

THE
UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
WASHINGTON, D. C.
MAY 1911
OFFICE OF THE
SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE
SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

ADVERTISEMENT.

This Gentlemen to whom the publication of the following Discourse was entrusted, think proper to mention, that a copy of it was requested for the Press, by a member of the Citizens' body of New-Haven, and of New-York, who heard it preached, and who considered it as calculated to be extensively useful.

New-York, May 30, 1803.

✱ When this Sermon was delivered, it was prefaced
with a declaration, of the following import.

The following discourse will not intentionally apply
to any facts or persons; it being the Preacher's design to
examine principles, and not to give characters.

SERMON

ON

DUELLING.

PROVERBS 28th Chap. 17th Verse.

*A man that doeth violence to the blood of any person,
shall flee to the pit; let no man stay him.*

THIS passage of scripture is a republication of that general law concerning homicide, which is recorded in Genesis 9. 5, 6. But surely your blood of your lives will I require: at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of man; at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man. Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man. This law was published at the time when the killing of beasts for food was permitted. No time could have been equally proper. As the shedding of animal blood would naturally remove the inherent horror of destroying life,

and ~~the~~ man to shed the blood of ~~another~~ ^{man}; the law became indelible for the prevention of this crime, from the beginning. It ought to be observed, that the detestation with which God regards this sin, is marked with a pen of iron in that singular declaration: "*At the head of every beast will I require it.*" If homicide is so odious in the sight of God, as to expose the unconscious brute, which effected it, to the loss of his own life, as an expiation; with what views must He regard a man, a rational agent, formed in his own image, when accomplishing the death of his brother with design, from the indulgence of malice, and in the execution of revenge?

As this original law was given to Noah, the progenitor of all post-diluvian men, it is evidently binding on the whole human race. Every nation has accordingly felt its force, and executed it upon the transgressor.

In the text, the same law is promulgated with one additional injunction--"*He shall flee to the pit, let no man stay him.*" However strongly the past services of the criminal, or the tender affections of his friends, may plead for his exemption from the sentence; no man, from any motive, or with any view, shall prevent, or ever retard, his progress towards the punishment required. To this punishment God has consigned him, absolutely, and with his own voice. No consideration, therefore, can prevent, or hinder, the execution.

On every occasion, when a liberal sentiment is acknowledged to be correct, I am sure, besides those engaged personally by Christ, the feeling is cherished with ardour. As soon, he would expect to find all men in such countries agreeing, with a single voice, that such ought to be the fact; and willing, with a single effort, to bring it to pass. Above all, he would certainly conclude, that, whatever might be the decision of the vulgar, and the ignorant, there could be but one opinion, in such countries, among those who filled the superior ranks of society.

How greatly then, must such a person be astonished, when he is informed, that in Christian countries only, and in such countries among those only, who are enrolled on the list of superiority and distinction, homicide, of a kind no where excepted by God from this general destiny, but marked with all the guilt of which homicide is susceptible, is not only not thus punished, but is vindicated, honoured, and rewarded, by common consent, and unqualified suffrage!

The views which I entertain of dwelling, may be sufficiently expressed under the following heads:

THE FOLLY,

THE GUILT, and

THE MISCHIEFS, of this crime.

It is to be vindicated, not for any knowledge or
ends, on the following considerations only :—That it is
a punishment,
a reparation, and
a prevention of injuries; and
a source of reputation to the parties.

If it can be shown to be neither of these, in any such
sense as reason can approve, or argument sustain; if it
can be proved to be wholly unnecessary to all these pur-
poses, and a preposterous method of accomplishing
them; it must evidently fail of all vindication, and be
condemned as foolish, irrational, and deserving only
of contempt.

As a punishment of an offence, which for the present
shall be supposed to be a real one, duelling is fraught
with absurdity only. If a duel be fought on *equal terms*,
the only terms allowed by duellists, the person injured ex-
poses himself, equally with the injurer, to a new suffer-
ing; always greater in truth, and commonly in his own
opinion, than that which he proposes to punish. The in-
jurer only ought to suffer, or be exposed to suffering. No
possible reason can be alleged, why the innocent man
should be at all put in hazard. Were tribunals of justice
to place the injured party, appealing to them for redress,
in the same hazard of being obliged to pay a debt, with
the fraudulent debtor, in the same danger of suffering a

...the injured person constitutes himself his own judge; and resolves on a mode of reparation, which, if ordered by any other umpire, he would reject with indignation! "What!" he would exclaim; "am I, because I have been injured once, to be injured a second time? And is my enemy, because he has robbed me of my character, to be permitted also to rob me of my life?" Let it be remembered, that the decision is not the less mad, because it is voluntarily formed by himself. He who wantonly wastes his own well-being, is of all fools the greatest.

As a reparation, duelling has still less claim to the character of rational. What is the reparation proposed? If it be any thing it must consist either in the act of fighting, or in the death of the wrong-doer. If the injury be a fraud, neither of these will restore the lost property; if a personal suffering, neither can restore health; nor renew a limb, or a faculty. Or if the wrong be an injury to the character, it cannot need to be asserted, that neither fighting as a duellist, nor killing the wrong-doer, can alter

of all the reputation which has been attacked. The challenger has, perhaps, been charged with lying. If this charge is just, he is a liar still. If it be shown to be just, neither fighting, nor killing his antagonist, will wipe off the stain. The public knew him to be a liar before the combat; with the same certainty they know him to be such after the combat. What reparation has he gained? Not one man will believe the story the less, because he has fought a duel, or killed his man. If, on the other hand, the charge is false; fighting will not, in the least degree, prove it to be so. Truth and falsehood must, if evinced at all, be evinced by evidence; not by fighting. In the days of knight-errantry this method of deciding controversies had, in the reigning superstition, one rational plea, which now it cannot claim. God was then believed to give success, invariably, to the party which had justice on its side. Modern duellists neither believe, nor wish, God to interfere in their concerns.

The reparation enjoyed in the mere gratification of revenge, will not here be pleaded, because duellists disclaim with indignation, the indulgence of that contemptible passion. In the progress of the discourse, however, this subject will be further examined.

As a prevention of crimes generally, it is equally absurd. I acknowledge readily, that the fear of danger

...will, in a number of instances, prevent
injuries, and then again, in some instances, be dis-
courage[d] from committing private injuries by the dread
of being called to an account in the morning. But
these instances will be few; and this mode of prevent-
ing injuries, therefore, almost wholly ineffectual. Duell-
ing is always honourable among dentists; and, to be
generally practiced, must be generally esteemed honour-
able. That which is honourable will always be courted.
The danger to life will, therefore, recommend duelling,
to most men, instead of deterring from it. None, who
call themselves men of honour, ever show any serious
reluctance to give, or except, a challenge. All are
brave enough to hazard life, whenever the hazard be-
comes a source of glory. Every savage, that is, every
man in a state of nature, will fight, because it is glori-
ous. Civilised men have exactly the same natural
character. Persuade them that it is glorious to give and
accept challenges, and to fight duels, and few or none
of them will hesitate. The dread of danger, appealed
to, and relied on, in this case, is therefore chiefly ima-
ginary. Few persons will, ultimately, be prevented
from doing injuries by the practice of duelling. Affronts,
on the contrary, will be given, merely to create oppor-
tunities of fighting. Fighting, in the case supposed, is
glory; and to acquire glory men will make their way
to fighting through affronts, injuries, and every other
course of conduct, necessary, or believed to be necessa-

ay, to the end. This fact in the case of humbler and more vulgar battles has long been realized. A young bully spends a great part of his life in fighting; and will at any time abuse those, with whom he is conversant, not from malice or revenge, but merely to provoke them to battle, that he may obtain the honour of fighting. The nature of all classes of men is the same; and polished persons will do the same things, which are done by clowns, without any other difference than that which exists in the mode. The clown will fight vulgarly; the polished man politely: the provocations of the clown will be coarse; those of the gentleman will be more refined. With this dissimilarity excepted, the conduct of both will be the same; but as the gentleman will feel the sense of glory more exquisitely, so he will seek it with more ardour, and will do wanton injuries with more frequency, and less regret. Thus the ultimate effect will be to increase, and not to prevent, injuries; and the extent of the increase cannot be measured. Besides, injuries so slight as to be ordinarily disregarded; nay imaginary and unintended injuries, will, amidst the domination of such pride and passion as regulate this custom, be construed into serious abuses; and satisfaction will be demanded with such imperiousness, as to preclude all attempts at reparation, on the part of the offender; lest, in the very offer of them, he should be thought to forfeit the character of an honourable man. Wherever fighting becomes the direct and

what means to glory, no occasion on which it may be displayed will be neglected. The loss of any appearance will be regarded as tantamount to a serious loss; and the triumph of the hour, as a serious disgrace. The mind will therefore be alive, vigilant, and jealous, lest such a loss, or such a disgrace, should be incurred. Almost every thing, which is either done, or omitted, will by such a mind be challenged as an affront, and regarded as an injury. Thus the injuries, which will be felt, will be incalculably multiplied. To what a condition will this reduce society!

But duelling is considered as a source of reputation. In what does the reputation, conferred by it, consist?

"The duellist is a brave man." So is the highwayman; the burglar; the pirate; and the bravo, who derives his name from gallant assassination. Nay the bull-dog is as bold as either. Bravery is honourable to man, only when exerted in a just, useful, rational cause; where some real good is intended, and may hopefully be accomplished. In every other case it is the courage of a brute. Can a man wish to become a competitor with an animal?

Be this claim to bravery is questioned. If from the list of duellists were to be subtracted all those, who either give, or receive, challenges from the fear of being

disgraced by the omission, or refusal; how small would be the remainder! But is acting from the fear of disgrace, merely, to be regarded as bravery in the honorable sense; or as courage in any sense? Is it not, on the contrary, simply a crossing of two evils, that, which is felt to be the least? Is there any creature which is not bold enough to do this?

Genuine bravery, when employed at all, is always employed in combating some real evil; something which ought to be opposed. When public opinion is false and mischievous, it will of course meet, resolutely, public opinion; and dare nobly to stem the torrent, which is wasting with its violence the public good. Genuine bravery would nobly disdain to give, or receive, a challenge; because both are pernicious to the safety and peace of mankind. No man is truly great, who has not resolution to withstand, and will not invariably and undauntedly withstand, every false and ruinous public opinion.

Let us suppose it were really reputable in the view of the public; the question would still recur with all its force—Is it right? Is it agreeable to the will of God? Is it useful to mankind? No advance is made towards the defence of duelling, until these questions can be answered in the affirmative. The opinion of the public cannot alter the nature either of moral principles, or of

30
In the days of Johnson, the public
opinion of England, and especially the worship
of the nation, was, both in fact and appearance, entirely
in the hands of the "No Bishops." The public
opinion in England then, and the brightest and best
of the time as virtuous as Bismarck. In a similar
manner public opinion has erred, erring, in every
age and country. An honest and brave man would, in
every case, even, have withstood the public opinion;
and would, always firmly resolve, with Abdiel, to stand
alone, rather than fall with multitudes. He who will
not do this, when either the worship of a stock, the im-
molation of a human victim, or the murder of his fel-
low-men, is justified by public opinion, is not only de-
void of sound principles, but the subject of miserable
contempt. It is a mockery of language, and an affront
to common sense, to call him, who, trembling for fear
of losing popular applause, sacrifices his faith and his in-
tegrity to the opinion of his fellow men, by any other
name than a coward.

But duellists claim the character of delicate and
peculiar honour. On what is this claim founded? Are
they more sincere, just, kind, peaceable, generous, and
reasonable, than other men? These are the ingredients
of an honourable character. They themselves cannot
deny it. That some men, who have fought duels have
exhibited greater or less degrees of this spirit, I shall
not hesitate to acknowledge. Men of real worth have

undoubtedly ~~have~~ guilty of this folly and vice, as well as of other follies and other vices. But these men derived all their worth from other sources; and gained all that was honourable in their minds, and lives, by the character which they maintained as men, and not as duellists. As duellists, they fell from the height, to which they had risen. He, who will explain in what the honour or the delicacy of the spirit of duelling consists, will confer an obligation on his fellow men; and may undoubtedly claim the wreath due to superior intellect.

On the contrary, how generally are duellists haughty, overbearing, passionate, quarrelsome, and abusive; troublesome neighbours, uncomfortable friends, and disturbers of the common happiness? Their pretensions to honour and delicacy are usually mere pretensions; a deplorable egotism of character, which precludes *them* from all enjoyment, and prevents *those around them* from possessing quiet, and comfort, unless every thing is conformed to their vain and capricious demands.

There is neither delicacy nor honour, in giving or taking affronts easily and suddenly; nor in justifying them on the one hand, nor in revenging them on the other. Very little children do all these things daily, without either honour or delicacy, from the mere impulse of infantine passion. Those who imitate them in this conduct, resemble them in character; and are only bigger children.

to be reputable for the public opinion.
I have observed pronounced the circumstances of the case, I will an-
swer to you.

Who are the persons of whom the public is constantly
told? Are they wise and good men? Can one who was
good man, unquestionably wise and good, be named,
who has publicly appeared to vindicate duelling? If
there were even one, his name would, ere this, have
been announced to the world. This public is not then
formed of such men, and does not include them in its
number. Is it formed of the mass of mankind; either
in this, or any other, civilized country? I boldly deny,
that the generality of men, in any such country, ever
justified duelling, or respected duellists. Let the appeal
be made to facts. In this country, certainly, the pub-
lic voice is wholly against the practice. Some persons,
who have fought duels, have unquestionably, been here
respected for their talents, and their conduct; but not
one for duelling. The proof of this is complete. This
part of their conduct is never the theme of public, and
hardly ever of private, commendation. On the con-
trary, it is always mentioned with regret, and generally
with detestation. Who then is this public? It is the
little collection of duellists; magnified by its own voice,
as every other little party is, into the splendid character
of the public. That duellists should pronounce duelling
to be reputable, cannot be thought a wonder, nor alleged
as an argument.

“That it is dishonourable not to give a challenge when affronted; and to refuse one, when challenged. Who can endure the sense of shame, or content to live in infamy? What is life worth without reputation; and how can reputation be preserved, as the world now is, without obeying the dictates of this custom?”

This, I presume, is the chief argument, on which duelling rests; and by which its votaries are, at least a great part of them, chiefly governed. Take away the shame of neglecting to give, or refusing to accept, a challenge; and few men would probably enter the field of single combat, except from motives of revenge.

On this argument I observe, that he, who alleges it, gives up the former arguments, of course. If a man fights, to avoid the shame of not fighting, he does not fight, to punish, repair, or prevent, an injury. If the disgrace of not fighting is his vindication for fighting, then he is not vindicated by any of these considerations; nor by that of delicate honour, nor by any thing else.

The real reason, and that on which alone he ultimately relies for his justification, is, that if he does not fight he shall be disgraced; and that this disgrace is attended with such misery, as to necessitate, and justify his fighting.

In alleging this reason as his justification, the duellist

...and when the inherent necessity of doing so is
acknowledged it is to be in itself wrong. Otherwise he
sincerely "said and acted," nor appeal to this reason, as
his justification. The misery of this disgrace, is there-
fore, according to his declaration, such, as to render
that right, which is inherently, and which but for this
misery would still be, "wrong, or sinful."

This is indeed a strange opinion. God has, and it
will not often be denied that he has, prohibited certain
kinds of conduct to men. These he has absolutely pro-
hibited. According to this opinion, however, he places
men by his providence in such circumstances of distress,
that they may lawfully disobey his prohibitions; because,
otherwise, they would be obliged to endure intolerable
misery. Has God, then, published a law, and after-
wards placed men in such situations, as to make their
disobedience to it lawful? How unreasonably, accord-
ing to this doctrine, have the scriptures charged Satan
with sin? His misery, as exhibited by them, is certainly
more intolerable than that, which is here professed, and
of course will warrant him to pursue the several courses,
in which he expects to lessen it. This is the present
plan of the duellist; Satan might make it with double
force.

HAD the Apostles bethought themselves of this argu-
ment, they might, it would seem, have spared them-
selves the scorn, the reproach, the hunger, the naked-

near, the persecution, and the violent death which they finally encountered, rather than disobedience to God. Doubtless indeed must they have gone to the stake, and the cross; when they might have found a quiet refuge from both in the mere recollection, that the loss of reputation was such extreme distress, as to justify him who was exposed to this evil, in any measures of disobedience, necessary in his view to secure his escape.

What an exhibition is here given of the character of God? He has published a law, which forbids homicide; a law universally acknowledged to be just; and particularly acknowledged to be just in the very adoption of this argument. At the same time, it is in this argument avowed, that he often places his creatures in such circumstances, that they may lawfully disobey it. Of these circumstances every man is considered as being his own judge. If then any man judge, that his circumstances will justify his disobedience, he may, according to this argument, lawfully disobey. If the argument were universally admitted, how evident is it, that every man would disobey every law of God, and yet be justified. Obedience would therefore vanish from men; the law become a nullity; and God cease to govern, and be unable to govern, his creatures. This certainly would be a most ingenious method of annihilating that law, every jot and tittle of which he has declared shall stand, though to fulfil it *heaven and earth shall pass away.*

"That a good name is by the Scriptures themselves asserted to be an invaluable possession." It is. "What is a good Name, in the view of the Scriptures? It is the Name, which grows out of good principles, and good conduct. It is the result of wisdom and virtue; not of folly and sin; a plant brought down from the heavens, which will flourish, and blossom, and bear fruit forever.

"But is not the esteem of our fellow-men an incalculable enjoyment? and have not wise men, in every age of the world, given this as their opinion?" The esteem, let me ask, of what men? The esteem of banditti is certainly of no value. The character of the men is, therefore, that which determines the worth of their esteem. The esteem of wise and good men is undoubtedly a possession, of the value alleged; particularly, because it is given only to wise and good conduct. If you covet esteem then, merit it by wisdom and virtue; and you will of course gain the blessing. By folly and guilt you can gain no applause, but that of fools and sinners; while you assure yourself of the contempt and abhorrence of all others.

I SHALL conclude this part of the discussion with the following summary remarks.

DUELLING is eminently absurd, because the reasons, which create the contest, are generally trivial. These are almost always trifling affronts, which a magnani-

...would dispute to suggest. A brave and meri-
tious officer in the British army was lately killed in a
fight, which was not of the fighting of two dogs.

As an equivalent of duelling, it is supremely absurd.
If the parties possess equal skill, innocence and crime
are placed on the same level; and their interests are
decided by a game of hazard. A die would better ter-
minate the controversy; because the chances would be
the same, and the danger and death would be avoided.
If the parties possess unequal skill, the concerns of
both are committed to the decision of one; deeply in-
terested; perfectly selfish; enraged; and precluded by
the very plan of adjustment from doing that which is
right, unless in doing it he will consent to suffer an in-
comprehensible evil. To avoid this evil he is by the
laws of the controversy justified in doing to his antago-
nist all the future injustice in his power. Never was
there a more improper judge, nor a more improper
situation for judging. To add to the folly, the very
mode of decision involves new evils; so that the in-
justice already done can never be redressed, but by doing
other and greater injustice.*

* This, however, is beyond a doubt the real state of the subject. Duelli-
sts profess to fight on equal terms, and make much parade of adjusting
the combat so as to accord with those terms. But all this is mere pretence.
Most of those who design to become duellists, apply themselves with great
avidity to shooting with pistols at a mark placed at the average usual
fighting distance. In this manner they prove that they intend to avoid

Finally, it is infinite folly, as in every duel, each party puts his soul, and his eternity, into extreme hazard, voluntarily; and rushes before the bar of God, stained with the guilt of suicide and with the design of shedding violently the blood of his fellow-man.

The guilt of duelling involves a train of the most solemn considerations. An understanding, benumbed by the torpor of the lethargy, only, would fail to discern them; a heart of flint to feel them; and a conscience vanquished, bound, and trodden under foot, to regard them with horror.

Duelling is a violation of the laws of Man. "Submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake," is equally a precept of reason and revelation. The Government of every country is the indispensable source of protection, peace, safety, and happiness, to its inhabitants; and the only means of transmitting these blessings, together with education, knowledge, and religion, to their children. It is therefore a good, which cannot be estimated. But without obedience to its laws no government can continue a moment. He,

themselves of their superior skill, thus laboriously acquired, to decide the combat against their antagonists. It makes not the least difference, whether the advantage consists in better arms, a better position, an earlier fire, or a more skillful hand. In each case the advantage lies in the greater probability which it furnishes one of the combatants of success in the duel. Superior skill ensures this probability, and is, therefore, according to the professions of duellists, an unfair and illegitimate advantage.

...the... of the government itself, and of all the... which it contains.

Thus laws of every civilized country forbid duelling, and forbid it, in its various stages, by denouncing against it severe and dreadful penalties; thus proving, that the wise and good men of every such country have, with one view, regarded it as an injury of no common magnitude. The duellist, therefore, openly, and of system, attacks the laws, the peace, and the happiness, of his country; loosens the bonds of society; and makes an open war on his fellow-citizens, and their posterity.

At the same time he takes the decision of his own controversies out of the hands of the public, and constitutes himself his own judge and avenger. His arm he makes the umpire of all his concerns; and insolently requires his countrymen to submit their interests, when connected with his own, to the adjudication of his passions. Claiming and sharing all the blessings of civilized society, he arrogates, also, the savage independence of wild and brutal nature; wrests the sword of justice from the hand of the magistrate, and wields it, as the weapon of an assassin. To him government is annihilated. Laws and trials, judges and juries, vanish before him.

Arms are his laws, and a party his judge; his only trial is a battle, and his hall a field of blood.

All his countrymen have the same rights which he has. Should they claim and exercise what he claims, what would be the consequence? Every controversy, every concern of man would be terminated by the sword and pistol. Civil war, war waged by friends and neighbours, by fathers, sons, and brothers; a war of that dreadful kind which the Romans denominated a *tumultus*, would spread through every country: a war, in which all the fierce passions of man would be let loose; and wrath and malice, revenge and phrenzy would change the world into a dungeon filled with maniacs, who had broken their chains, and glutted their rage with each other's misery. Thus duelling, universally adopted, would ruin every country, destroy all their peace and safety, and blot every hope of mankind. Who but a fiend could willingly contribute to this devastation?

This guilt begun in the violation of the laws of man, is finished in the violation of the laws of God. This awful Being, who gave us existence, and preserves it; who is every where, and sees every thing; who made, and rules, the universe; who will judge, and reward, both angels and men; and before whom every work, with every secret thing, shall be brought into judgment; with his own voice proclaimed to this bloody world, from

...of the law of God. Every man is a creature of God, and as such, is bound to obey His law. In this place, the law of God, forbids the use of arms. The exception, as I have observed, is in the case of self-defence, or in the case of a just war, which the lawgiver has himself made. There, I further observe, are limited to killing beasts, when necessary for food, or plainly necessary; and putting men to death by the sword of public justice; or in self-defence; whether private or public: this being the only ground of justifiable war. As these are the sole exceptions, it is clear that duelling is an open violation of this law of God.

The guilt of duelling in this view is manifold, and in all its varieties is sufficiently dreadful to alarm any man, whose conscience is susceptible of alarm, and whose mind is not too stupid to discern, that it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.

If the duellist is a mere creature of solitude in whose life or death, happiness or misery, no human being is particularly interested; if no bosom will glow with his prosperity, or bleed with his sufferings; if no mourner will follow his hearse, and no eye drop a tear over his grave; still he is a man. As a man, he owes ten thousand duties to his fellow-men; and these are all commanded by his God. His labours, his example, his prayers, are daily due to the neighbour, the stranger,

the poor, and the public. He cannot withdraw them without sin. The eternal Being, whose wisdom and justice have numbered all these claims, will exact the forfeiture at his hands; and enquire of the wicked and *clothed wretch*, why, in open defiance of his known pleasure, he has thus shrunk from his duty, and buried *his talent* in the grave.

Is he a son? Who licensed him, in rebellion against the fifth command of the decalogue, to pierce his parents' hearts with agony, and to *bring down their grey hairs with sorrow to the grave*? Why did he not live, to honour his father and his mother; to obey, to comfort, to delight, and to support them in their declining years; and to give them a rich reward for all their toil, expense, and suffering, in his birth and education, by a dutiful, discreet, and amiable life, the only reward which they asked? Why did he shroud the morning of their happiness in midnight, and cause their rising hopes to set in blood? Why did he raise up before their anguished eyes the spectre of a son, slain in the enormous perpetration of sin; escaping from a troubled grave; or coming from the regions of departed spirits to haunt their course through declining life; to alarm their sleep, and chill their waking moments, with the despairing, agonizing cry,

"Death, 'tis a melancholy day
To those that have no God."

Is he a villain? He has broken the marriage vow;
He has dishonoured God. He has forsaken the wife of his
youth. He has refused to furnish her sustenance; to
cheer her joys; to soothe her sorrows; to watch her
slight; and to provide for his children and hers, the
means of living here, and the means of living for ever.
He has denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.
Where, in that fatal, guilty moment, when he resolved
to cast away his life, were his tenderness to the partner
of his bosom; the yearnings of his bowels towards the
offspring of his loins; his sense of duty; his remem-
brance of God? In every character, as a dependent
creature, as a sinful man, his eternal life and death were
suspended on his forgiveness of his enemies. He, who
alone can forgive sins, and save sinners, has said, *If
ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your
heavenly Father forgive you.* He has gone farther. He
has forbidden man even to ask pardon of God, unless
with a forgiving spirit to his fellow-men. In vain can
the duellist pretend to a forgiving temper. If he felt the
spirit of the cross, could he possibly for an affront, an
offence lighter than air, shed the blood of his neigh-
bour? Could he plunge the friends of the sufferer into
an abyss of anguish; sink his parents in irrecoverable
despair; break on the wheel the hearts of his wife and
children; and label on the door-posts of his house,
Mourning, Lamentation, and Woe?

Satisfaction for a professed injury is the very demand which he makes; the only basis of his contest. Is this the language of forgiveness? It is an insult to common sense, it is an outrage on common decency, to hold this language, and yet profess this temper. The language is the language of revenge. The spirit is the spirit of revenge. The varnish, notwithstanding it is so laboriously spread, is too thin to conceal the gross materials, or to deceive the most careless eye. Revenge for a supposed affront, revenge for wounded pride, for disappointed ambition, for frustrated schemes of power, dictates the challenge, seizes the weapon of death, and goes to the field. Revenge turns the heart to stone, directs the fatal aim, and gloomily smiles over the expiring victim. Remove this palliation, miserable as it is, and you make man a fiend. A fiend would murder without emotion; while man is hurried to the dreadful work by passion only.

But what an image is presented to the eye by a man, thus dreadfully executing revenge! A worm of the dust; a sinful worm, an apostate, who lives on mercy only; who would not thus have lived, had not his saviour died for him; who is crimsoned with ten thousand crimes, committed against his God; who is soon to be tried, judged and rewarded for them all; this worm raises its crest, and talks loftily of the affront which it has received, of injured honour, of wounded character.

...by the blood of his fellow-servant. All this
...the all-murderous eye, and in the circum-
...of judgment, who has among the motives
of his mercy, being on his forgiveness of his fellow.
He answered, O Heaven, as this I must then surely be
heartily afraid!

Now is this crime merely an execution of revenge; it
is a cold, deliberate revenge. The deliberate killing of
a man is murder, by the decision of common sense,
by the decision of human laws, by the decision of God.
How few murderers have an equal opportunity, or
equal advantages, to deliberate! By a mind informed
with knowledge, softened with the humanity of polished
life, enlightened by revelation, conscious of a God,
and acquainted with the Saviour of mankind, a cool,
deliberate purpose is formed, cherished, and executed,
of murdering a fellow-creature. The servant, who for-
gave not his fellow-servant his debt of an hundred pence
but thrust him into prison, was delivered over to the
tormentors by his Lord, until he should pay the ten thou-
sand talents, which he owed, when he had nothing to
pay? What will be the destiny of that servant, who,
in the same circumstances, for a debt, an injury, of the
tenth part of the value of an hundred pence, robs his
fellow-servant of his life?

HAD an Apostle, had Paul, amidst all the unex-

unparalleled injuries which he suffered, sent a challenge, or fought a duel, what would have become of his character as an Apostle, or even as a good man? This single act would have destroyed his character, and gained his reputation. Infidels would have triumphantly objected this act, as unquestioned proof of his immorality, of his consequent unfitness to be an Apostle from God to mankind, and of his destitution, therefore, of inspiration. Nor could Christians have answered the objection. But can that conduct, which would have proved Paul to be a sinner, consist with a virtuous character in another man?

Had the Saviour of the world* (I make the unnatural supposition with shuddering, but I hope with becoming reverence for that great and glorious Person) sent a challenge, or fought a duel, would not this single spot have eclipsed the Sun of Righteousness for ever? Can that spot, which would have sullied the divinity of the Redeemer, and obscured his mediation, fail to be an indelible stain, a hateful deformity, on those whom he came to save? *If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his.*

* It is, I believe, universally admitted by Christians, that the conduct, which would have been sinful in Christ, considered merely as placed under the law of God, and required to obey it, is sinful in every man acquainted with the Gospel; and that the conduct of Christ as a moral being, is in every instance applicable to our circumstances, a rule of duty to us. I have put this

these things, and his country, and religion
 have been, even in this island country, when
 they were at first settled and visited, they placed
 in them in great suspicion and doubt; revenge is
 taken; and the miserable victims of wrath and malice
 are forced to go wistfully and. Come then, thou sur-
 viving, and in thine own view, fortunate and glorious char-
 pton; accompany me to the scenes of calamity, which
 thou hast created, and survey the mischiefs of dwelling.

Go with me to yonder church-yard. Whose is that
 newly opened grave? Approach, and read the letters on
 the yet uncovered coffin. If thou canst retain a steady
 eye, thou wilt perceive, that they denote a man, who yester-
 day beheld, and enjoyed, the light of the living. Then
 he shared in all the blessings and hopes of life. He
 possessed health, and competence, and comfort, and use-
 fulness, and reputation. He was surrounded by neigh-
 bours who respected, and by friends who loved him. The
 wife of his youth found in him every joy, and the balm
 of every sorrow. The children of his bosom hung on his
 knees, to receive his embrace, and his blessing. In a thou-
 sand designs was he embarked, to provide for their sup-
 porting care, because I believe few of those, who may evade with various

pretences the preceding arguments will be at a loss to determine here. In
 the same manner divines frequently make, on certain occasions, the suppo-
 sition of injustice, falsehood, or other turpitude, and apply it to the divine
 character; to shew, forcibly, what deplorable consequences would follow,
 were the supposition true.

34
poor and education, and to settle them peacefully and comfortably in the world. His enquiries and benevolent efforts, he lighted up all their hopes.

YESTERDAY he was himself a creature of hope, a pro-bationer for immortality. The voice of mercy invited him to faith and repentance in the Lord Jesus Christ, to holiness, and to heaven. The day of grace shone, the smiles of forgiveness beamed upon his head. While this happy day lasted, God was reconcilable, his Redeemer might be found, and his soul might be saved. The night had not then come upon him, in which no man can work.

WHERE is he now? His body lies mouldering in that coffin. His soul has ascended to God, with all its sins upon its head, to be judged, and condemned to wretchedness, which knows no end. Thy hand has hurried him to the grave, to the judgment, and to damnation: He affronted thee; and this is the expiation which thy revenge exacted.

TURN now to the melancholy mansion, where, yesterday, his presence diffused tenderness, hope, and joy. Enter the door, reluctantly opening to receive even the most beloved guest. Here mark the affecting group assembled by this catastrophe. That venerable man, fixed in motionless sorrow, whose hoary head trembles with emotions unutterable, and whose eye refuses a tear to les-

...in the Father's house. That man
...the Father's house. Yes,
...their consolation, and
...them. To how they looked, under God,
...the evils of their old age; to close their eyes
...the bed of death; and to increase their transports
...eternity.

But their comforts and their hopes have all vanished
together. He is now a corpse, a tenant of the grave; cut
off in the bloom of life, and sent unprepared to the judg-
ment. To these innumerable evils thou hast added the
tormenting agony of remembering, while they live, that he
was cut off in a gross and dreadful act of sin, and
without even a momentary space of repentance: a re-
membrance, which will envenom life, and double the
pangs of death.

Turn thine eyes, next, on that miserable form sur-
rounded by a cluster of helpless and wretched children.
See her eyes rolling with phrenzy, and her frame quiver-
ing with terror. Thy hand has made her a widow, and
her children orphans. At thee, though unseen, is direct-
ed that bewildered stare of agony. At thee she trembles;
for thee she listens; lest the murderer of her husband
should be now approaching to murder her children also.

See and they have lost their all. Thou hast robbed
them of their support, their protector, their guide, their

solace, their hope. In the grave all these blessings have been laid by thy hand. If his effort to thee demanded this terrible expiation, what, according to thine own decision, must be the sufferings, destined, to retribute the immeasurable injuries, which thou hast done to them?

The day of this retribution is approaching. The voice of thy brother's blood crieth from the ground, and thou art now cursed from the earth, which hath opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood. A mark is set upon thee by thy God; not for safety, but for destruction. Disease, his avenging Angel, is preparing to hurry thee to the bed of death. With what agonies wilt thou there recall thy malice, thy revenge, and the murder of thy friend! With what ecstasy will the soul cling to this world, and with what horror will it quake at the approach of eternity! Alone, naked, drenched in guilt, thou wilt ascend to God. From him what reception wilt thou meet? From his voice what language wilt thou hear? "*Depart, thou cursed into everlasting fire.*" And lo! the melancholy world of sin and suffering unfolds to receive thee. Mark, in the entrance, the man, whom thou hast plundered of life, and happiness, and heaven, already waiting to pour on thy devoted head, for the infinite wrongs which thou hast done to him, the wrath and vengeance of eternity.

At the close of this awful survey, cast thine eyes

whom you have plunged in hopeless misery. The
 perishing drop and the remorseless Seraphim will there
 draw nigh, and witness their crimes by a comparison
 with yours. They indeed were murderers, but they
 were never dignified with the name, nor blessed with
 the privileges of Christians. They were born in blood,
 and educated to slaughter. They were taught from their
 infancy, that to fight, and to kill, was lawful, honour-
 able, and virtuous. You were born in the mansion of
 knowledge, humanity, and religion. At the moment
 of your birth, you were offered up to God, and baptised
 in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy
 Ghost. You were dandled on the knee, and educated
 in the school of piety. From the house of God you
 have gone to the field of blood, and from the foot of
 the cross, to the murder of your friends. You have cut
 off life in the blossom, and shortened, to the wretched
 objects of your wrath, the day of repentance and salva-
 tion. The beams of the Sun of righteousness, shining
 with life-giving influence on them, you have intercepted;
 the smile of mercy, the gleam of hope, the dawn of
 immortality, you have overcast for ever. You have
 glutted the grave with untimely slaughter, and helped
 to people the world of perdition. Crimined with guilt,
 and drunk with blood, Nineveh will ascend from the
 tomb, triumph over your ruin, and smile to see her own
 eternal destiny more tolerable than yours.

Q - 229