
SPEECH
OF
JACOB F. PRICE,
ON THE TRIAL OF
REV. JOS. C. STILES,
IN NOVEMBER, 1840.

Price, Jacob F.: SPEECH OF JACOB F. PRICE, BEFORE THE WEST-LEXINGTON PRESBYTERY, ON THE TRIAL OF REV. J.G. STILES, FOR HIS AGITATING, REVOLUTIONARY AND SCHISMATICAL COURSE: WITH AN APPENDIX, CONTAINING THE ENTIRE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN JACOB F. PRICE AND JOSEPH STILES, IN REFERENCE TO MR. STILES' ATTACK UPON MR. PRICE'S VERACITY, AND THE MINUTE OF THE SETTLEMENT OF THEIR PERSONAL DIFFICULTIES. Frankfort, Ky.: Wm. M. Todd. 1841. Original printed wrappers [dusted, extremities worn]. Stitched, 48pp, lightly foxed. Good+ or so.

The pamphlet is an outgrowth of the "contest between the new and old schools of 1840" in the Presbyterian Church, and the "alleged insubordination to the Presbytery on the part of Price." Coleman. Price's difficulties developed from his appointment as prosecutor of charges against Reverend Stiles, whose "strange mental aberrations" had resulted in various offenses against the Church.

FIRST EDITION. Coleman 1688. AI 41-4287 [6]. OCLC locates 7 [two accession numbers. (#22030) \$375

48.

SPEECH
OF
JACOB F. PRICE,
ON THE TRIAL OF
REV. JOS. C. STILES,
IN NOVEMBER, 1840.

1875

JACOB F. FRISCH

SPEECH

OF

JACOB F. PRICE,

BEFORE

THE WEST-LEXINGTON PRESBYTERY, ON THE TRIAL OF

REV. J. C. STILES,

FOR HIS AGITATING, REVOLUTIONARY AND SCHISMATICAL COURSE:

WITH AN

APPENDIX,

CONTAINING THE ENTIRE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN

JACOB F. PRICE AND JOSEPH C. STILES,

IN REFERENCE TO MR. STILES' ATTACK UPON MR. PRICE'S VERACITY, AND THE MINUTE OF
THE SETTLEMENT OF THEIR PERSONAL DIFFICULTIES.

FRANKFORT, KY.

PRINTED BY WM. M. TODD—BOOKSELLER AND BOOK AND JOB PRINTER.

1841.

1850

JACOB T. FRISON

1850

THE WEST-INDIAN MERCHANTS OF THE ISLAND OF

ST. JOHN'S, A. B. M.

FOR THE SALE OF ALL THE STOCKS AND SHARES OF THE

1850

ASSOCIATED

AND TO RECEIVE THE PROCEEDS OF THE SAME

AND TO PAY THE DIVIDENDS THEREON

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE BY-LAWS AND REGULATIONS

OF THE ASSOCIATION

AND TO SIGN

AS WITNESSES TO THE ABOVE SAID BY-LAWS AND REGULATIONS

1850

PREFACE.

THE following is the substance of the speech delivered by the author before the West-Lexington Presbytery, pending the trial of the Rev. J. C. Stiles. Impelled by circumstances, which are explained in the speech, to table charges against Mr. Stiles, and *required* by the Presbytery to prosecute the public charges, when the personal ones were withdrawn, I became the prosecutor of Mr. Stiles. Since his trial and suspension by the Presbytery, I have been grossly misrepresented, both as to the speech and the appended correspondence, and the Presbytery traduced.

I have been repeatedly urged by friends, in whose judgment I have great confidence, to write out and publish the speech, as a vindication of myself, and also of the Presbytery, as it contained the grounds on which its decision was based. As to the correspondence, besides its gross misrepresentation by Mr. Stiles' friends, I have been accused of being the offender in the case. The speech, as written, contains the *substance* of the same as *delivered* before the Presbytery. Some parts have been curtailed, others have been a little enlarged. The speech, in its present form, will be easily recognised by every individual who heard it delivered, although slightly changed in some of its parts. I have, in the printed speech, omitted altogether any notice of Mr. Stiles' effort to show that the church *required approval* of the acts of the Assemblies of '37 and '38. What he has so often said on that subject is known by all his New School friends, of any intelligence, to be an utter mistake. This part was omitted only for the sake of brevity. The cases he has adduced, admit of an easy and satisfactory explanation, but would require considerable space. It is sufficient to say, that the General Assembly, with the Rev. J. L. Wilson, D. D. as its moderator, examined and approved the records and acts of the Synod of Ky.

at Paris. It is known that the Paris Synod permitted brethren to remain in the Presbyterian Church, expressly withholding their approbation of those acts of '37 and '38. It is then clear that the Assembly, and the Synod of Ky. never required approval.

The speech is offered as the grounds of the Presbytery's action in the case of Mr. Stiles, with the more confidence, as the defence made by him was not even an attempt to reply to the arguments it contains. Entertaining the hope, from the solicitude for its publication, by judicious friends, that it may contribute, in some humble degree, to the promotion of the cause of truth, I have offered it to the public.

JACOB F. PRICE.

re-
ro-
m-

in
de
is.
di-
he

SPEECH.

MR. MODERATOR,

I arise to address you, and through you, the Presbytery, under circumstances peculiarly embarrassing. I appear before you, in the unpleasant attitude of a prosecutor, and that too, of a ministerial brother, between whom and myself, there have, since our first acquaintance, until recently, existed the most friendly and fraternal relations. It is due to me, to state, that no act of mine has contributed to the severance of these relations.

The brother under process, is the sole aggressor in this case, and if consequences shall ensue, deeply humiliating to him, he will remember that this trial is the result of his own conduct.

I deeply regret the circumstances which render this prosecution necessary. Nothing but a high sense of duty to the interests of the church, whose "peace and unity" I have solemnly sworn to consult and preserve, and to my own character, could have induced me to have appeared before you, in the unpleasant capacity of prosecutor.

The case before you, is one deeply solemn and affecting,—it is one involving the ministerial character of bro. Stiles; the peace and interests of the church, whose guardians we are, and the interests of souls around us and yet unborn.

That I shall be censured by the partizans of bro. Stiles, I have no doubt. To do justice to the case, and escape the vituperation of his heated and excited friends, would be more than human. To satisfy and please all, where party feeling has been so deeply enlisted, would be impossible.

I stand here, not as a party man or as a party prosecutor, but am here in the defence of the Presbyterian Church—her sworn friend, bound to guard her peace and union, or prove false to my plighted vows.

That my motives, my conduct, and what I shall say on this occasion, will be misrepresented, by some, I have no doubt. It is the misfortune of all men, who *pursue an erratic course, and assume to themselves the province of leaders* of a party, to have around them

those who have no *higher merit* to recommend them to the favor of their *patron saint*, than their willingness to perform the low offices of scullions and scavengers for their party. By such I expect to be slandered: by such I expect my motives to be impugned, and what I shall say to be misrepresented. I have no regrets to express on this point. Slander and misrepresentation, from polluted sources, are often the highest encomiums.

I shall endeavor, on this occasion, as on all others, faithfully and fearlessly to discharge my high and painful duty, unawed and unsecluded—alike regardless of the frowns or smiles of any.

To prevent misconception, it may be proper for me to explain how I became the prosecutor in this case. It is known that I had used my influence, whatever it might have been, at two successive Presbyteries, to prevent a prosecution from being entered against bro. Stiles for his agitating and revolutionary course. I had supposed myself better acquainted with Mr. Stiles than the most of my brethren. I knew him to be a man of peculiar temperament; that, when excited, he would magnify molehills into mountains; that he believed himself divinely called, (as was Paul to preach,) to do whatever he desired, however absurd, and that no effort to enlighten his mind on any subject, however uninformed he might be, would have the slightest influence upon him. I endeavored to persuade the brethren just to let him alone, and not oppose him in any way, and he would soon fight himself down. I was well aware that the great mass of the people had become satisfied that Mr. Stiles was laboring under some strange mental aberrations, upon every subject upon which he became excited. I had never approved of his course, but was for bearing with him. He became still more desperate in his efforts to injure the standing and disturb the peace of the church. He had even gone so far as to whisper, "in a rather private—rather confidential or discreet manner," tales against my personal and private character. The knowledge of this fact coming to me, led to a correspondence between myself and Mr. Stiles upon that subject.* In this correspondence, Mr. Stiles acknowledges that he had been whispering suspicions, or fears, or positive opinions against my veracity. This led me to take the steps required by the word of God and our Confession of Faith, to have these difficulties adjusted. In company with two brethren, I waited on Mr. Stiles, at his own house, and made a long and sincere effort to have these difficulties satisfactorily adjusted. The effort failed—Mr. Stiles refused

*See Appended Correspondence.

to make any reparation for the injury he had attempted to inflict upon me. I determined to enter process against him before the Presbytery, as the only course left for me to pursue. His own conduct had shut me up to this course,—there was no alternative. In reflecting upon the course I should pursue, my first determination was to table charges against him only for his personal offence against me, but upon a more mature reflection upon the subject, I felt that I should be acting faithlessly to the church, to suffer all his public assaults upon her to pass unnoticed, and only to arraign him for his personal offences against myself. I then tabled charges against him for his public offences against the church, and his private ones against me. By the intervention of mutual friends, during the meeting of Synod, in Danville, these personal matters were adjusted, and the charges based upon them, agreed to be withdrawn.* That agreement was expressed in such general terms, that it might be construed into an arrangement to withdraw all—the public as well as the private charges. I was unwilling, if Mr. Stiles so understood it, to have any further connection with the case. I remarked, at the time, to several brethren, that although I did not understand the settlement to include any thing but the private and personal matters, yet if Mr. Stiles understood it to embrace all, the settlement should stand according to his, and not according to my understanding of it. When spoken to on the subject, by bro. Breckinridge, Mr. Stiles asserted that the public charges had not been withdrawn, in our settlement, and that I was bound to prosecute them, and that I would do so with untarnished honor. Mr. Stiles had, in writing, complained to Synod, that his Presbytery would not try him. He had, in a speech delivered to the Synod, taunted the Presbytery for not trying him, and more than insinuated that the Presbytery was afraid of him. He thought it was due to himself that he should be tried. He can make no just complaint against me for prosecuting these public charges, for he would not release me from it; nor against the Presbytery for trying the case, for this trial he has long sought at your hands. He not only has no just grounds of complaint against you or myself, but he will not dishonor himself so much as to make any. Any attempt upon his part, or upon the part of his friends, to raise the cry of persecution, after what has occurred, will be deeply disgraceful and childish. He has toiled too hard for a martyr's death to expect a martyr's sympathy.

*See minute of our settlement in Appendix.

The subjects involved in this trial, lie at the foundation of all government, both of church and state. With the principles and rights, assumed by Mr. Stiles, acted out, no government can exist. They are radical, and utterly at war with, and subversive of all government.

Who is the court of last resort, in all difficulties and controversies in the church? Is each individual member to decide for himself, and is his decision the law in the case? Then we have no law. Every man is a law unto himself, and all claims to government, whether civil or ecclesiastical, is a wild chimera. But our constitution has expressly and wisely provided the regular succession of courts of appeal, until you reach the General Assembly, the court of last resort. When a case has been fairly met and finally settled by these courts in our church, there is nothing left, on our part, but submission or separation. Revolution, it is true, under some circumstances, is justifiable.

The next question which arises, as a preliminary to this case, is, has any man a right, under pretence of christian liberty, to remain in a church, while he is doing all in his power to war against its interests—to prejudice its good name and injure its character? And if so, has the church any government or authority over its members; and what is that government and authority? In short, the claims that Mr. Stiles makes as rights, are all usurpations, and absolutely inconsistent with all government. If these claims are now to be discussed, it ushers upon the carpet for investigation, every fundamental principle of Presbyterian government.

There are, Mr. Moderator, two great parties in the world. The one is for the rigid maintenance of law, in both church and state, and the other is a wild, furious, and onward party, sweeping on, like a desolating storm, over all governments, whether ecclesiastical or civil, strewing its pathway with the wrecks of governments and the destruction of law.

It is a difficult, perhaps an impossible task, to determine and define with precise accuracy, the boundary line between the liberty and the licentiousness of speech and the press. There is, however, a point where liberty ends and licentiousness begins. Where is that point, and who is to determine that question? Is each man for himself, or is the church by its appropriate courts? If each man is the judge, and to determine it for himself, why have we a court and why a law? Could any civil government exist with such a principle? If each man is to determine for himself, what the law is, and what relation his conduct

sustains to the law, then you have no law, and your courts, civil and religious, are usurpations and have no authority.

In the formation of civil government, all the subjects of it enter into a compact, in which all yield many of their natural rights, in order to have their civil rights the better secured and the more safely guarded. The whole people, in mass, covenant and agree with each individual, to afford their aid to protect each in his civil rights, and each individual binds himself to yield all his rights, except those that the constitution and laws, (which are nothing but the expressed will of the whole people,) secure to him. If a man could be found alone, upon some distant island, with no human being within his reach, whose rights could clash with his own, he would have no law but his own will, and no restraints but his own weakness. But let the wreck of some lost ship throw upon that island another human being—their rights and interests would soon clash—collision would necessarily ensue. They would be compelled to have some understanding, either expressed or implied, between them, and this understanding would be the terms upon which they would agree to regard each others rights. Man yields many of his natural rights in becoming a member of civil government. When he becomes a member of the church he yields more,—the circle of his rights is narrowed. The church requires more of her ministers and members than the civil government does of its.

What then is liberty? It is not the unrestrained license to do what we please, regardless of the will of others. That would lead to anarchy and the wildest confusion. Liberty is not the licentiousness of Owen or Fanny Wright. Liberty is the secured right to do our own will, so far as that will does not conflict with the public good. What will and what will not conflict with the public good, is to be ascertained by the constitution and laws of any government.

The constitution and laws of any people are their published will. To be a loyal and peaceful subject of any government, our actions and conduct must circulate within the orbit of the constitution and laws of that government. The question might again return, who is to determine what is the constitution and law in any given case? Every government has its constituted and established tribunals, by which to determine this point; and no man has a right, under any pretext, to set up his opinion and authority as superior to, and subversive of the authority of the regularly constituted tribunals of the government under which he lives. This is alike the dictate of enlightened reason, religion, and common sense. Mr. Stiles seems to have entirely mis-

understood every feature in the Presbyterian Form of Government that he has ever expressed an opinion about. As an example of his singular misconceptions of his own Form of Government, I refer you to the Form of Government, ch. I, art. 1: "God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrine and commandments of men:" "therefore they consider the rights of private judgment, in all matters that respect religion, as universal and unalienable: they do not even wish to see any religious constitution aided by the civil power," &c. This article in our Form of Government, is simply our declaration to the world that we do not believe that civil government has any right to interfere with a man's religious faith,—that a man may be a Methodist, a Baptist, a Presbyterian, or an infidel, and that civil government has no right to coerce his faith, and require of him this, that, or the other religious belief. That, in matters of religion, civil government ought to leave men free to embrace whatever religious faith they prefer; that it is a matter of conscience and private judgment, with which civil government has no right to meddle. Under this article in our form of government, Mr. Stiles claims the right to do, just what he has been doing, against the peace of the church. He says, in his Manifesto, page 16: "God has given to every man his own mind, and he has an indestructible right to his own 'private judgment' concerning the conduct of men around him,"—Form of Gov. ch. I, art. 1. Again: Convention Address, p. 14: "It is the glory of Presbyterianism, that the liberties of the mind are so nobly sheltered by her platform. She plants upon the threshold of her government this exalted sentiment:—the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, considers "*the rights of private judgment*, in all matters that respect religion, AS UNIVERSAL AND UNALIENABLE,"—Gov. ch. I, art. 1. By this constitution also, the Presbyterian has an equal right to "*publish his opinions*," &c. This article only teaches that Mr. Stiles has a perfect right to join any church whose doctrines and practices he likes better than the Presbyterian Church, and civil government has no right to interfere with him. Now it strikes me that the man who can find in the article, just read, a right to disturb the peace of the church, unmolested, can find in the same article Symmes' theory of a concave world within our globe.

No man can be farther from wishing to narrow the circle of human rights, unnecessarily, than myself. But there is a base coin, passing under the title of liberty, which is licentiousness,—it knows none of the restraints of law, and is a curse to any government. The majestic

Mississippi, that queen of rivers, with its thousand tributaries, draining this immense valley, that stretches 1200 miles, from the Alleghany to the Rocky Mountains, and 2400 miles, from the lakes to the gulf, is a rich blessing to the fertile region through which she flows. She bears upon her bosom, to market, the surplus products of this immense and luxuriant valley, and bears back the wealth and products of other lands, in return. While this wondrous stream keeps within her banks—the channel nature has grooved out for her, she is the greatest physical blessing a kind Providence could have bestowed upon a region so fertile and vast. But no sooner does this stream become swollen in all her tributaries—maddening and swelling, as she rolls on, and bounds over her banks, than she desolates cities, towns, habitations, and fertile fields, and strews ruin along her furious track. She is then a scourge and curse, instead of a blessing, to the lands through which she flows. The liberty of speech and the press is the stream, gliding gently and softly within her banks—the licentiousness of both, is the inundation that desolates and destroys.

There is another great principle, to which I wish to call your attention, for a moment, as I pass along, before we begin to apply the testimony to the case. The principle to which I allude is this, that when any government becomes divided in sentiment, upon any question, and the parties separate and form two independent governments, no man has a right to remain with one party and fight in favor of the other. The very fact that he remains with one party is the highest pledge that he can make, that he will be true and faithful to its interests. When a question is raised in a government, the members of the government have an undisputed right to take either side of that question: but when a full and protracted discussion results in a division of the parties into two separate and independent governments, it is treason to remain with one, and war against its interests, and to aid and abet the other. To illustrate the principle: when this country were colonies of Great Britain, and the stamp act and the tea tax were passed, the citizens might either remonstrate or justify. But so soon as those acts led to a separation between the colonies and the mother country, and we became independent, to remain with us and fight for old England was high treason against the country and punishable with death. No man has a right, under any pretext, to expect to repose in the bosom of any community, and enjoy its benefits and protection, whilst he is aiding its enemies to pull down its institutions and subvert its authority. All such must expect to be treated as enemies and

to share their fate. This is a principle deeply founded in the very nature and necessity of things, and no man can escape its force but by divesting himself of all reason and common sense.

The case before us, aptly illustrates the principle under consideration. When the great question of difference in doctrine and order was raised in our church, between what were called the Old and New School, brethren took either side in the controversy, as their preferences led them. But when this discussion led to a separation between the Old and New School, and to the formation of a new and independent General Assembly, no man had a moral or ecclesiastical right to remain with the Old and use all his influence in favor of the New School, or their principles. He was bound, as an honest man, to follow his preferences or his principles, as the case might be, and change his ecclesiastical relations.

As the division which began in the General Assembly ran down through the Synods, Presbyteries, and churches, each individual took his stand with the one or the other Assembly, just as he chose. There was no compulsion—every one acted voluntarily and freely. It was ecclesiastic treason for a man to take his stand and vote his allegiance with one side, and then to open his batteries and wage a war of extermination against the very church to which he had pledged his submission and his cordial support. I invite Mr. Stiles' special attention to this point in his reply. I have several times advanced this argument for his consideration, but have never been able to screw him up to even attempt a reply. I hope he will at least show his courage by making an effort to answer it, even though he should fail in the attempt. I have presented this argument to minds abler than my own, and all concur, that it is unanswerable. It is based upon the old and universally admitted axiom, that self preservation is the first law of nature. This is as true of governments as individuals.

I shall now take up the several specifications, in this bill of indictment, in their regular order, and the testimony under each; and if I have not altogether mistaken what constitutes proof in any case, I shall be able to show clearly, and even beyond the smallest remnant of a doubt, that Mr. Stiles has been guilty of every offence charged against him in this bill. And if Mr. Stiles has not suffered his ambition and his excitement to close every avenue to his sounder judgment, I shall convince even him, that he has violated the laws of his church and outraged the clearest propriety.

I invite your candid and patient attention while I, in as concise a manner as possible, attempt to apply the testimony to this case.

The general charge is, a "A BREACH OF MINISTERIAL VOWS, IN ATTEMPTING TO PRODUCE SCHISM." Under this general charge are several specifications, which I shall notice in their numerical order.

SPECIFICATION I.—"By misrepresenting, and holding up the acts of the highest judicatory of the Presbyterian Church, in sermons and various publications, as arbitrary, tyrannical, oppressive, &c. calculated to prejudice the character of the church, when he had twice voted to adhere and submit to the Old School Assembly, with a full knowledge of these acts."

It is unnecessary to read to this Presbytery the resolutions adopted by this body, (the West-Lex. Pres.) at its fall session of '38, at Winchester, for which Mr. Stiles voted. It is sufficient just to remind you that he there voted that the *Old School was the true Assembly, and to it he adhered*. When the Synod met at Paris, but a few weeks after the meeting of Presbytery, Mr. Stiles again voted that the Old School was *the true Assembly, and to it he would adhere and submit*. To preserve his consistency, he, with others, desired to record upon the minutes of the Synod that they *withheld* their approbation of the reform measures of '37 and '38. This request was cheerfully granted, and the Synod itself re-affirmed its cordial approval of those measures. It was then hoped that all collision, in the Presbyterian Church in Ky. was at an end, and that all would cordially unite in endeavoring to build up our churches and extend the conquests of the cross.

These votes were given by Mr. Stiles, both in Presbytery and Synod, with a full knowledge of all the acts of the Assembly, that had any bearing upon the subjects upon which he has since been agitating the Church.

The arrangement at Paris, (called by Mr. Stiles, sometimes, a "*covenant*," a "*compact*," a "*compromise*," &c.) if it mean anything at all, means that the Synod would never require of these brethren to *approve* of the leading acts of the Assemblies of '37 and '38. And the brethren upon their part, agreed that so long as the Synod would *not require of them to approve* these acts, they would adhere and submit to the Old School Assembly, and its subordinate judicatories, in good faith. Now I ask, has the *Synod violated* its part of this agreement, and *required of those brethren to approve*? No, never! Has Mr. Stiles *submitted*, and is he now *submitting*, as he solemnly voted to do at Paris? He shall answer this question himself, and not I. Manifesto, p. 3: "What *further submission* can he make without sacrifice of principle? Our brethren must suffer us here to say, *our course we*

feel bound to change." Now I ask, has not Mr. Stiles, by his own admission, violated his solemn agreement at Paris, to submit?

The Synod never changed its course, but Mr. Stiles says he has changed his, and felt himself bound so to do. Did the Synod or Mr. Stiles, then, fly from the Paris arrangement? Mr. Stiles, by his own admission. He then, wantonly and in the face of his own vote, twice solemnly given, is in arms against the church of his choice.

So much for the Paris compromise, as it is sometimes called.

Let us now take a rapid survey of some of Mr. Stiles' misrepresentations of the acts of the General Assembly.

1st. The disowning acts. Mr. Stiles says in his Manifesto, p. 3: "It is known to all, that the Assembly of 1837, by one grand stroke, without previous notice, without regular charge or opportunity of defence, severed from the bosom of our church, four Synods, containing more than 500 ministers, and nearly 60,000 communicants. This strange act, to many intelligent and godly minds, is without a parallel in all protestant ecclesiastical history." Again, "But strange to tell! in our day, in the very face of the constitution, this, one of the clearest and dearest of the rights of man, has received a most startling and violent overthrow, and that, by an American Republican General Assembly." "If we ask the ground of this procedure, we apprehend it will be found in an arbitrary assumption of original legislative jurisdiction, by the Assemblies of '37 and '38." p. 4: "So rapidly indeed, did the remedy follow the discovery of their mistake, that an undissolved committee of prosecution, on the floor of the Assembly, survived the act that legislated all the criminals beyond their reach." "Say! was it not violently unjust and oppressive, that the administrators of such a constitution, after publicly preferring their criminal charges, should by one legislative stroke, banish 509 ministers, 599 churches and 57,774 communicants from membership in the church of Jesus, and interest in the funds of the corporation? Oh! was it right to cut them off without the shadow of a trial, and that, by breaking their death grasp upon their constitutional privileges?" He might have said, with more propriety, by *breaking their death grasp upon the funds of the corporation*. For they have certainly clung with more tenacity to the funds than to the constitution. These are but specimens, taken from the chaotic mass of confused statements made by Mr. Stiles, against the acts of the Assemblies of '37 and '38, in evidence before you. I presume, since the world began, there never was before, just such a string of confused ideas, tangled absurdities, and mis-

statements, thrown together, as may be found in these publications. They are more like the ebullitions of confined and nourished wrath bursting out of a confused and heated mind, than any thing I can conceive. The excited mind, that views these acts of the Assembly through the frightful storms and whirlwinds of wrathful words which Mr. Stiles has thrown around them, may expect to be haunted by spectres and nightmare in his slumbers.

Let us look at them through the medium of calm and sober history, and see what they really are. The General Assembly had adopted a plan of union as early as 1801, by which Congregationalists and Presbyterians, under certain restrictions, might enter into church organizations in the new settlements, and have a certain connection with the Presbyteries. At the time this plan of union was adopted, the Congregational churches and ministers were acting in good faith under the Saybrook and Cambridge platforms of faith, which was the same with our Confession of Faith. The plan allowed Presbyterians and Congregationalists, holding the same faith and only differing in government, to enter into church organizations in connexion with our Presbyteries. The very face of the plan declares it to be a missionary arrangement, and only intended for the new settlements, which shows it to have been at first intended as a temporary affair. This plan, though not intended to be permanent, and designed for good, was a palpable violation of the constitution in all its features.

It allowed Congregational committee men, who never adopted our Confession of Faith, to sit in Presbytery, to deliberate and vote in the administration of Presbyterian government, when they rejected that government themselves. It allowed them to aid us to govern ourselves, while they refused to be governed by us. Our government has expressly provided that all our church courts shall be composed only of ordained bishops and ruling elders. They adopt our doctrines and form of government, before they can be invested with these offices. This plan was a violation of our constitution, in allowing Congregationalists a seat in our Presbyteries, and thereby to vote for commissioners in the General Assembly, and thus to take part in the government of the whole church. It was equally a violation of the constitution, in restricting the constitutional rights of the Presbyterians who composed a part of these mixed churches. It deprived them of the right of appeal, unless by the consent of the Congregationalists, when the constitution guaranteed the right of appeal to all Presbyterians. This *plan* grants to Congregationalists, rights in our church

courts, which the *constitution* has only granted to Presbyterians, and it restricts the rights of Presbyterians, which the constitution expressly grants. Thus, it is clear that the plan of union was unconstitutional, and it was so declared by the Assembly of '37, and by it abrogated. This is one of the dreadful acts of the Assembly which has so disturbed Mr. Stiles' equanimity. The resolution of the Assembly, which abrogated the plan of union, declared it unconstitutional, and therefore void from the beginning. The Assembly then declared the effect of the abrogation of the plan of union, and that was, that the four Synods, Western Reserve, Geneva, Genessee and Utica, that had been attached to the General Assembly by virtue of this abrogated plan of union, were no longer, in fact or in form, an integral part of our church. It was known that the great mass of the membership, ministry and church organizations which entered into the composition of these Synods, was Congregational. It was so admitted by the delegates from these Synods in the Assembly of '37. Out of the 139 churches in the Western Reserve, not more than 25 or 30 laid any claim to being Presbyterian.

It is perfectly notorious, that whole associations of Congregationalists had been received into the Synod of Albany as early as 1808, "declining the terms of adopting our standards," and "were received, retaining their own names and usages," in their church government. These associations were afterwards cut up into nominal Presbyteries, and out of them and similar materials, *fresh* from New England, the other three Synods were formed.

The plan of union was the only tenure by which these bodies could claim any connexion with the Presbyterian Church. That plan having been abrogated and their only tenure broken, these Synods fell necessarily, along with the plan, so far as any connexion with us was concerned. These Synods never had a constitutional, but only a formal connexion with the Presbyterian Church. It is asked why did the Assembly not cite and deal with them for not being Presbyterian? That would indeed have been unjust and cruel in the Assembly.—What! Arraign, try and condemn these four Synods for being just what the Assembly's plan of union allowed them to be? They would have come forward with this plan of union in their hands and thrown it in the teeth of the Assembly, saying, here is your law allowing us to be Congregationalists, and yet retain a certain connexion with your church. Would it not have been violently unjust for the Assembly to have had any such procedure in this case? The assembly in what they

did, pursued the only kind and constitutional course left to them.— The Assembly took the blame of all the disorders to itself in forming the plan of union, and thereby, not only inviting, but opening a wide door to disorders.

Now I put it to the candor of every sober and reflecting mind, who has no ambitious and party ends to answer in this matter, whether the Assembly's acts in the case of these four Synods, were not the kindest, the tenderest, and the most fraternal that could have been passed in the case, and the constitution preserved. We will read these acts and see how kind they are.

“Be it resolved, by the Gen. Assembly of the Pres. Ch. in the U. S. A.”

“1st. That, in consequence of the abrogation, by this Assembly, of the plan of union of 1801, between it and the General Association of Connecticut, as utterly unconstitutional, and therefore, null and void from the beginning, the Synods of Utica, Geneva and Genessee, which were formed, and attached to this body, under, and in execution of said plan of union,” be, and are hereby declared to be out of the ecclesiastical connexion of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, and that they are not, in fact, or in form, an integral portion of said church.”

“2d. That the solicitude of this Assembly, on the whole subject, and its urgency for the immediate decision of it, are greatly increased by reason of the gross disorders which are ascertained to have prevailed in these Synods, (as well as that of the Western Reserve, against which, a declarative resolution, similar to the first of these, has been passed during our present session,) it being made clear to us, that even the plan of union itself, was never consistently carried into effect by those professing to act under it.”

“3d. That the General Assembly has no intention, by these resolutions, or by that passed in the case of the Synod of the Western Reserve, to affect in any way the ministerial standing of any members of either of said Synods; nor to disturb the pastoral relation in any church; nor to interfere with the duties or relations of private christians in their respective congregations, but only to declare, and determine, according to the truth and necessity of the case, and by virtue of the full authority existing in it for that purpose, the relation of all said Synods, and all their constituent parts, to this body and to the Presbyterian Church in the United States.”

“4th. That in-as-much as there are reported to be several churches and ministers, if not one or two Presbyteries, now in connexion with one or more of said Synods, which are strictly Presbyterian in doctrine and order, be it, therefore, further resolved, that all such churches and ministers as wish to unite with us, are hereby directed to apply for admission into those Presbyteries belonging to our connexion, which are most convenient to their respective locations. And that any such Presbytery as aforesaid, being strictly Presbyterian in doctrine and order, and now in connexion with either of said Synods, as may desire to unite with us, are hereby directed to make application, with a full statement of their cases, to the next General Assembly, which shall take proper order thereon.”

Could any thing kinder have been passed? It does really seem to me, that the mind that is in such a state as to see unkindness in these resolutions, would be shocked at the Saviour's kindest words, “my

peace I leave with you." How different are these disowning acts from Mr. Stiles' distorted version of them.

Now I would ask Mr. Stiles to put his finger on the act of the Assembly, where a committee of prosecution was ever appointed to *prefer criminal charges* against the disowned Synods? And where are the criminal charges preferred, either by the Assembly or their committee, against these bodies? Oh! shame, where is thy blush?

There was a committee of inquiry and prosecution, appointed by the Assembly, to ascertain "*what judicatures* were chargeable, by common fame, with disorders." These four Synods were not named in the resolution appointing this committee. No criminal charges were ever preferred, either by the Assembly or its committee, against the disowned Synods, and yet Mr. Stiles affirms and re-affirms—publishes and re-publishes, to the world, that "the administrators of such a constitution, after publicly preferring their criminal charges, by one legislative stroke, banish 509 ministers, 599 churches, and 57,774 communicants from membership in the church of Jesus." I cannot, for my life, conceive how Mr. Stiles ever wrought himself up to such a pitch of excitement, as to have so entirely unhinged every function of sober intellect. It looks more like the mad ravings of lunacy, than the legitimate operations of a calm and christian mind.

These acts were not intended to sever one single Presbyterian from the church. They were not designed to injure the standing of one single minister or private member, in all these four Synods. Not one single Presbyterian is now out of our ecclesiastical connexion, by reason of those acts; if any such are out, it is the result of their own voluntary choice.

But it has been alleged by Mr. Stiles, that the fact that the Assembly has invited any who may be in the bounds of the four Synods, and prefer a union with the Presbyterian to the Congregational church, *to apply for admission into* the nearest Presbyteries, proves that they were turned out. He has often asked, with an air of conscious triumph, why tell them *to apply for admission*, if they have not been turned out? He seems either to have forgotten, or to have never known, that *applications for admission* are occurrences of every day, with members and ministers in good and regular standing. When a member removes from one place to another, he carries with him his letter, and *applies for admission* into the church in whose bounds he removes. When a minister changes his presbyterial relations, he has *to apply for admission* into the Presbytery in whose bounds he re-

moves. Does this imply that he has been cut off from the church of Jesus? By no means. The General Assembly invited the Presbyterians, who might be interspersed through the four disowned Synods, to apply to the nearest Presbyteries for admission, and they should be received—did that prove that they were cut off from the church? Not a whit more in the one case than the other. The Assembly had dissolved the four Synodical organizations, and directed the Presbyterian particles to chrysalize on the nearest Presbyteries. All was as kind, as fair, as tender, as it could possibly have been; and yet Mr. Stiles has, in sermons and various publications, denounced these acts as the most cruel, arbitrary, tyrannical, unjust, oppressive acts, known “*in all protestant ecclesiastical history.*” Strange to tell, these were the divisionary acts, which separated the Old and New School parties into two independent Assemblies, and with a full knowledge of all these acts, Mr. Stiles voted, twice, his solemn allegiance to the Old School Assembly, and then waged a furious war upon the church, for the manner by which the separation occurred.

The New School admitted, in the Assembly of '37, that a division was necessary. We will quote their very words, to prevent all mistake:

Minutes of the Assembly of '37, pages 432-3: “Whereas, in the extension of the church over so great a territory, embracing such a variety of people, *difference* of view, in relation to important points of *church policy and action, as well as theological opinion,* are found to exist. Now, it is believed, a division of this body into two separate bodies, which shall act independently of each other, will be of *vital importance to the best interests of the Redeemer's kingdom.*”

Now, this was the deliberate admission of the committee of the New School, selected to represent the interest of their party, in the Assembly of '37. Here they admit important differences to exist between them and the Old School, in *church policy and order,* as well as *doctrine.*

Mr. Stiles pretends to make no complaint against us for doctrine—it is entirely for the policy and order of the church. The policy of the church to which he objects, seems to be only the divisionary acts: but you observe, the New School admit that they materially differed, upon policy and order, from the Old School, even before the disowning acts were passed. They objected to the policy and order, as well as doctrine, of the Presbyterian Church, long before these four Synods were touched by the Assembly. In confirmation of these frank admissions of the New School, that they do not hold to the strict doctrines nor order of the Presbyterian Church, I will read an extract or two from Mr. Reid's “*Visit to the American Churches.*”

The first extract we shall give, is on the subject of doctrine. Mr. Reid says, page 51, vol. 2: "A friendly or New School hand, thus describes their doctrine:—"Sinners can repent, without the grace of God, but never do." "In regeneration, the sinner's wickedness is gradually reduced to nothing. The Spirit of God never operates directly upon the heart of the sinner, but only on the truth, or on the motive, so as to give it an overpowering efficacy." A very careful hand, states the New School doctrine thus:—"That we have no more to do with the first sin of Adam than with that of any other parent. That he was not constituted the covenant head of his posterity, but was merely their natural progenitor. That there is no such thing as original sin; that infants come into the world as perfectly free from original sin as Adam was when created. That to speak of innate, corrupt inclinations, is an absurdity; that by human depravity, is meant nothing more than the universal fact, that all the posterity of Adam will always begin to sin when they begin to exercise moral agency. That the doctrine of imputed righteousness, is imputed nonsense. That the human will determines itself. That the impenitent sinner is, by nature, in full possession of all the powers necessary to a full compliance with all the commands of God. That he has plenary ability to repent and believe, without the special aid of the Holy Spirit," &c. &c. Mr. Reid remarks: "I have *good reason to know*, that they, (the statements read,) *faithfully represent the opinions of many*" in the Presbyterian Church. So much, then, for the difference in doctrine, between the New and Old School.

What does Mr. Reid, an English Congregationalist, of high character and very extensive intelligence and travel say, on the subject of the difference in church order. On p. 61, vol. 2, of his "Visit to the American Churches," he says:—"What is much more important to observe is, that the great numbers of Congregationalists, both ministers and people, who have passed into the Presbyterian Church, have not forgotten their predilection for a more simple and less restricted form of government. This has operated silently, but with power; the effects begin to be seen and felt. It has contributed certainly, in its measure, to that conflict in opinion and conduct, which I have already noticed." "Speaking impartially, I know not that this is to be regretted. While it supplies us with the edifying and scarce example of two religious bodies dwelling in oneness and amity, it may, in the end, by the influence they shall exert on each other, supply us also, with the example of a church possessing within herself, all the advan-

tages of independency and all the force and beauty of consolidation,"
i. e. a Congregationalized Presbyterian Church.

Here then, the admission of the New School, in the Assembly of '37, of important differences in church policy and order, as well as in doctrine, between the Old and New School, is fully corroborated by the best testimony. What is admitted by the party, and is proved by other and good testimony, must be so. We hope never to hear it again said by any man, who has any character for truth or intelligence, that there is no difference between the New and Old School in *doctrine*—there is a difference as wide as darkness and light, falsehood and truth. But I must return to the points that lie more directly in my intended route.

What has the Assembly done since '38, that has so much excited Mr. Stiles against the church? Mr. Stiles will, himself, admit that all these acts he deems so dreadful, had been done by the Assembly, and known to him, previous to his votes at Winchester and Paris, to adhere and submit to the Old School. Have these acts grown worse, or has his wrath grown warmer, and his vision more jaundiced? The acts themselves have undergone no change, they remain upon the minutes of the Assembly just as they were when they were passed. The change has all been in the mind and feelings of Mr. Stiles.

He seems to think, that unless he is allowed to disturb the church, and misrepresent its acts, and injure as far as he can, its character, it will be fatal to its liberties. The Confession of Faith, chap. XX. art. 4, teaches that no man has a right, either by the sentiments he publishes, or the manner of publishing them, to disturb the external peace of the church, and if he should, he may, and ought to be proceeded against by the censures of the church. Has not Mr. Stiles, both by the injurious and unfounded statements he has published, and by the manner of their publication, disturbed the peace of the church, both external and internal, as far as he had influence to do so.

It is true, no man is bound to believe all the acts of the Assembly to be right. To disapprove, and to express disapprobation of its acts, is one thing,—but to pursue a regular, systematic, and persevering course of action and abuse, to injure the character, weaken the authority, and break the influence of the church with its members and the world, is quite another and a very different thing. This is the *manner* of publishing and expressing sentiments, which is calculated to disturb the external peace of the church, and call for its censures. We are allowed to disapprove, and express our disapprobation of the action

of the church, but we are not allowed to war against its interests, its peace and its union.

I shall not detain you longer upon this specification. There are many other misrepresentations of the Assembly's acts in evidence before you, but as they may as appropriately be discussed under the third specification as the first, we shall defer them until we reach that specification. Enough has been said to satisfy every member of this Presbytery of the truth of the first item in the indictment.

SPECIFICATION II.—"By misrepresenting the Synod at Hopkinsville, and attempting to throw odium upon it."

Mr. Stiles has endeavored, by his representations, to make the impression that the Synod treated him very unkindly; invited him out of their connexion; accused him of being vain, proud and imperious, &c. &c.—when it will be seen, from the evidence, that no such conduct was enacted by the Synod, and no such treatment received by Mr. Stiles from that body. Manifesto, pp. 1-2: "At our last meeting at Hopkinsville, after a full, frank and courteous expression of our sentiments and difficulties, to all our brethren of the Synod, more than once we were told, 'that as conscientious and consistent men, we could not retain our present ecclesiastical connexion.'" The "*Plain Statement*" of Dr. Cleland, Mr. Winston and McCoun, and endorsed in a supplement by Mr. Stiles, alleges that Mr. Burch said of them: "The brethren's hearts are not with us, and if their hearts are not with us, they had better leave, or go out from us." "Of Stiles, he said, the brother was proud, dictatorial and imperious, in most, if not all his writings and speeches." Mr. Stiles, in his supplement to this "*Plain Statement*," says, "pass by personalities—was it kind now, my brother, that the Synod," &c. "through one of its respondents, should pronounce our hearts alienated, after we had pronounced them attached? Was it kind that they should suffer one of their number, without one discordant note from the rest, to publish his suspicion of perfect integrity of our conduct at Paris, and of our disclosures at Hopkinsville; his knowledge of the indifference of one of our friends; his information of the apostacy of another, and his belief of the heterodoxy of others still? Above all, was it kind in our brethren addressed, to suffer such an interview as ours to close, without one relieving expression, after we *had been more than once informed* in their hearing, by members of the Synod, that *they* could not conscientiously preserve their ecclesiastical connexions, if they entertained the views *we had expressed*." "You have read your mistake in the solemn testimony of

four of the members of that body." After this full and ample endorsement of the plain statement by Mr. Stiles, conceive, if you can, my surprise at his effort, made in open Presbytery, to shuffle out of all responsibility for that "*Plain Statement*," and to disclaim any connexion with it. Who are the four members to whom Mr. Stiles alludes, if he be not one of them? Dr. Cleland, Mr. Winston, and Maj. McCoun are but three, and Mr. Stiles, in his indorsement, is the fourth. If the "*Plain Statement*" were a note for \$10,000, with Dr. Cleland, Mr. Winston, and McCoun, the original signers of it, and they should prove insolvent, and Mr. Stiles was worth the money, and had endorsed the note, just as he has the "*Plain Statement*," no business man here would fear that he could recover the money.

It would be deeply disgraceful too, for Mr. Stiles to refuse to pay the money, and shuffle out of his responsibility to do so, under the circumstances. But we have other testimony, introduced by Mr. Stiles himself, which hermetically seals up this point. Dr. C. Blackburn, a gentleman of high character, and a member of Mr. Stiles' church, and a warm personal friend, swears, "that soon after Mr. Stiles' return from Synod at Hopkinsville, he stated, that he could not see how he could remain in the Presbyterian Church as a minister and a gentleman—conceived that he had been invited out of the church."

Mr. C. Alexander, also, testifies that Mr. Stiles "stated that Mr. Burch charged him with being a proud, vain, arrogant man," and "that Mr. Breckinridge or Mr. Burch, or both, stated that if they entertained such views as he did, they could not, consistently, remain in the Presbyterian Church."

Now it is clear, beyond all cavil or dispute, that Mr. Stiles did, upon his return home from Hopkinsville, represent the Synod as having invited him out of the Presbyterian Church, and denounced him as proud, vain, arrogant, &c. Although he has attempted to shuffle out of the "*Plain Statement*," his own witnesses seal him up on this point.

Now, Mr. Moderator, I shall show you, that so far from there being any proof to establish these false allegations of Mr. Stiles against the Synod, the evidence is directly the other way. It clears the Synod, and every member of the Synod, from any such conduct.

The testimony of Mr. J. S. Berryman, is, "as far as I could judge, the spirit of the speakers, (the five that spoke) was kind, indeed more so than I had ever witnessed on an occasion of the kind."

The evidence of the Rev. N. H. Hall, is, that he was present during the interlocutory meeting, and "did not hear either Breckinridge or

Burch make the statements against them, (Stiles, Cleland, &c.) in the publications called a Plain Statement and the Manifesto." "The remarks of the brethren who spoke, were kind and conciliatory as I then thought and believed." "I heard no charge of pride, dictatorial, &c. made against brother Stiles, by brother Burch, or any other person in Synod."

The testimony of Capt. S. Wallace is to the same purport: "Mr. Burch made a very kind speech" at Synod, "in regard to Dr. Cleland, that he had been long acquainted with him; that he had the fullest confidence in his orthodoxy and piety—and confident he did not say he ought to leave the Synod."

Mr. Birch swears: "I know that I never said to these brethren what they have charged me with saying, in the printed paper, called a Plain Statement, and Manifesto. I did not hear bro. Breckinridge say what they state he did say, in the same papers." "Brother Breckinridge was exceedingly kind and gentle in his speech."

Quest. by Prosecutor—"Did you in the Synod at Hopkinsville, say that Mr. Stiles was vain, proud, dictatorial, &c.?"

Ans.—"I did not say it, or any thing like it; I said nothing at all about the character of Mr. Stiles."

Maj. McCoun, who was one of the signers of the Plain Statement, has given testimony in this case, which, so far from sustaining the misrepresentations of Mr. Stiles, only corroborates the testimony of the witnesses just noticed, except in one particular. He "states that he understood brother Breckinridge to say, that if his heart was like the brethren, he could not, consistently, stay in the Synod." This is the only point in which Maj. McCoun's testimony differs from the other witnesses. He is an honest man, and doubtless stated what he believed to be correct, but from the testimony of four other witnesses, on this point, he must have been mistaken. He further testifies, "As far as I can recollect, Mr. Burch said he did not wish any of the brethren to leave the Synod, but if his heart was as they had expressed their hearts, he could not stay, or that he could not stay in a church that his heart was not in." Here, you will observe, the witness says that Mr. Burch said one of two things, either, that if his heart was as they had expressed their hearts, he could not stay, or, he said, that if his heart was not in a church, he could not stay in it. Now, Mr. Burch admits he said he would not stay in a church if his heart were not in it.

Maj. McCoun, further testifies, upon cross examination: "I understood Mr. Burch to say, that he had entire confidence in Dr. Cleland's

piety and orthodoxy, and that he ought to be at the head of the Presbyterian Church in Kentucky." It is perfectly clear, from the testimony of Maj. McCoun, that Mr. Burch did not say of the brethren, that their hearts are not in the church, and that they ought to leave. That would make Mr. Burch guilty of the singular folly of saying, that Dr. Cleland ought to be at the head of a church that he was not fit to be in. Mr. Burch never says two directly opposite things in the same breath. He could never have said, that Dr. Cleland's heart was not in the church, and that he ought to leave, and at the same time, that he ought to be at the head of the Presbyterian Church in Kentucky. This would be making Mr. Burch an idiot, and whatever else his enemies may say of him, they clear him of the sin of idiocy.

I ask you, Mr. Moderator, if this specification has not been clearly established. That Mr. Stiles has misrepresented the conduct of the Synod, at Hopkinsville, so as to throw odium upon it, is as clearly established as human testimony can establish any proposition.

It may be as proper now, as at any time, to notice, how Mr. Stiles has garbled the extracts which he has made in his publications. It is a painful task to me, and I enter upon it with extreme reluctance. Nothing but the deepest necessity could ever impel me to make such an exposure of any human being as I shall now be compelled to do. Every single extract in Mr. Stiles' Manifesto and Convention Address is either so misquoted or garbled, as to make an entirely different impression from the one intended to be made, in the connection in which it is used. The first one to which we invite your attention, is to be found in the Manifesto, on the 8th page, at the bottom.

"Had the Synods been cut off," says the Court in Bank, "without hearing or notice, the act would have been contrary to the cardinal principles of natural justice, and consequently void."

Law Suit, page 589—Judge Gibson's decision—"Now had the excised Synods been cut off by a *judicial sentence*, without hearing or notice, the act would have been contrary to the cardinal principles of justice, & consequently void."

Here is an extract, marked as a literal quotation from the decision of the Court in Bank, and yet the most important words, "*judicial sentence*," to the proper understanding of the case, is left out. How Mr. Stiles managed to extract the sentence, and leave these words, so essential to its meaning, behind, I cannot understand. These words, you observe, occur, not at the beginning nor at the end of the sentence, but in the middle. The extract he has given, is a slander upon the court. The court never uttered, and never intended to utter, what he has said for them. Oh, will Mr. Stiles go and read what he has

said, in his Convention Address, about the evil effects of attempting to "justify wrong," and come forward and confess and repent for this flagrant wrong. If he so misstates a printed document, and perverts its obvious meaning, what reliance is to be placed in any of his statements about what was said in debate in Synod?

Manifesto, p. 9—"But even as a legislative act," says the Court, "it may have been a hard one, though constitutional and just."

Law Suit, p. 591—"But even as a legislative act, it may have been a hard one, though *certainly* constitutional & *strictly* just."

Mr. Stiles, to obviate the force of the decision of the court, to the undoubted constitutionality and strict justice of the Assembly's acts, disowning the four Synods, leaves out the qualifying terms, "*certainly and strictly*." Did the Court in Bank say what he has said they said? No! The court said more. It said the acts of the Assembly, about which Mr. Stiles has made such a fuss in the church, were "*certainly constitutional and strictly just*."

Again—*Manifesto*, page 14, near the top—"What motive could have prompted them to adopt a method of proceeding, so palpably subversive of constitutional order and individual right? They have presented their explanation. Let it speak for itself. It is found in the circular epistle of the General Assembly to *all the churches of Jesus Christ*, (Minutes 1837, p. 506.)—"To have attempted to separate from us the brethren with whom we could no longer walk in peace, by personal process, in each case, would, obviously, have been impossible, and if possible, *tedious, agitating, and troublesome*, in the highest degree." This is at once a giving up of the ship—an abandonment of the constitution. It sounds very like an apology for having sacrificed our standards to expediency."

Min. of the Assembly, 1837, p. 506—"We are aware that some have called in question the constitutionality of our proceedings. On this subject, the more maturely we reflect, the more firmly are we persuaded that we have taken the most eligible, and even the only practicable course. To have attempted to separate from us the brethren with whom we could no longer walk in peace, by personal process in each case, would obviously have been impossible, and even if possible, tedious, agitating, and troublesome in the highest degree.—The General Assembly is vested, by the constitution of our church, with plenary power "to decide in all controversies respecting doctrine and discipline; to reprove, warn, or bear testimony against error in doctrine or immorality in practice, in any *Church, Presbytery, or Synod*; to *superintend the concerns of the whole church*; to *suppress schismatical contentions and disputations*; and, in general, to recommend and attempt reformation of manners, and the promotion of charity, truth, and holiness, through all the churches under their care." It is manifest that *no other body* but the *General Assembly* is competent to sit in judgment on a *Synod*; and it is equally manifest, that no other body can be vested with power to *abolish a system which the General Assembly itself had formed, without consulting any*

of the Presbyteries. We have, therefore, not hesitated to apply the *constitutional remedy* in its fullest extent."

Here Mr. Stiles tears a sentence out of its connexion, and then proclaims: "this is at once a giving up of the ship—an abandonment of the constitution." I ask, did the Assembly give up the ship, and acknowledge that they had abandoned the constitution? And did they apologize for so doing? I answer, no—and Mr. Stiles knows it—for the very paragraph from which he has extracted this acknowledgment denies it, and asserts, that "we have, therefore, not hesitated to apply the *constitutional remedy*, in its fullest extent." If this sort of liberty is to be allowed, then any slander may be published and you have no redress. If Mr. Stiles so perverts written statements and facts, what possible reliance is to be placed in his statements of what brethren say in debate?

We shall give but one more, out of the almost numberless instances of his gross perversions, which occur in his publications. After some two or three pages of high sounding bombast, in his Convention Address, in which he portrays the evil effects of attempting to justify wrong, (a lesson which Mr. Stiles ought to read to himself, for his own private benefit,) and calls upon the General Assembly "to advance before heaven and earth and confess her wrong," and "all will be well." In the midst of these "great swelling words of vanity," he has given another most striking proof of his capacity to pervert.

Convention Address, p. 20—"In all the anxious conflicts of the church, in time to come, the love of power, party, error, or orthodoxy, struggling for the ascendancy, will look back to the memorable era of '37, and read the broad and uncanceled inscription, "*accept the propositions*, or tomorrow we shall excise a sufficient number of Synods from the General Assembly to secure, thereafter, in that body, the predominance of the Old School."—*Mil. Rep.* p. 58.

Miller's Report of the Law Suit, p. 58—Mr. Randall, the counsel for the New School, wished to ask Judge Jessup if Rob't. J. Breckinridge did not say something like Mr. Stiles' quotation, and the court would not permit the question to be put.

Here Mr. Stiles quotes the remarks of Mr. Randall, the New School lawyer, as the avowed doctrine, and "*broad and uncanceled inscription*" of the Assembly of 1837. Now I ask, will Mr. Stiles' conscience permit him to be at rest, until he has confessed and repented of these "crying wrongs." Whether he intended them as evidences of his tact, as a *lawyer*, or as flights of his fancy, or as flashes of superior genius, I shall not undertake to determine. These are but a few examples of garbled extracts and misquotations, with which all Mr.

Stiles' writings against the church abound. I do not charge these as intentional blunders—but, whether intentional or unintentional, it is perfectly immaterial to my purpose. If they are *intentional*, his moral integrity is gone—if they are unintentional, which charity forbids me to doubt, (and they must be one or the other,) what reliance can be placed upon the verbal or written statements of a man who cannot quote from even printed documents correctly, but who garbles and misquotes so grossly in all his attempts at quotations?

What must be the fate of the man and his cause, which depend upon such perversions and misstatements to sustain them? Such an array of facts as these, which Mr. Stiles will not deny, would blast the prospects of any political aspirant in the land. If Mr. Stiles can sustain himself, among an honest and thinking people, with such a load upon him, he can swim the Ohio river with a ton of lead upon his back. He cannot do it. He will just as certainly sink in the public mind as lead will in water. These have been painful exposures and very reluctantly made, on my part, but truth and the interests of a bleeding church have impelled me to it.

I shall now pass to the consideration of the next specification, feeling assured that nothing could add to the certainty with which this specification has been established. I shall discuss the next two specifications together.

SPECIFICATION III.—"By pursuing such a course, and making such representations of the church, of which he is a minister and member, as tend to produce schism."

SPECIFICATION IV.—"By declaring, in open Presbytery and elsewhere, that he first purposed, upon his return from Synod last fall, to leave, but afterwards concluded to remain in his present ecclesiastical connexion, to enlighten the minds of his brethren, and bring the church over to his views, i. e., to agitate and distract the churches."

The evidence we have adduced, under the two preceding specifications, is all in point under these.

We have offered, and they are in evidence before you, Mr. Stiles' articles, in the Protestant and Herald, on the New and Old School. Every member of the Presbytery has read, and doubtless recollects, the purport of those articles. Without going into details, it is sufficient to observe, that the sum and substance of these articles were, that the New School were better, wiser, sounder, and more zealous than the Old School.

Manifesto, p. 9—"The second grand step in the march of the reformation, is the "*imperative act*." Mr. Stiles denounces, as a fearful encroachment upon the free and liberal spirit of the church, the

act of the Assembly, making it the duty of Presbytery to examine those "who make application for admission into their bodies, on experimental religion, didactic and polemic theology, and church government." Does Mr. Stiles suppose that a Presbytery is bound to receive all who make application, whether it is satisfied or not? If so, why have all our Presbyteries been in the universal habit of taking the vote, whether the applicant shall be received or not? The very fact, that such a vote is always taken, should satisfy any reasonable mind that the Presbytery has a right to reject. It is perfectly clear, that if the Presbytery has a right to examine in any case, (and who doubts this right?) it also has a right to examine in all cases. The General Assembly thought that it would be best to examine in all cases, and thereby to prevent the appearance of suspicion of one more than another—and, consequently, passed a resolution, making it the duty of Presbytery to examine in all cases. And who is it that would complain of such a requisition? Surely not those who are best qualified to undergo such an examination. It looks suspicious to dread an examination.

Again—Manifesto, p. 10—"Another palpable breach of the constitution, respects Presbyterial representation in the General Assembly. Here too, witness the war of the spirit of reform upon the standards of the church." We shall read this dreadful act of the Assembly, which has excited so deeply, Mr. Stiles' pious horror. Min. Ass. 1837, p. 446: "Resolved, that no commissioner from a newly formed Presbytery, shall be permitted to take his seat, until the Presbytery shall have been duly reported by the Synod, and that the same rule apply where the name of any Presbytery has been changed."—What is *expressed* in this resolution, has always been understood or implied from the very necessity of the case.

The Synod, by our system of government, forms the Presbytery—the fact of its formation must be reported to the Assembly before the Assembly can admit the commissioner of that new Presbytery to a seat. If this were not the case, and the Assembly bound to receive any one who comes, whether from a proper constituency or not, who does not see, that any body of men, whether a Presbytery or not, could gain a seat in our General Assembly? The Synod that forms the Presbytery must report the fact to the Assembly, and when so reported, and the Assembly thereby officially informed that it is a proper Presbytery, it is duly received and its commissioner takes his seat. What could be plainer? What more easily understood? Yet Mr.

Stiles takes fright at this resolution, as though it were "the pile by Pallas, raised to ruin Troy," and exclaims with shuddering apprehensions, "what an outrageous invasion of the fountains of power have we here!" We shall read as a literary curiosity, what Mr. Stiles has said on this subject. "Suppose a Presbytery be formed this fall; it meets according to the appointment of Synod; is regularly constituted; transacts all the usual business of a Presbytery, and subsequently does the same on its own regular adjournments. Is not that Presbytery as much entitled to a seat in the General Assembly, as the old mother Presbytery of Philadelphia? Not yet, replies the above new (constitutional) rule! Not yet, re-echoes the 'supreme legislature' of '37! Not until it shall have first passed the door of the Synod. Now, the Synods meet in the fall, generally, and the Assembly in the spring, always. This new Presbytery, therefore, is cut out of its constitutional right to a seat in the Assembly, at least once—by accident or inadvertence, oftner, and if the Synod choose, more frequently still." This, whether it be regarded as rhetoric, logic or history, is a singular production, and can only be surpassed by what remains of the paragraph from which I have just read. There is no need, as Mr. Stiles ought to have known, (and certainly would have known, if he had known what he was writing about,) of a newly formed Presbytery's loosing its seat in the first Assembly after its formation. The Synod that forms the Presbytery is bound to send up its records every spring, to the Assembly, for examination, and thereby reports all its acts to the Assembly. If any newly formed Presbytery entertained any fear that the Synod's report of its formation, might fail to reach the Assembly, the Presbytery could obtain from the stated clerk of Synod, an extract from its minutes, and convey the report to the Assembly itself. There are several cases in the minutes of '38 and '39, of newly formed Presbyteries being reported to the Assembly, and their commissioners obtaining their seats, the very first Assembly after their formation. The case of the Presbytery of Greenbrier, (Min. 1838, p. 9,) and also the cases of the Presbyteries of Caledonia, in the Synod of New Jersey, and of New Lisbon and St. Clairsville, in the Synod of Pittsburg, (Min 1839, p. 147.) Mr. Stiles thinks, that a newly formed Presbytery must, by necessity, be cut out of a seat in the Assembly once, by the Assembly's resolution. It is all a mistake, as every one who ever read the Confession of Faith, and knows any thing of our government, must know. He seems to be laboring under some singular misconceptions, about mysterious ceremonies to be observed, in passing and re-passing

the door of the Synod, and some two or three years pilgrimage, before a Presbytery could find its bewildered way to the General Assembly. The mysteriousness of the operation is not in the resolution of the Assembly, but in the brothers confusion of ideas. But the most singular part of this mysterious paragraph remains to be read, it is "Observe, if you please, that by the constitution, the Presbyteries are the *creator* of the Assembly, and by the confession of our reform brethren, 'the fountains of its power.' If there be not here, a clear case of the *creature's* treading upon the *creator*, and the *stream* flowing up hill, and shutting down the very *fountain* of its power, we are at a loss to understand the operation." To attempt "*to understand the operation*" by which such a sentence was produced, its rhetoric, logic, or its ideas, would be a singular task indeed. The Presbyteries, according to Mr. Stiles, *create* the Assembly; the Assembly *creates* the Synods, and the Synods *create* the Presbyteries. Here then, we have a circle or triangle of creators, and yet all creatures. Each child the creator of his own grandfather, and the child of his own grandson. The Assembly, once undertook to make the third Presbytery of Philadelphia. In that case, the *creature*, instead of treading upon the *creator*, undertook the singularly mysterious work, of *making its own creator*. In the same sentence in which we have this jumble of creations, the figure of a *creature treading upon the creator*, by some wonderful tergiversation is changed into a *stream flowing up hill*—and still further, by some sort of legerdemain, into a *shutting down the very fountains of its power*. It is truly a singular sentence, whether it was intended to convey an idea or not. I have heard of words being intended to convey ideas, and of words being intended to conceal them, but this sentence seems to have been intended to confuse them.

It is the misfortune of some men, to be so constituted, as to have their belief entirely under the control of their will. Whatever they wish to be so, they can, with singular facility, persuade themselves is so. A mind so constituted, can make a belief to fit his case as snugly as the greatest adept in the profession of shoe making can make a boot to fit his foot. In confirmation of this fact, in mental operations, I would relate an instance which may serve both as an illustration and a confirmation. A gentleman once told me, that when he was a young man, at one of the eastern colleges, he was very wild, prodigal, and neglectful of his studies. He had occasion to write home to his father, in the South, for more remittances, as he was in need of some cash, and, very much to his surprise, instead of receiving the

money, got a long letter from his father, informing him that he knew of his prodigality, wildness and negligence of his studies, and that while he continued so, could remit him no more money, and that unless he reformed, would entirely cut him off from any share in his estate. The young man sat down and wrote in reply, a long letter to his father, acknowledging his wildness, prodigality, and negligence of his studies, but assumed the ground, that he was not to blame for it. That it resulted from one of the three following causes, to-wit: 1st. either that his father had set him a bad example, and instilled incorrect principles into him, and if this were the cause, his father, and not he, was to blame; or 2d, that God had so made him, at his creation, I suppose so constituted, in the popular language of phrenology, his cerebrel organs, that he was but following the leadings of his nature, and if this were the case, God, and not he, was to blame; or 3d, that God was exerting a direct influence upon him, propelling him to all his course, and if this were the cause, God, and not he, was to blame. In any of the three aspects of the case, he was clear, and that God and his father might divide the blame between themselves.

This gentleman informed me, that his room mate came in and found the letter unfolded on the table, and began to read it, but had not read far before he burst out into a loud laugh, and exclaimed, why Joe have you gone crazy! You do not intend to send this letter to your father. He said he never was more indignant in his life, for he said he as *conscientiously* believed every word in the letter, as ever he believed any thing in his life. Now, suppose that young man, who could *conscientiously believe* the *absurdities* in the letter to his father, should join a church and become a minister, and then wish to pick a quarrel with his church, he would be at no loss to make, and then *conscientiously* believe some dreadful charge against her. He could, if he chose, just as readily believe all the *absurdities, misquotations and misstatements in the Manifesto and Convention Address*, as did the young man at college, believe the *ridiculous absurdities* in his letter to his father. It is perfectly a clear case, that these publications are not a whit more absurd and false, than was the letter the young man wrote his father. If he could bring his conscience to believe the letter, he might conscientiously believe these remarkable publications. The gentleman who was once the young man at college, and who wrote the famous letter to his father, is the brother now before you, and the author of those singular publications. One is the product of his intellect in its youth,

the other, the product of his intellect in its manhood. The two prove incontestibly *his mental identity, if not the identity of his faith.*

There is one point of belief expressed in his youthful letter, that is the faith of his riper years. He has often said, in Presbytery and to his brethren in private conversations, that "all was dark before him; he had no plan; could not see before him, &c.—but *intended to advance just as God pushed him on*; would go to God for light, and was going, just as Abraham went out from Ur of the Chaldees, not knowing whither he went." This was precisely the doctrine in his letter to his father—that God was propelling him, by a divine influence, to all his course. Whether the course of *prodigality, wildness, and negligence* which he, in the days of his youth, *believed, conscientiously*, to be the result of a divine impulse, was more or less promotive of the cause of Christ and the good of souls, than the agitating and divisionary course which he now, with equal conscientiousness, no doubt, believes to be the result of God's Spirit upon his mind, I shall not now stop to enquire. He certainly believed that both were the immediate results of a divine impulse.

But, I ask, is Mr. Stiles thus driven on by a blind fanaticism, and has he no design, and has he made no attempt to produce schism? His whole course, in public and in private, tends directly to produce schism. His whole design and effort, in his public addresses; in his publications, and in his private intercourse and correspondence, so far as they have come to light, have been to alienate the minds of the membership and the men of the world from the Pres. Church. And in every circle of his influence, he has produced this alienation, to the full extent of that influence. Mr. Stiles once purposed to abandon our ecclesiastical organization and afterwards concluded to remain in our connexion, only for collision, agitation, and schism.

Dr. C. Blackburn testifies, that Mr. Stiles was opposed to remaining in the church, "because, he said, he thought it calculated to do harm, by producing divisions." Now, I would ask, how could his remaining in the church produce divisions, if he "followed the things that make for *peace*," as he promised, at his ordination, to do? His remaining in the church never could have done "*harm*, by producing divisions," but by his pursuing the course he has pursued. His knowing that his stay would so result, is conclusive evidence, that he intended to pursue the very course he has pursued, and to produce the very results he has produced, viz: "*divisions*." But it is proved, by other witnesses, that Mr. Stiles, time and again, in public and in pri-

vate, avowed, that the reason why he remained in his present ecclesiastical connexion, was "*to try the rights of free discussion,*"—"*to enlighten the minds of his brethren,*"—and "*to bring the church over to his views.*" Mr. D. C. Humphries testifies, that Mr. Stiles told him, "that he remained for the purpose of pressing out his views, and enlightening the minds of his brethren, and to try the rights of free discussion; that he intended to oppose the reform measures of the General Assembly, and would not submit to them." Mr. Stiles has said the same things, time and again, in Presbytery and Synod, as you all know, and as is in proof before you. What he said to Mr. Humphries, and so often to the Presbytery, about his remaining in our church "*to press out his views*"—"*to try the rights of free discussion*"—"*to enlighten the minds of his brethren*"—"*to bring the church over to his views*"—"*to oppose the reform measures*"—and *to not "submit," &c.* all throw the clearest light upon what he said to Dr. C. Blackburn, that his "*remaining in the church would do harm, by producing divisions.*" Here then, by the testimony of men of the highest character, Mr. Stiles remained in the Presbyterian Church, with a deliberate purpose, and malice aforethought, "*to do harm, by producing divisions.*" And "*suiting the action to the word,*" he set himself to work and has persevered in doing just what he said he would do. Ah, Mr. Moderator, could I but lift the veil, and disclose to you, the secret conclaves—the private and concealed plans—the insidious influences, and dark machinations, that have been put in operation to break down the sacred bulwarks of our beloved church, and that too by her professed friends, you would weep over poor human nature. Look at the letter of Mr. Stiles, to Mr. Humphries, how cautiously he approaches him; how artfully he plays upon his pride by flattery; how insidious are his advances, all to break Mr. Humphries' confidence in, and attachment to, his own church. Aaron Burr, himself, never approached a friend of the Union, with more address and winning forms, and in a manner better calculated to succeed, than Mr. Stiles did Mr. Humphries, in this letter, in evidence before you. Mr. Humphries stood firm by the church, unawed and unseduced. Every device has been tried—pride, passion, prejudice, ambition, independence, all have been addressed and appealed to, "*by all means to gain some.*"

I ask you, Mr. Moderator, if Mr. Stiles has not pursued "*such a course, and made such representations of the church, of which he is both a member and a minister, as tend to produce schism?*" Has he not done more? Has he not done all, knowing, believing, and pur-

posing "to do harm, by producing divisions" or schisms? Oh what but the most blinding ambition, and vitiated state of moral feeling, could have so beclouded his intellect, and so alienated his affections from his church, as to have prompted him to have pursued such a wild crusade against her peace, her union, and her interests.

SPECIFICATION V.—"By aiding in calling a convention, to be composed in part, of Ministers and laymen, not in our ecclesiastical connexion, to council and advise, what he should do as to his present church relations."

On this specification, but little need be said. That Mr. Stiles has aided in calling a convention, such as is charged, he has himself admitted. That he has taken part in a similar convention, at Versailles, its published minutes show. It is known to you, and to the public, that Mr. Stiles, not only took a part in the Versailles convention, but that he, in his manifesto, called it, and was its master spirit. (Mr. Dickerson will pardon the expression.) There were, it is true, (and I am happy to say it,) some brethren in that convention, solely for peace, and it was by their influence in the convention, open schism was prevented. They were actuated by far different and higher motives, than were the prime movers in the affair. The published minutes of that convention show, that Mr. A. C. Dickerson and Dr. Thos. D. Mitchell, two of the bitterest and most malignant enemies of the Presbyterian Church, in Ky. were members, and took a prominent part in its proceedings. There were two others in the convention who had seceded from the Presbyterian church, and were opposing its interests.

Who then is Mr. Dickerson? And who is Dr. T. D. Mitchell? And what are their relations to the Presbyterian Church? Mr. Dickerson is the identical little gentleman who wrote a *pamphlet* and an *extra Gazette*, in which he *praised himself* and *slandered the church of Christ*. The very same, who induced a small fraction of the church at Bowlinggreen to secede, that he might have some body to preach to. Whose whole manner, dress, diamond finger-ring, writings, all clearly show that he is *either a very great man*, or is laboring under a *very great mistake*. He boasts in his *pamphlet and extra Gazette* of his important connexion with "*Constitutional Presbyterianism*" in the South, which, by the way, must have been a very small concern, or Mr. Dickerson would not have left it to take care of a handful of seceders in Bowlinggreen. Mr. Dickerson's boasts, remind me of the story of the boy, who wished the world to know that he had a very important connexion with the fame of Dr. Johnson. When some one spoke in commendation of a much admired work of the Doctor's, the boy, feeling his pride kindle, stepped forward, seized the volume, and holding it

up in the view of the croud, with great self-complacency and delight, exclaimed, "I made the paste that bound that book!"

And who is Dr. T. D. Mitchell? He is the same distinguished gentleman who has been, for several years, writing anonymous and slanderous letters against the Presbyterian Church for every paper that would publish them. Who, like the frozen and famished serpent, has been attempting to fasten his envenomed fangs into the vitals of those who warmed and fed him. The slanders of whose foul pen, and yet fouler tongue, become the highest praise, when their author is known.*

These are the men whose aid, counsel, and comfort, Mr. Stiles sought and obtained. To have given similar aid, counsel, and comfort to the enemies of his country, would have been high treason, and punishable with death. If some of the officers, in our glorious revolutionary struggle, had been found in conventions and secret conclaves with Arnold and other deserters, planning and plotting against our peace and union, I ask, would it not have been the vilest treason? Is it not equally treason against the church to be found in conventions and secret conclaves with these ecclesiastical enemies, plotting and planning against her *peace and union*?

SPECIFICATION VI.—"By aiding and abetting the Session of the Versailles Presbyterian Church, in a slanderous, and party prosecution, against the minority of said church, for expressing in memorials to the West Lexington Presbytery, their belief of the injurious tendency of his course."

It is perfectly well known to every member of this Presbytery, that thirteen members of the Versailles Church—as exemplary, orderly, and as pious as any members in the church—were arraigned, tried, and condemned, by the Session of that church, for certain memorials sent by them to the Presbytery. The Session say, in their decision, that the whole thirteen would have been *suspended* "but for the sacred right of petition."

*Dr Mitchell is a member of Dr. Beecher's church, in Cincinnati, and has been doing all in his power to introduce into Lexington, and Kentucky generally, the principles of this *new and abolition sect*. He has abused and slandered far better and abler men than himself, both in the ministry and medical profession. Whose treatment of Holloway and Milton, and slanders of other gentlemen about Lexington, show him to be below the ordinary sensibilities of our common nature, and throw him entirely out of the pale of all sympathy with elevated minds. The fact that Dr. Mitchell *withholds his name* from his slanderous publications against the Presbyterian Church, proves one of two things, that he either knows what he writes is false, and is ashamed to sign his name to them, or that he knows his name is so infamous as to destroy the credit of any thing it is found in company with, and therefore he conceals it. The Doctor and his good neighbors, in Lexington, agree upon this point, if upon no other. This is the man who said that "the most damnable heresies, known to the church, were in the Old School party." Truth and decency seem to be heresies with Dr. Mitchell. He also said that he would "sooner turn Turk than countenance the blasting and mildew influence of the Old School." Thank you Doctor, your countenance would form a shade dark as Egyptian midnight. It is thought, in becoming Turk, you would have but little *turning* to do. You seem to be far more *Turk* than *Christian* now.

In the first citation, nothing is charged against the minority but their memorials. When the minority appeared before the Session for trial, the Session were not ready. They wished to amend their bill of indictment. They so amended their bill as to make it a vile slander of the minority, charging them with "*scoffing, reviling, &c.*" Mr. Stiles. The Session, with all their patient efforts, proved utterly unable to furnish a single particle of proof that they had been guilty of any such conduct.

The right to memorialise the only competent power to redress grievances, is indeed a sacred right, and the man who would lay his hand upon that right, is a tyrant. This right has been infringed; its sanctity has been invaded by the Session of the Versailles Church, in their trial of the minority. So flagrant and palpable was their *irregularities or corruption*, that the Presbytery and Synod deposed them from office, for their offences in this trial. This the Presbytery had the clearest right and was bound to do. (See Form Gov. Ch. VII, Sec. III, Sub Sec. XIII.)

But was the Session the prime movers in this case? No sir, far from it! They were but the willing instruments of Mr. Stiles, ready and subservient to do his bidding. They were like Anthony, "no more than Cæsar's arm, when Cæsar's head is off." It is in proof, that Mr. Stiles proposed to the Presbytery at Salem, in July, to try this minority, for their memorial then before the Presbytery. He returned home in company with one of the Session, and in a very short time the minority received a citation to be tried for the very memorial for which Mr. Stiles wished the Presbytery to try them. Who is so dull as not to see Mr. Stiles' hand in that? It has been admitted by him, that when the Session found themselves incompetent to issue the case, he aided them in making out the charges and specifications. And it has been proved here, that Mr. Stiles was present during the progress of the trial, prompting and suggesting questions to the prosecutor, and sometimes, asking questions of the witnesses himself. Mr. Stiles has not only aided and abetted the Session, in this prosecution, but has instigated them to it. He first proposed to Presbytery to try them—next, he aids, by his own confession, in making out the charges, and lastly, in the progress of the trial, he is found straddle of the prosecutor, urging and spurring him on in his unhallowed work.

This trial was, itself, a violent outrage upon every feeling of propriety, christian right, and constitutional order. Mr. Stiles has declaimed, at large, against oppression, tyranny, and arbitrariness, and in favor of liberty, and the widest latitude of expression of his views

of public men and measures in the church: but, no sooner did the minority of the Versailles Church express their belief of the injurious tendency of his public course, and that too in respectful memorials to the Presbytery, the only competent power to redress their grievances, than he arraigns, tries, and condemns aged mothers and fathers, and brethren and sisters. He has made the very welkin to ring, with boisterous distentations of voice, in favor of the *widest latitude for himself*. He has, in this trial, as with the hammer of a Cyclops, attempted to *cleave down the dearest rights of others*, and *subvert the liberties of the church*. The annals of the world may be searched in vain, to find, out of the church of Rome, a parallel to this case. It furnishes another illustration and proof, that the *greatest professions of liberty and tolerance* are usually found in company with the *highest degree of arbitrariness and tyranny*. *Liberal christianity*, as it is called, *has always been intolerant*. The Assembly, and the subordinate judicatories of the church, have been held up, by Mr. Stiles, in their acts, since '37, as arbitrary, tyrannical, oppressive, and as dangerously threatening to the liberties of the church; but I defy him, if he had the eyes of an argus, to find any thing to equal his own acts in this very case. His notions of liberty seem to be, not only the right to do himself, but also to make others do as he pleases. I know that on this point incredulity, itself, is satisfied, that Mr. Stiles instigated this trial; that he aided and abetted the Session in what they did, and that, at any time, a single word from him would have put a stop to the whole proceeding.

SPECIFICATION VII.—"By aiding and abetting the Rev. A. W. Campbell, who has been attempting to draw off the Greer's Creek Church from its present ecclesiastical connexion."

That Mr. Campbell has been making efforts to draw off the Greer's Creek Church, from its connexion with us, is clearly proved by the testimony of Messrs. Stuart and Allen, two of the committee of Presbytery, appointed to visit that church. These two witnesses swear: "Mr. Campbell said to the congregation, that he had no part or lot with the Old School party, and said, if the congregation sustained him, they must fall under the censure of the Presbytery, and that he had always, on former occasions, told them so; said, that if they wished to obtain his services, they must declare themselves off from the West-Lexington Presbytery." Here Mr. Campbell offered to the Greer's Creek Church, the strength of their attachment to him, and desire for his services, as the motive to influence them to "declare themselves off from the West-Lexington Presbytery."

Mr. Stiles aided and abetted Mr. Campbell, by advising him to preach to that church, when he knew that Mr. Campbell had no connexion with our church and intended to form none. He further aided Mr. Campbell at his meeting, and thus countenanced him, when he knew that Mr. Campbell was making efforts to lead that church off. Mr. Stiles, by ministerial intercourse with Mr. Campbell, under the circumstances, was giving him the weight of his influence and countenance, to break the union of that church with our Presbytery.

It seems that Mr. Stiles was well aware of the impropriety of his conduct in this respect, from the fact that he refused to be present when Mr. Campbell was to administer the ordinance of the supper. He refused to be present, much less to take part in the table service, as Mr. Campbell testifies, and yet he could advise Mr. Campbell to preach there, and assist in every way, except at the sacramental table. This looks really like "straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel." This is another rare instance of that squeamishness, which sometimes passes under the title of modesty.

Ah sir, this is no matter of amusement. Mr. Stiles is too modest to even see Mr. Campbell handle the emblems in the ordinance of the supper, but can do all in his power, by advice, countenance, ministerial intercourse, and aid, to give him influence to break the union of that church with our Presbytery, and yet his delicate nerves are shocked at the very idea of being present at the sacramental supper. This proves too much; it proves that Mr. Stiles was doing what he knew and felt to be disorderly and wrong, and intended this squeamishness as a palliation of his offence. It looks very much like the man who professed to serve the Lord, and was yet afraid to offend the Devil, for he said he did not know into whose hands he might fall.*

I have now waded through the various specifications of this tedious case. I have not said all that I intended, nor even the moiety of what might, with great pertinancy, have been said: but your patience has been sufficiently taxed, with the outline which I have so hastily and imperfectly drawn. You cannot fail, even from this hasty and imperfect outline, to form a tolerably correct idea of the true features of this singular case. I do not wish to trespass farther upon your patience, but you will allow me to correct some of the distorted historical representations, Mr. Stiles so often makes, of the character of our Scotch ancestry. Mr. Stiles, instead of drawing upon the proper sources for his

*It seem, after all Mr. Stiles' ado about refusing to be present at the sacramental service, that he actually remained and partook of the elements at Mr. Campbell's hands.

history, seems to rely chiefly, upon his reasoning powers to furnish his facts in this case. This fact would destroy all its claims to authenticity. Mr. Stiles has often argued, that because the Kirk of Scotland is the established church, and because the civil institutions of the country are monarchical, therefore, the church is monarchical and arbitrary; and that when these Scotch Presbyterians emigrated to America they brought with them the arbitrary spirit of the land and institutions from which they came, and that this spirit was greatly modified by the liberal and free civil institutions of this country; and that American Presbyterianism is the result of the liberalizing influence that our republican and free civil government exerted upon the cramped, bigoted, intolerant, and arbitrary spirit of the Scotch Presbyterians. Now all this looks very plausible to a mind that is perfectly ignorant of the history both of Scotland and America. Now, I would just ask, what were the civil institutions of this country, when first discovered by Columbus? Is Mr. Stiles really laboring under the delusion that there was a free republican civil government here, such as we now have, when our adventurous forefathers first set foot upon the American soil? There is a speculation afloat, that at some far remote period of antiquity, there was a race of people who understood many of the arts of civilized man, that inhabited this country. If this speculation were true, the race was either extinct or had relapsed into the savage state, and lost every traditionary vestige of its former civilization. So far from meeting the hospitable welcome, upon the American continent, by a race of refined and civilized freemen, as Mr. Stiles seems to think, our English and Scotch forefathers met the yell, the tomahawk, and scalping knife of the savage Indian, and the terrific howl and frightful scream of the ferocious wild beast, and a dark and almost impenetrable wilderness. And was there any thing in all these to modify the religious principles of these noble men? Is the republican government of the Presbyterian Church in America a medium between Scotch Presbyterianism and the savage state? If Mr. Stiles had only studied the history of our Scotch ancestry, he had never uttered sentiments so dishonoring to their pious and venerated memory. The Presbyterianism of Scotland has ever been the palladium of her liberties. It has ever stood, like a breastwork of adamant, against the invasions of tyranny and oppression. This the Charles's and the James's well knew, and they sought to extirpate it from the realm, because they declared it not only inimical to, but absolutely incompatible with monarchy. Presbyterians, by the admission of Hume, who was no friend,

has secured to England whatever of liberty she enjoys. It was the principles of liberty, which these noble men brought with them, and which they impressed upon their posterity, to which we owe our liberty and free institutions. They were not indebted to this country for their liberal principles, but this country, and we, their unworthy sons, are indebted to these men, whom we sometimes shamelessly dishonor, for what we are, as a government, civil and religious. They too, were the firmest and the most undaunted friends of this country in its contest with the crown. No men more nobly fought, bled, and died, than did *these Scotch Presbyterians*, in our glorious and ever memorable revolutionary struggle. Ah, if Mr. Stiles would rely *more* upon *history*, and *less* upon his *imagination*, for his facts, our Scotch ancestry would, at least, have greater justice, and the cause of truth would suffer less at his hands.

And now, Mr. Moderator, my painful task is done. The part that circumstances have compelled me to take, in this case, has been very uncongenial with my feelings. But however painful this task may have been, I hope I have met it with a fearless and unfaltering step. Naturally disinclined to all collision, and averse to all strife, nothing could be more trying to my feelings, than to be placed in circumstances which force me to prosecute a ministerial brother: but it is sometimes the case, that the path of duty is an unpleasant and painful one, and we should tread that path with as firm and willing a step as if it were the most pleasant. Towards Mr. Stiles I would indulge the kindest feelings. I would entreat him, for his own sake, to desist. The evil he can do the church is small indeed, but that he will do himself is great and irreparable. The church is safe. Built upon the blood and protected by the arm of her Almighty Redeemer, who can harm her? "But on whomsoever *this stone* shall fall it will grind him to powder."

These painful collisions, with us, will all soon be over. We shall, if we be christians indeed, soon exchange the tents of our pilgrimage for the palace of our home; the weapons of our warfare for the palms, harps, and crowns of our triumph; the angry tones of debate and rebuke for the soft and sweet song of Moses and the Lamb. And oh! fathers and brethren, when our short and hurried pilgrimage ends, and we shall mingle with the redeemed tribes from earth, whose tents shall whiten on every hill around the heavenly Jerusalem, and look back, with unclouded vision, upon this dark earth, how changed will be our views and feelings with reference to many of the subjects which

now occupy our thoughts. Ambition and fame are noisy puffs—empty bubbles, that elude the grasp and disappoint our hopes.

In conclusion, I entreat you to let your decision, in this case, be such as you shall approve, when you come to view it in the light of eternity. Far be it from me to dictate to you what your verdict, in this case, shall be. You will permit me to entreat you to err, if err you shall, on the side of tenderness and mercy. I utter but the honest feelings of my heart, when I beg you, in your decision of the case of the unhappy brother before you, to lean as much to clemency and mercy as your high sense of duty to your bleeding church and your God will permit.

I now leave the case, so far as the prosecution is concerned, in your hands, praying that wisdom, discretion, tenderness, justice, and mercy may be happily and harmoniously blended in your decision; and that it may be such as God, and your own consciences, may approve; and such that God's glory may be advanced, and the church's permanent peace and prosperity and harmonious union may be promoted.

The examination of the witnesses and the hearing of the parties, occupied the attention of the Presbytery for four days. The following minute was brought in by a committee appointed for that purpose, as the decision of the Presbytery in the case, viz:

“Presbytery having deliberately and seriously considered the case of prosecution against the Rev. J. C. Stiles, have come to the following conclusion, or judgment, viz: that the charge and specifications preferred against the said Rev. J. C. Stiles are established by the evidence; and that he be admonished by the Moderator of the serious and lamentable evils he has occasioned to the church and its judicatories by his imprudent, agitating, revolutionary and schismatical course, and that he be warned against a continuance of such conduct, and further, that Mr. Stiles be requested to subscribe the following acknowledgment, viz: I acknowledge the course I have pursued to be wrong and attended with evil consequences which I deeply regret, and I solemnly promise, in reliance on divine grace, to abstain in future from all such measures as tend to divide and distract the church. And if Mr. Stiles now submit to this decision, he be considered as in good standing in the church. But if he refuse to submit, that he be forthwith suspended, for contumacy, from all the functions of the gospel ministry until he shall submit.”

The foregoing was adopted by the following vote, viz:

YEAS—Ministers: Burch, C. Stewart, Simrall, Logan, Forsythe, M^cElroy, N. H. Hall, Davidson and Bullock. Elders: Allen, Seargeant, Carr, Bullock, J. Logan, D. McKee, Irwin, Lowrey, Russell, J. McKee, Castleman and Holloway—21.

NAYS—Elders: Jos. H. Davies, Jno. H. Berryman and J. R. Alexander—3.

The decision of the Presbytery was then read by the Moderator to the accused, to which he refused to submit, and also declared that he would not submit to any censure which this Presbytery might pronounce; wherefore, the Moderator proceeded to pronounce the sentence of suspension, for contumacy, from all the functions of the gospel ministry till he shall submit.

CHAS. A. CAMPBELL, s. c. w. l. p.

APPENDIX:

CONTAINING THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE REV. J. C. STILES AND MYSELF.

July, 26th, 1840, Woodford Co. Ky.

Rev. J. C. STILES:

Dear Brother:—I have just been informed, that you have made remarks prejudicial to my moral character. I am very unwilling to believe that you have done so. The remark that I have been informed you have made, in regard to me, is, that you have long since known that I would not tell the truth, or words to that effect. If you have *not* made any such remark in regard to me, it is due to *you*, that myself and friends should know from you that no such remark had been made by you. If you *have made* any such remark, it is due *to me* to know it, that I may be able to remove any such impression from your mind. You will, in justice to me, if you have said any thing unfavorable to my veracity, specify the particular instances in which I have ever departed, in the slightest degree, from the strictest veracity, that I may have an opportunity to clear myself from any such charge. You will write me by the bearer, and thus do an act of justice to

Your brother in Christ,

J. F. PRICE.

Rev. JACOB F. PRICE:

Dear Brother:—I have received your letter, by Mr. Berryman, inquiring whether I had made a specified remark unfriendly to your veracity, or whether I had ever known you to “depart, in the slightest degree, from the strictest veracity.” What words I may have used, in expressing my views of your character, I now remember not. My opinion of you, at your request, I will state. I have not, brother Price, that confidence in your integrity and truth which I wish to possess. I have felt, recently, some increase of my want of confidence in you, in this respect. I have seriously feared that you did suffer yourself to speak and act in reference to *strict veracity* as I think *I could not do*, and as I think *is inconsistent with strict veracity*. Sometimes I have felt strongly convinced that you did suffer yourself to depart from strict veracity, at others, I have hoped that party excitement might account for at least some part of my unfavorable impression. This has been, and still is my view and feeling in reference to your character. As to the evidence, I cannot expatiate—I have only to two things: first, You may remember, that years ago, I told you, alone, that I had troubles on this very point, and gave you my specifications connected with the trial of Castleman. You made a long explanation and did, at least, considerably alleviate my fears. Second, Your certificate concerning “the interlocutory meeting,” has revived these fears. I specify at present, two points: You certainly told me in Hopkinsville, that I was “*very kind*,” (in Synod) and Mr. Burch *not kind*—perhaps your word was “*rough, severe*,” or something like it. In your publication you change our characters and make me the violent man

and Mr. Burch the kind one. This, with some other matters in that document, has not contributed to ease my anxieties.

As to my *speaking* of you, I have to say, that I remember on some one or two occasions recently, (to whom, when, where, I now know not,) to have expressed my fears and anxieties, perhaps a decided opinion, (as to this point, I do not remember,) my impression is, that I have spoken of you rather in private—rather confidentially, or discreetly—I mean to say, that I have not been in the habit of expressing my views on the point before us, publicly, or of voluntarily introducing the topic.

I have now to say in conclusion, that I do regret the state of my views and feelings in reference to your character—I hope it may be that I am utterly mistaken in the matter, and will weigh any thing you have to say, if you think it worth while to present any explanation. Yours, with good wishes,

JOS. C. STILES.

N. B.—I have written you hastily.

July 28th, 1840, Woodford Co. Ky.

Rev. J. C. STILES:

Dear Brother:—I received, late last evening, your letter in reply to my note, by brother Berryman, and hasten to reply. *Conscious of my own veracity*, and happy and proud of that consciousness, I shall fully and fearlessly meet this whole case. This is the first time that *my character for truth or the sternest veracity*, was ever assailed by any *human being* that made *any pretensions* to veracity themselves. On the subject of veracity, I defy the malice of earth and hell.

When I first heard (which was Saturday last) that you had made any attempt to asperse my character for truth, I was very indisposed to credit the information. Had it not been for the worthy and respectable source through which I received it, I should have suffered it to pass as unheeded and unnoticed as the idle wind. I could hardly believe that you could so far have forgotten your character as a minister of Christ, a christian and a gentleman, as to assail, in the dark, the character of a brother minister in the same church, and one too, who had labored so hard to aid you in your wars abroad, and to defend your veracity, amid your many *misstatements* and *perversions*, in *your unnatural warfare against your own church*.

We have fallen indeed upon evil times, when to accomplish party and ambitious ends, you can wantonly assail the veracity of a ministerial brother for whom you have expressed the warmest affection, and in whom the highest confidence, and on whom you have bestowed the highest encomiums, both as to intellectual and moral worth, and who, you said, was a fac simile of your admired and beloved brother who is dead.

But to the matter at issue—my veracity. Do not be surprised when I tell you, that your letter, to which this is a reply, *contains more evidence of your want of veracity than you can rake up from earth against my integrity*. You say in your letter, “my opinion of you, at your request, I will state.” Now, I ask you to point out the sentence in my note, where *your opinion of me is asked?* I hope I shall never become so stupid, nor so vain, as to ask any man his opinion of me. I could point out at least fifty instances in which you have

grossly misquoted, misrepresented, and perverted, facts, arguments, and statements, in your controversies with your brethren, which requires a great stretch of charity to reconcile with veracity. Yet I have endeavored to do so. I have known, for a long time, that your memory is exceedingly frail; that you are a man of great excitement; that you read and write by scraps; that you do not take things in their connexion; that you are governed more by excitement than calm reason; that you are influenced more by impressions than facts; and that you are supremely under the influence of party excitement. I have never seen a more *one-sided* mind in my life. Without this explanation, you can never vindicate your veracity in the world. How could you, (with my note before you) *say that I asked your opinion of me?!!!* I never made such a perversion in my life. With such blunders at every step, you should be slow to suspect other men.

We shall see whether your specifications, 1st. and 2nd, are not misstatements, even more gross than that I asked your opinion of me.

Your version of our conversation in regard to my conduct, in the trial of brother Castleman, is *wide of the truth*. You say "you may remember that years ago, I told you, alone, that I had troubles on this very point, (my veracity) and gave you my specifications connected with the trial of Castleman." The point on which we conversed in regard to my conduct in that trial, had no sort of connexion with my character for veracity. You never intimated to me, in your life, a suspicion of my want of veracity until this strange letter. You charged me with manifesting partiality for Father Laird, in that trial, in undertaking, as moderator, to reconcile two seemingly contradictory statements in his testimony, when you knew there was no contradiction. I could state as fully and clearly, this moment, every single idea connected with this affair and our conversation, as if it had transpired this morning. You cannot but remember, that I denied the charge, and charged the fault (prejudice or partiality, not falsehood) upon you, and went into a detailed argument to prove it, and you acknowledged that the prejudice *might be in you*, which is as full an acknowledgment as I ever knew you to make about any thing. *Did you acknowledge that you might have been guilty of a want of veracity in that trial?* If veracity was the subject of our conversation, you did; but it was not the subject of our conversation and you must have known it. You now say in your letter "you made a long explanation, and did at least considerably alleviate my fears." Did I alleviate *your fears of my veracity* by *awakening in you, fears of your own integrity?!!!* Shame! Shame!! Shame!!! You will, surely, if you have a memory that you can trust for any thing, and have any disposition to do me justice, as well as yourself, you will take back every remark you have made upon this subject. What had my reconciling brother Laird's statements to do with my veracity? You ought to be ashamed of what you have said on this subject. I have never in my life, since I have been a man, made so gross a misstatement about any man or thing, as you have made about me, and our conversation in this matter. *If you have one spark of the nobleness of a christian gentleman, you will write me a full and honorable retraction of what you have said on this subject. We shall see.*

"*Mirabile dictu,*" it was after all this, that you left your wife's room, at

"Uncle" Ned Blackburn's, and came and spent the night with me, in the room I slept; told me how much you loved me; what a noble fellow I was; how much in person, head and heart, like a noble brother of yours, that was dead. And now you say you knew, before all this, that I would not tell the truth. "*O tempora! O mores!*" "Tell it not in Gath." You had better turn the edge of your uplifted sword away from the church and your brethren, at which you have aimed it, and wield it against some worse foes in your own bosom.

The second specification against my veracity, is my statement of what occurred in the interlocutory of Synod.

I would just remark, before I notice this specification, that I hope, after all your blunders of memory and of statement, in regard to what transpired in Hopkinsville, you will not hold me responsible for any thing your imagination, under its excitement, may conjure up.

You say, "at some times, I had hoped that party excitement might account for at least some part of my unfavorable impressions." I am truly gratified to learn *from you, that you have so far cooled down*, as to see that any of your wrong impressions may have been engendered by your party excitement. You have, hitherto, made no acknowledgment on the subject of your party bias. And now it is but a bare possibility, "*might,*" &c.

Second Specification—You say, "You certainly told me in Hopkinsville, that I was very kind, (in Synod) and Mr. Burch not kind—perhaps your word was rough, severe, or something like it." "In your publication you change our characters, and make me the violent man and Mr. Burch the kind one." Here, again, if you could recollect, and discriminate, my veracity would never have come upon the carpet. You asked me, on Saturday morning, in Hopkinsville, whether I thought *your manner* was kind and courteous. I remarked to you, it was. You then reproached me for not having expressed my views in Synod. I told you that I had intended to have done so, but you had deprived me of the opportunity by asking leave of absence, and breaking up the interlocutory. You then remarked, that you considered the remarks of the brethren as an invitation to leave the Synod. My reply was, brother Stiles, be cautious, and make no such statements, for the very moment you decide that what was said in Synod, was an invitation to you, to leave, *it would be your own verdict that your heart was not in our church*. You then spoke of going into Synod, and confessing some faults which Mr. Burch had charged upon the New School, and their publications—"vanity, &c. and then make a thrust at him, about his faults." I advised you against it, that such a course could do no good, and might do harm, and that Mr. Burch had said nothing that you could make personal, without placing yourself in a very awkward position, and that if you undertook thrusts with Burch, you would find him rather *too "hard" or "rough" for you*.

In my statement, published, nothing is said of your *manner*. I spoke in that paper of the hard and bitter epithets, you heaped upon the Assembly's acts, viz: "*tyranny,*" "*oppressive,*" "*arbitrary,*" &c. These epithets, you will not deny having used. I said nothing, in that paper, of your violence—that is all a vagary of your own brain. I never said to you, or any body else, that Burch was unkind, at Synod, or any thing like it. I never knew him kinder in my life.

I said, and so did Mr. Berryman, who was present during part of our conversation at Hopkinsville, when you seemed disposed to take Mr. Burch's remarks as personal, and meant for you, that we did not so understand them, and even if they were, and had been severe, it was not the act of the Synod. The Lord has given me a very good memory, for which I am thankful, and I have tried to cultivate it, and I do most solemnly aver, that this statement is correct.

I have, brother Stiles, recently, been very near to my grave—I have been reviewing my past religious life—I have endeavored to test my christian character, and be ready, whenever called, to depart in peace; and I do most solemnly, in the presence of my judge, declare, that you have misstated the facts, in all your specifications against my veracity. It is *not my character* in regard to *veracity*, that needs correction, but *your statements*. I defy you to furnish as much evidence against my veracity, as your letter does against yours.

To cap the climax of guilt, you say you have spoken against my character, "*rather in private,*" "*rather confidentially*" or "*discreetly,*" and "*not voluntarily introducing the topic.*" "*Rather in private, rather confidentially,*" is the slyest, meanest, lowest, and yet the most effective way of assailing character. I would much have preferred your taking a text and preaching against my veracity from your pulpit. It would have been *equally christian, and far more open and manly*, than the way you have chosen. I could then have met, and refuted the false charges.

What you mean by assailing a man's character "*discreetly,*" I know not, unless it is this half "*private,*" half "*confidential*" way, which *wants the courage of true manhood, and stabs in the dark*. I cannot understand how you can "*introduce*" the topic of my veracity "*involuntarily.*" I have not so learned mental Philosophy.

You say "in conclusion, that I regret the state of my views and feelings in reference to your character." You should not only *regret* them, my dear brother, but *repent* and *weep* over the causes which have induced such a state of views and feelings. *The causes are all to be found in the state of your own mind.*

Your strange perversions, misstatements, and misrepresentations, in your publications and in your letter to me, have awakened in my mind, some very unpleasant fears in regard to you.

When I take into consideration, your many mental and constitutional defects; the frailty of your memory; the dizzy party excitement under which you have been laboring for some time; your impulsive and impetuous character; your suspicion of every body that does not see as you do; your utter incredulity of every thing that opposes your party ends; your perfect confidence in every suspicion against those who differ from you; and your utter disregard of even the common courtesies of life, towards those who do not think as you do; when I remember all this, I can allow more room for you to aberrate and yet save your veracity, than any man I ever saw. I shall still endeavor to throw the mantle of a wide spread charity over your many aberrations, misstatements, misrepresentations, and discourtesies, and attribute them to mental and constitutional defects, provided you openly and honorably acknowledge, and redress the wrongs you have done me. Remember all you have said about "*wrong justi-*

fiel," in your convention address. If you cannot, like a noble man, make a full and hearty acknowledgment, I do not wish any. I have perfect contempt for any half way confession, such as, *I may be wrong*. You cannot but know you have wronged me, and sinned in this matter.

You say, "I hope I may be mistaken, and will (very condescending) weigh any thing you may choose to say in explanation." Now my dear brother, I am the wronged and pursued man, in this matter, I am the man whose veracity has been assailed, and that too, upon points that I can make as clear as day, and rivet conviction home, of my perfect integrity in this whole matter, even through the deepest prejudice. All I ask is even handed justice. Your own character demands that I should have it. I shall await a speedy reply, hoping that you are not lost to all sense of justice, but have been betrayed into your sin in this matter, by a blinding party excitement, and will yet do a brother, whom you have deeply wronged, that justice which truth, honor, and religion, all loudly demand at your hands. We shall see.

If you will cease to asperse the character of your church, and to stab, in the dark, the characters of your brethren, and will spend the time and energy you waste in this way, in endeavoring to improve your own christian character, although it may *not so much gratify your feelings or your ambition now*, it will greatly ease your dying agonies and enhance your eternal peace.

My prayer is, that God may grant you repentance, and forgiveness, and nobleness enough to confess your wrong, and preserve you in future from all similar offences, and guide you in the path of humility, and usefulness, and finally save you, for Christ's sake.

Yours, with the best wishes for your present and future welfare.

JACOB F. PRICE.

To the above letter Mr. Stiles made no reply. I then, in company with two brethren, waited on him at his own house. He refused to make any acknowledgment. I then tabled charges against him, before the Presbytery, including his public course and his private offence. He, also, preferred charges against me, for this letter I addressed him. How the personal matters were settled, the following minute will explain:

At a meeting, in the house of Mr. Young, between brethren Price and Stiles, at the request of their mutual friends, brethren Blythe, Young, and McAfee, with a view to remove the difficulties which had arisen between the former brethren: brother Stiles stated, that he did not intend, by the language of his letter, or any other language, to charge brother Price with a want of veracity—nor did he intend to express, in his letter, any positive opinion as to his veracity. Brother Price, on his part, disclaimed any intention, in his letter, of charging brother Stiles with malignant and profane ambition, or a want of veracity. The brethren, thereupon, agreed, mutually, to withdraw the charges which they had, respectively, tabled against each other.

JOS. C. STILES,
JACOB F. PRICE.

Danville, Sept. 25th, 1840.

X
BX
8958
.W35
A48
1841



