if not proved to be imported, to be destroyed by order of Court.

Sec. 16. Upon proof that seized liquors were purchased and kept for a purpose lawful under the act, they shall be delivered up to the owner.

Sec. 17. Bonds for fine and costs in case of appeal from an order of Court to destroy seized liquors.

Sec. 18. A seizing liquor near any public shop, such as cattle farm, muster, &c., and thirty days' imprisonment.

Sec. 19. No suit to be maintained for liquors sold in violation of the law, nor for recovery of the possession of liquors parted with in violation of the law.

Sec. 20. The act to take effect in sixty days from and after its passage. Existing laws inconsistent therewith repealed; but pending prosecutions not to be affected by it.

The Essex Freeman, a Free Soil paper, gives the following notice of a recent discourse in Salem, by Parker Pillsbury:—

MR. PILLSBURY'S DISCOURSE.—The sermon in Lyceum Hall, on Saturday evening, by Parker Pillsbury, was very able and impressive, and was heard with attention and satisfaction by a large audience. Mr. Pillsbury first read the sixth chapter of Matthew in a serious and emphatic manner. An opportunity was then given for oral prayer by any one whose duty or privilege it was to engage in it, of which no one took advantage. Mr. Pillsbury then proceeded to read a written sermon, the title of which was, 'The peace on earth.' The purpose of the discourse was to show that the progress of truth in this world is always accompanied by agitation, opposition and violence. This was illustrated by reference to the history of Christianity, of the Protestant Reformation, of the American colonies, and also to the temperance cause, the peace cause, and the anti-slavery reform. The discourse occupied two hours, and was a logical and vigorous discussion of the subject mentioned, and neither in spirit, language, nor manner did we find any thing warranting the sweeping and unprincipled attacks lately made upon Mr. Pillsbury. Much was said of the peace cause, but all was serious, reverent, and in accordance with the sanctities of the time and the moral elevation of the subject. We hope it was heard by some who have swallowed as true the silly and false dog-story of the Register, as amplified in the tedious twaddle of the gurgulous 'Sigma' of the Transcript. Certainly, no one could take exception to the fact, that the peace cause, unless they are such over-ripe, sensitive and thin-skinned people, as to be totally unfit for this homely world. Mr. Pillsbury assailed no man's faith or doctrine, though he was not sparing in his denunciation of the monster of the day.

BENEFIT OF THE CLOTH. Clergymen sometimes let themselves down to familiar ways as well as other people. Witness the following note from Rev. E. L. Magoon, to Mrs. Kate Sedgwick, brought to light in the Forester case:—

DEAR 'KATE'—Your kind invitation to 'eatin,' at 3 P. M., came to hand at 11 this morning. I posted to your tabernacle, and now here I sit, to say that it is impossible utterly to be with you as you desired. At the hour you name, the dead are to be buried, and at almost every other hour for many days and nights to come, I shall be up to my eyes in work. Last week I was in four congregations in Providence, Boston, and New York, and next week—but no matter. Wife and I send lots of love.

Yours pertinaciously, MAGOON.

[From the Philadelphia Freeman.]

THE CLIMAX OF SHAMEFULNESS.—The man who figured most prominently in the Kossuth meeting at Harrisburg, and who was actually selected by the citizens of that place to go to Baltimore to convey their invitation to the illustrious Fugitive, was Commissioner McAllister, the very basest of the whole tribe of Northern slave-catchers, and the only one, so far as we know, who has ever cried and surrendered a slave in the darkness of the early morning, to save the master the annoyance of a trial by daylight. The creature actually had the impudence to mouth a speech to Kossuth, filled with high sounding eulogiums of Liberty and expressions of sympathy for him as a fugitive from oppression! Satan has hitherto stood unrivaled for impudence, and his appearance 'among the sons of God' seemed to have him beyond successful competition in that line; but his bold and audacious majesty does not send his list to McAllister, he will prove himself incapable of appreciating the merits of a rival who has beat him all hollow!

The Springfield Republican learns that Mrs. Jenny Lee Goldsmith had purchased a farm in Northampton, Mass., with a view of having a habitation as well as a name in that place.



CURES WITHOUT FAIL. BUNNET'S RUSSIA SALVE. FLESH WOUNDS, CHAPPED HANDS, SORES, CHILBLAINS, CHURCHMAN'S OINTMENT.

TRY IT ONCE, AND YOU NEVER WILL BE WITHOUT IT. THE GOOD IT DOES IS FELT AT ONCE. RUSSIA SALVE. VEGETABLE OINTMENT. EVERY MOTHER WITH CHILDREN. ALL HEADS OF FAMILIES. PRICE, 25 CENTS PER BOX.

IMITATIONS OF WOODS AND MARBLES. LIGHT and dark Oak, Maple, Black Walnut, &c. in wood, Rosewood and Mahogany finish. MRS. M. CHOATE, MIDWIFE AND PHYSICIAN.

TO THE LADIES. AMONG the many improvements of the day, a most for the better promotion of female comfort. MRS. M. CHOATE, MIDWIFE AND PHYSICIAN.

THE PRACTICAL CHRISTIAN. A Fortnightly Paper: the Organ of the BOSTON COMMUNITY, Milford, Mass.

MISS H. MARTINEAU'S NEW BOOK. ON THE LAWS OF MAN'S NATURE AND DEVELOPMENT. BY HARRIET MARTINEAU AND H. G. ARTHUR.

HIGHLY IMPORTANT TO FEMALE DEVELOPMENT. PREPARATORY PARTURITION. OR FEMALE RELAXING EMBROCATION. FOR MITIGATING THE PAINS OF CHILD-BIRTH.

DISSOLUTION OF PARTNERSHIP. NOTICE is hereby given that the Partnership heretofore existing under the firm of Smith, O'Brien & Co., is this day dissolved.

BOOKS. BELLA MARSH, No. 25 Cornhill, has the following valuable books, viz: The Slave or Memoirs of Anthony Moore.

THE SPOONER ARGUMENT ON THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF SLAVERY. SPOONER'S DEFENCE OF FUGITIVE SLAVES AGAINST THE ACTS OF CONGRESS OF FEBRUARY 12, 1850.

THE GREAT HARMONIC, vol. 2.—The Teacher, by A. J. Davis. The Philosophy of Spiritual Interference, &c. do do of Special Providence.—A Vision.

J. B. YERRINGTON & SONS, BOOK, NEWSPAPER AND JOB PRINTERS. LIBERTY OFFICE, 21 CORNHILL.