

The Weekly Mariettian.

Devoted to Politics, Literature, Agriculture, Horticulture, The Fine and Useful Arts, General News of the Day, Local Information, &c., &c.

F. L. Baker, Editor and Proprietor.

Terms,—One Dollar a Year

SEVENTH YEAR.

MARIETTA, PA., SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1861.

NO. 29.

The Weekly Mariettian
IS PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, BY
Frederick L. Baker,
AT ONE DOLLAR PER ANNUM,
PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

PUBLICATION OFFICE in the second story of CRULL'S ROW, on Front Street, five doors East of Mrs. Finley's Hotel, MARIETTA, LAKEVIEW COURT, PENN.
If subscriptions be not paid within six months, \$1.25 will be charged, and if delayed until the expiration of the year, \$1.50 will be charged. Any person sending us five new subscribers shall have a sixth copy for his trouble. No subscription received for a less period than six months, and no paper will be discontinued until all arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the publisher. A failure to notify a discontinuance at the expiration of the term subscribed for, will be considered a new engagement.

ADVERTISING RATES: One square (12 lines, or less) 50 cents for the first insertion and 25 cents for each subsequent insertion. Professional and Business cards, of six lines or less at \$3 per annum. Notices in the reading columns, five cents a line. Marriages and Deaths, the simple announcement, FREE; but for any additional lines, five cents a line. Having recently added a large lot of new JOHNSON AND COMPANY, we are prepared to do all kinds of PLAIN AND ORNAMENTAL PRINTING, at short notice and reasonable prices. A liberal discount made to quarterly, half-yearly or yearly advertisers.

Borough Directory.

Chief Burgess, Samuel D. Miller,
Assistant Burgess, Peter Baker,
Town Council, Barr Spangler, (President) John Crull, Thomas Stence, Ed. P. Trainer, Henry S. Libhart,
Town Clerk, Theo. Hiestand,
Treasurer, John Auer,
Assessor of Taxes, William Child, Jun.,
Collector of Taxes, Frederick L. Baker,
Justice of the Peace, Emanuel D. Roath,
High Constable, Absalom Emswiler,
Assistant Constable, Franklin K. Mosey,
Regulators, John H. Goodman, E. D. Roath,
Superior, Samuel Hipple, Sen.,
School Directors, John Jay Libhart, President, E. D. Roath, Treasurer, C. A. Schaffner, Secretary, John K. Fidler, Aaron B. Grosh, Jonathan M. Lazzeroni,
Post Office Hours: The Post Office will be open from 7 o'clock in the morning until 8 in the evening. Chas. Kelly, Postmaster.
Beneficial Societies: THE HARMONY, A. N. Cassel, President; John Jay Libhart, Treasurer; John Jay Libhart, Secretary. THE PROTECTOR, John Jay Libhart, President; Abram Cassel, Treasurer; Wm. Child, Jr., Secretary.

WHEN I MEAN TO MARRY.

BY JOHN G. SAKE.

When do I mean to marry?—Well—
'Tis idle to dispute with fate;
But if you choose to hear me tell,
Pray listen, while I fix the date—
When daughters haste, with eager feet,
A mother's daily toil to share;
Can make the puddings which they eat,
And mend the stockings which they wear;
When maidens look upon a man
As in himself what they would marry,
And not as army soldiers scan
A sutler or a commissary;
When gentle ladies who have got
The offer of a lover's hand,
Consent to share his "earthly lot,"
And do not mean his lot of land;
When young mechanics are allowed
To find and wed the farmers' girls
Who don't expect to be endowed
With rubies, diamonds, and pearls;
When wives, in short, will feelly give
Their hearts and hands to aid their spouses,
And live as they were wont to live,
Within their sires' one-story houses;
Then, madam—if I'm not too old—
Rejected to quit this lonely life,
I'll brush my beard, cease to scold,
And look about me for a wife!

SPECIAL TRAIN FOR PRESIDENT LINCOLN.

We learn that the tender of a special train to the President elect, by the President of the Pittsburgh, Fort Wayne and Chicago Railroad, has not yet been accepted, owing to the impossibility of determining definitely what route will be taken. The above named company propose that the "iron locomotive car," which will hold fifty persons comfortably, shall be used if desired, or a full train for the President and as many friends as shall desire to accompany him, will be made up for the purpose. The officers of the Pennsylvania Central have joined the Pittsburgh, Fort Wayne and Chicago in their invitation, and propose to furnish the magnificent Prince of Wales car to Mr. Lincoln's party, and make arrangements to run the same through to Baltimore, if desired. It is evident that the President elect may travel in royal style, if he wishes to do so, all the way to Washington.—*Harrisburg Telegraph.*

EXECUTIVE WARRANT.—Gov. Banks and the Executive Council of 1860 closed up their labors on Saturday, and among their last doings was the issue of a warrant for the execution of Alexander Desmarceaux, at Springfield, Friday, March 29. Desmarceaux, is a young Frenchman, and was tried and sentenced last May, for the rape and murder of the child Augustine Lucas, at Chiopee, in the autumn of 1855.

Thoughts on a Sermon,

Entitled "The Character and Influence of Abolitionism: Sermon preached in the First Presbyterian Church of Brooklyn, New-York, on Sunday evening, Dec. 9, 1860, by Rev. HENRY J. VAN DYKE. As reported for the 'New-York Herald.' Washington: Henry Polkington, Printer, 375 D. Street, 1860."

(CONTINUED.)

Mr. Van Dyke's text is 1st Timothy vi: 1-5. It is the only passage from the New Testament (as Levit. xxv is the only one from the Old) quoted by him in proof that slavery is a sacred institution, sanctioned by God, his Son and the Apostles. He does not, as in the Old Testament, claim it to be a divine institution; for it is Grecian and Roman slavery he now deals with; but he claims a semi-approval of it, from the silence of Christ and his Apostles in regard to it. He gives a brief and correct picture of Grecian and Roman slavery—its prevalence and extent, its powers of life and death over the slave, and its intimate interfusion with social and civil institutions—but he withholds the fact that all this slavery was not that of color or of race, but a slavery of all colors, nations and races—of the white to the colored, as well as the colored to the white. And he alleges, as proof that this slavery was approved of God,—it is a remarkable fact that the New Testament is utterly silent in regard to the alleged sinfulness of slaveholding—"there is not one distinct and explicit denunciation of slaveholding, nor one precept requiring the master to emancipate his slaves"—it "is never spoken of, except in respectful terms."

Silence in regard to any special act, is no proof of commendation thereof, or even its mere innocency. Take piracy, for instance, a conglomeration of cruel robbery and murder by wholesale. It was so common at the Christian era, and earlier, that villages and cities were usually built at a distance from the sea-coast to be secure from its ravages: and most slave markets were furnished by its successes. Yet, amid the many crimes denounced and forbidden by the Saviour and his Apostles, piracy is never distinctly and explicitly forbidden! Even manstealing, so strongly forbidden by the Law, is not named in the Gospel, and "men-stealers," only once—in 1 Tim. i: 10. Yet who doubts that these, and other unnamed crimes were actually forbidden in the numerous precepts which strike at their very source, root and origin!

Mr. Van Dyke repels with seeming horror Dr. Wayland's explanation of this silence and seemingly tacit indifference to slavery and other political evils. The Dr. says—"Moral Science," p. 213—

"The Gospel was designed, not for one race or for one time, but for all races and for all times. It looked not to the abolition of slavery for that age alone, but for its universal abolition. Hence the important object of its author was to gain for it a lodgement in every part of the known world, so that by its universal diffusion among all classes of society it might quietly and peacefully modify and subdue the evil passions of men. In this manner alone could its object—a universal moral revolution—have been accomplished. For if it had forbidden the evil instead of subverting the principle; if it had proclaimed the unlawfulness of slavery and taught slaves to resist the oppression of their masters, it would instantly have arrayed the two parties in deadly hostility throughout the civilized world; its announcement would have been the signal of servile war, and the very name of the Christian religion would have been forgotten amidst the agitation of universal bloodshed."

Mr. Van Dyke protests against the "imputation here cast upon Christ and his Apostles. Do you believe" (he asks) "the Saviour sought to insinuate his religion into the earth by concealing its real design, and preserving a profound silence in regard of one of the very worst sins it came to destroy?" But Dr. Wayland does not even imply any such "imputation" of concealment as is intimated in this artfully framed question. A brief view of the mission and position of the Saviour and his followers will make apparent the propriety as well as prudence ascribed to them by Dr. Wayland.

1. They came as founders of religion, not of civil government. Hence, though every principle and precept they taught sapped and undermined despotism of every kind, yet they never breathed a word directly against the despots which everywhere prevailed among men. They treated the usurping and tyrannical rulers with the same "respectful terms" in which Mr. Van Dyke says they spoke of

slavery and slaveholding. Were they, therefore, in favor of despotisms, and opposed to constitutional monarchies and republics? Their precepts and practice were opposed to the union of church and state, or any subjection of faith and conscience to civil and military rulers.—Yet they never uttered any denunciations against even the *Heathen* despots which did thus lord it over the faith and conscience, nor inculcated the duty of the oppressed to rise in rebellion against them. On the contrary, they urged the paying of tribute, honoring the king, and submitting patiently to persecution therefrom. Were they, therefore, in favor of church and state in government, and the consequent persecutions thereof? Did they, therefore, acknowledge the rightfulness of *Heathen* government persecutions? By no means!—Were they even cowardly or hypocritical in such forbearance, and in quietly subverting the principles on which these wrongs and evils rested, rather than in directly and vainly attacking the evils themselves? Certainly not. Their mission, and hence their main and only direct conflict, was with false religions and religious errors. All evils and errors connected with idolatry were promptly and boldly opposed: but still cautiously and prudently. But those connected mainly with governmental institutions were often passed by without mention, to be sapped and gradually overthrown by the religious doctrines they inculcated. Such was slavery and the frequency and other abominations of divorce under the Roman law—for slavery then, as now, was a governmental institution. And they were to conduct, in regard to political evils as directed by the Saviour, in Matt. x: 16-20.

But even in regard to idolatry, the great evil they were to oppose, they were careful to avoid any direct conflict with laws. Mr. Van Dyke commenting on Dr. Wayland's remarks, asks—"When Paul stood upon Mars' Hill, surrounded by ten thousand slaves as many slaveholders as there were idols in the city,* do you believe he kept back any part of the requirements of the Gospel, because he was afraid of a tumult among the people?" No, not on account of the mob; but with great prudence, and yet with honest tact, he carefully avoided incurring any legal penalty in that very address. It was against law to introduce the worship of a new or foreign god, without legal license. Turn, then, to that discourse in Acts xvii: 18-32, and see how Paul evaded the law, by taking the inscription on a *Heathen* altar for his text, and by appealing to a *Heathen* writer for proof of his position, that all men are God's offspring. These *Heathen*, fearing that among the "gods many," they might have omitted one, erected an altar "to the unknown god." As the true God was unknown to them, Paul preached Him unto them! He thus united prudence with wisdom and fidelity to duty; and, although he did not directly denounce idol worship, he preached what, if received, would undermine, (and, if carried out, would overthrow) not only idolatry, but despotism, and slavery, and every form of oppression among men! Hence, in being *honestly* crafty and catching men with guile—in *lawfully* becoming all things unto all men, that by any right means they might save them (1st Cor. ix: 19-23 and 2 Cor. xii: 16)—the Apostles were neither cowardly nor hypocritical, but prudent and faithful to the highest duty. It is worse than folly to sacrifice a mission for a side issue—the main point for a minor detail—or to throw away life for what can be better gained by preserving it. Dr. Wayland, therefore, is correct; Mr. Van Dyke, wrong.

2. But another consideration governed their conduct in relation to evils connected with governments. They had no vote, no voice, hardly any influence in choosing rulers, making laws, or changing institutions. They were generally esteemed the scum and offscourings of the earth—the base followers of a crucified malefactor, and impostor. Hence to have openly arrayed themselves against those despots, or political institutions as strongly established and defended as slavery, would have been like beating out their brains against a rock—would have sacrificed their duty to establish Christianity, (the great reformer of all evils, finally,) in a vain effort to abolish political wrongs.

But suppose the Roman Empire had been a republic, and each man a voter with freedom of speech—would Jesus *Doubtful! They had some 360,000 gods and goddesses in their pantheon, and their houses and streets as well as temples abounded in shrines and images. A. B. U.

and his Apostles have advocated and voted for holding men, women and children in slavery—taking from them the ownership of their own persons—compelling them to life-long toil without rights and without wages—subjecting them to the brutality and lust and cruelty of irresponsible Masters? Does any Christian—any man of common sense and feeling, believe they would? *Think!* They were humble men, and had sympathy for the lowly born. They were poor, and inured to manual labor;—would they so disgrace poverty and toil? They taught that God was the Father of all—had "made of one blood all nations of men"—that all men were brothers;—would they so degrade God's offspring and their own brothers into mere property, chattels personal? They taught that we should "do unto others as we would they should do unto us" in an exchange of circumstances—love others as we love our own selves—in honor prefer one another;—would they so doom any to bondage from which they themselves shrunk as from death? No—no—never! They proved their love for even the sinful and the vile to be that of brother for brother—Jesus and his apostles toiled, suffered, died for the slave as well as the master—the former was full as precious to their souls as the latter;—would they, then, have advocated and voted for making so great a difference for life between those whom they declared to be equal before God, equally "of one blood," and equally dear to their own hearts? Believe it who can—its bare statement seems to me *blasphemy!* But Mr. Van Dyke says—"The Apostle well knew, that for the present, emancipation would be no real blessing to the slave!" This is, indeed, presuming on the forgetfulness or ignorance of his hearers and readers—presuming that they will suppose that all slaves were utterly debased and ignorant negroes, and slavery a moralizing educating and elevating institution—neither of which is near the truth! For slaves then embraced not only colored persons and ignorant, but Jews, Greeks, Romans—men learned, polished, skillful—women refined, accomplished, lovely and amiable;—and slavery, yet unameliorated by Christianity, was worse in practice (though the same in essence) than in our Slave States. And he has the brazen assurance to say that, to such persons, and from such a system, "the Apostle well knew, that emancipation would be no blessing!"

3. But Mr. Van Dyke persistently urges—"They admitted slaveholders to the communion of the church"—"it was not the owning of slaves, but the manner in which he fulfilled the duties of his station, that made him a subject for church discipline. The mere fact that he was a slaveholder, no more, subjected him to censure, than the mere fact that he was a father or a husband." "There is not one command or exhortation to emancipate the slave." While much of this might be admitted as literally so, it can be clearly shown that the precepts, doctrines and entire spirit and tendency of Christianity are opposed to slavery and every other oppression and wrong, whether specifically named or not. But we go farther. So far as the power and influence of the Apostles could go, without direct opposition to government, they opposed and virtually abolished slavery. To show this, let us first settle, *What is slavery?*

It is not mere deprivation of political rights—nor subjecting men to restraints, as minors, pupils, apprentices, &c.—nor bondage for crime—nor compulsory service, military or civil—nor hiring labor for wages, in any form or for any period. It is reducing men to be mere property—depriving them of their right to themselves, their labor, their property, their offspring, as human beings. In the words of the law of South Carolina—"slaves shall be deemed, held, taken, reputed and adjudged in law to be chattels personal to all intents, constructions and purposes whatever." Or, "a slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs; the master may sell him, dispose of his person, his industry and his labor; he can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire anything but what must belong to his master." (Civil Code of Louisiana, Art 35.) Or, in the words of the eminent Thomas Ruffin, late Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of North Carolina—comparing slavery with the system of parentage, apprenticeship, &c., he very emphatically decided—"There is no likeness between the cases. They are in opposition to each other, and there is an impassable gulf between them. In the one, the end in view is the happiness of the youth born to equal rights with that governor on whom the duty devolves of

training the young to usefulness in a station which he is afterwards to assume among freemen. With slavery it is far otherwise. The end is the profit of the master, his security and the public safety; the subject, one doomed, in his own person and in his posterity, to live without knowledge, and without the capacity to make anything of his own, and to toil that another may reap the fruits. The power of the master must be absolute, to render the submission of the slave perfect."

According to these definitions, (and they are authoritative and correct,) there was no slavery under the Mosaic Law; for the end of that system was the welfare, the education and the conversion of the servant. And Christianity never recognized such slavery—Greek and Roman—under the Gospel. For the slave was always addressed as a human being having a conscience to will, to feel responsibilities and duties, and rights to exercise his soul in the worship of God and the service of man, even though his master might forbid. And the master no sooner entered the church, than he was taught to treat his slave as a brother in Christ, (or, if not a Christian, as a man,) and to give him remuneration for his services which should be "just and equal." And as to all slaves, whether his own or others, he was commanded to "remember those in bonds as bound with them"—as if the master's flesh, and blood, and spirit were the chain of the slave also! For proof of these facts and teachings we refer to Eph. vi: 5-10; Col. iv: 1; Philm. 9-20; and James v: 4.

In the civil government, the Apostles had no part, and it would perhaps have been imprudent to express even their wish to dissolve a relation established by law; but in the church, where they had authority, they acknowledged no slavery—no superiority of master over slave—"neither bond nor free," as existing in the State; "for ye are all one" (all equals) "in Christ Jesus," or the Christian church. Such being their practice, as well as their precepts, who can doubt that if they had had freedom of speech and of suffrage in the State, they would have urged and voted for the emancipation of slaves there also? Who can doubt that if we have the Spirit of Christ, and obey his precepts, and follow the practice of his Apostles in our duties as voters—as the sovereigns of this republican government—we should speak and act in all lawful ways for the ultimate removal of slavery?

If you still doubt the opposition of Christianity to slavery, examine its history; and you will find that wherever it came in its purity and power, feudalism, serfdom and slavery have gradually disappeared, as darkness before the sun; until now, in the whole Christian world, chattel slavery is found only in our Southern States. Even Russia has freed her millions of serfs;—and yet our Slave States, (aided by a few at the north, who profess to be disciples of Washington and Jefferson!) are striving to extend and perpetuate our worse chattel slavery! To these northern apologists and advocates for slavery, I have a few words to offer in another article, next week.

Marietta, Jan. 26, 1861. A. B. G.
P. S.—It is but justice to Mr. Van Dyke to say that though his admirers in this place deem the sermon conclusive against Republicans especially, he himself, directs it only against distinctive Abolitionists. He says, p. 19—"It is no more than simple justice for me to say plainly, that I do not consider Republican and Abolitionist as necessarily synonymous terms."

But as his Sermon, in my estimation, falsifies and perverts the teachings of the Bible, and makes Christianity the abetter of oppression, tyranny, and other gross evils and wrongs, I have written solely out of regard for Divine Revelation and humanity, without special reference to parties or to names. I have deemed the latter portion of his sermon (an ingenious rather than ingenious complaint of the actions of Abolitionists) not specially worthy of reply. If the Bible does not warrant slavery—if Christ and his Apostles were opposed to it, and it is our duty to vote and act against it—the time, mode and manner matter but little, provided they are Constitutional and lawful. A. B. G.

Snow in Paris is seldom deep enough to make sleighing, but this year has been an exception, and sleighs or "sledges," as they call them, have been in universal use. Even snow-balling has been permitted, and the boys had such fun at it in the Tuileries Garden that the police had to go in a body and disperse them.

REMARKABLE CASE.—A LADY IN A TRANCE.—The Pittsburgh Gazette gives an account of a remarkable case of suspension of vitality in Wheeling. A lady residing in this city, who had been lying ill for some time, died to all appearances on Saturday night of week before last, and the necessary preparations were made for interment. It was discovered, however, when the body was about to be placed in the coffin, that it still retained its natural warmth. This, of course, occasioned a great surprise, and efforts were made to restore animation, but without success. The unfortunate woman still remains in the same condition, and as yet no signs of decomposition have appeared, although some six or eight days have elapsed since death was supposed to take place. The case has excited no little interest among the leading physicians and others of the city and vicinity.

THE ESCORT OF THE PRESIDENT ELECT.—The President elect will be escorted to Washington by the Springfield (Ill.) Zouaves, in spite of threats coming from any source. This company is composed of young men who have for some months past been under the instruction of Col. Ellsworth, and in drill they are said to be fully equal to the genuine original Zouaves. A correspondent, writing to the Davenport (Iowa) Gazette, says:—"This company intends to do escort duty to the President elect on the 4th of March next, accompanying him to Washington, and returning by Philadelphia, New York, Albany, &c. They number over sixty, and are in a perfect state of drill, having already taken several prizes, and surprised the famous Chicago boys in their efficiency. They are commanded by Captain Cook, a gentleman who understands the Zouave practice, and I doubt not will create a sensation while in Washington!"

Hon. John A. Gilmer writes to a friend in North Carolina, that "if the honest masses North and South can be induced, without passion, and with their cool heads to understand the abstract points of difference involved in the present disputes, they will at once arm themselves with the fraternal spirit of their revolutionary fathers; infuse the same into their political agents, and force a settlement of all sectional difficulties, and again return to their fields, shops, stores, ships, and schools." The free States ought to know that all the chances are on their side; that they have a surplus population to settle the Territories, while the South has none, and they should feel satisfied that the laws of climate, soil, and production will settle the question of slavery extension at last, in spite of the theories about which the politicians of the two sections have each other so much by the ears." Mr. Gilmer says, "I would have the people at once pull up their stakes, and come and pitch their tents around Washington, and command their representatives to adjust the difficulties which now divide the two great and powerful sections."

The Hon. Lyman Trumbull was re-elected last week U. S. Senator by the Legislature of Illinois, by eight majority, notwithstanding the "Democratic" gerrymander of that State, which gives the minority such unfair advantages.—Judge Trumbull has been an able and distinguished Senator for the last six years, and is a warm personal, as well as political, friend of the President elect, enjoying his fullest confidence. His reelection is therefore a cause of sincere congratulation. Mr. Trumbull was also formerly a "Democrat."

The New Orleans Bulletin announces that Messrs. G. H. Rozet and Paul Queyrouse have established a brogan manufactory in that city, which already turns out six hundred pair per day, and is expected, when in full blast, to make sixteen hundred.

Oil wells, in the western part of Pennsylvania, were known to the Seneca Indians more than a hundred years ago, and by settlers in the region seventy years ago.

Charles E. and E. P. Evans of Boston were arrested on the charge of defrauding the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, by not accounting for tickets sold by them.

Hopa Hokianger, or Job, a South Sea Island prince, died a month or two ago at the age of about 100. He remembered Capt. Cook very well.

The New York and Erie Railroad was sold at auction for \$220,000, and was bought in by the trustees.