

the celebration of Independence, was not sufficient for the purpose of this day.—A division of the company was therefore necessary, and the inhabitants of Worcester cheerfully yielded to the accommodation of their republican friends from the neighboring towns.

After dinner the principles and feelings of all who joined in the celebration, were expressed, with an unprecedented harmony and animation, in the following patriotic *saute*, accompanied with a discharge of cannon.

1st. *The Day*.—Which hailed our return to the principles from which we were once departing, and established the people.—“Free, sovereign and Independent” patriotic ode by W. C. White, Esq.

2nd. *The People of the United States*.—God made them to be free, and it is beyond the power of man to enslave them!

3rd. *The Constitution of the United States*.—May it always remain a Democracy, and our enemies for ever reproach us as Democrats!

4th. *The President*.—His “path of duty is plain as a ray of light before him,”—and the clouds of faction have neither darkened his progress, nor eclipsed his glory.

*Seventeen Guns—Nine cheers!* Songs, J. PEARSON and LIBERTY.

5th. *The United States and Congress*.—Remembering the advice of Washington, let us “srown indignantly upon the first dawn of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest.” [Song—Hail Columbia.]

6th. *The Heads of Departments*.—Firmness and integrity in the concerns of the Cabinet—Skill and economy in the management of the Treasury—Prudence and foresight in the regulations of the Army, with vigilance and assiduity for the preservation of our Navy.

7th. *The Judiciary system*.—Restored to its primitive order, may it never again be deformed by the midnight creation of judges, with no other duty than to oppose the government, and receive their salaries. [Six cheers.]

8th. *The Militia*.—Our best security in peace; our firmest reliance in the first moments of war.

9th. *The Government and Commonwealth of Massachusetts*.—Content with freedom of suffrage—let the choice of the majority be ours.

10th. *Virginia*.—The state of Washington, Jefferson, and Madison—May all America be republicans, and all republicans favor to little treat prejudices!

11th. *The Clergy*.—If the teachers of Pity and Morality, they have a claim to our respect: If the tools of a faction, they reap their reward in the contempt of the people!

12th. *The American Fair*.—If they choose an elective monarchy, we esteem them the more—May they always obtain the monarch of their choice, and find the government efficient, yet mild.

[Song—Queen Beings.]  
13th. *The Priest*.—Like the lightning of Heaven, may his flames be regulated by the conductors of truth, while they melt away the chains of slavery, and rend asunder the battlements of tyrants!

14th. *The Plough*.—The emblem of our riches, the instrument of our individual happiness, and the pledge of our National Glory. [Song—The Farmer.]

15th. *Our Mechanics and Manufacturers*.—On the invention and industry of our own citizens, let us rely for the comforts and conveniences of life.

16th. *The Plume of '75*.—It has twice consumed, “like a thread of tow,” the “green with” which the *Phylloxera* had prepared to bind upon us; and may it be kept alive, like the sacred fire, in the temple of our freedom.

17th. *The Government* is our own, and it is our duty to encourage our officers, in its legal administration.

**VOUNTEERS.**  
By Col. Benjamin H. Egz.—The firm and virtuous minority of the sixth congress!

By Maj. Andrew.—Our much esteemed young friend and patriot—the ORATOR of the day.

By Mr. Blake.—Our Envy Extraordinary—James Monroe.—For his past services, he has been rewarded with calumny.—For his future exertions, may he find his reward in the success of his mission, and the continued prosperity of his country!

By Col. Samuel Flogg.—The Attorney General of the United States.—Those who now pretend to doubt his virtues and talents, were lately prompt in their acknowledgment of both.—We can remember, and he is not changed!

By Mr. Wilson.—The brave though unfortunate Kefyisco.—Who, glowing with the sacred flame of liberty, imbibed from the heroes of '75, nobly struggled to restore to his ill fated nation, those principles under whose benign influence we this day rejoice.

By Mr. Pank.—The new state of Ohio.—Emancipated from “the wild miracles of madness and intoxication,” may the kind her energy encreased, by increasing the energies of the Union!

By the Orator.—Our political opponents.—“The foul and body live not more in parting.”

“Than greatness going off.”  
By Mr. William White.—ELBRIDGE GERRARD.—the useful, consistent, and

dignified patriot 1775.—An Whiffmore republican, and our ambassador for peace!

The dignity and solemnity of the celebration were much encreased, the attendance of many of our venerable patriots of '75—who had numbered more than seventy-five anniversaries, in the calendar of their declining years.

An evening, a salute of seventeen guns again “rattled in the *walkins*,” ear.” Every thing was “done decently and in order.” Those who were “seeking occasion, to reproach republicanism, with the faults of its professors,” have been constrained, reluctantly, to acknowledge, that when “left to manage their own affairs, in their own way,” they do not mingle excess with enjoyment, confusion with hilarity, outrage with triumph, nor insult with exultation!

FROM THE AURORA.  
A Letter to Thomas Paine.  
GREAT VALLEY, 21st Feb 1803.

In the Aurora of the first inst. appeared a letter addressed to you by the pious and venerable patriot Samuel Adams.—Your answer, which the same paper presented to the public, merited in my opinion a reply. For that reply I have till this time waited in vain. I therefore, take the liberty of transmitting to you, by the same public conveyance, a few thoughts on the most prominent parts of your letter. This liberty I am persuaded you will indulge to one who with pleasure, and with gratitude to the author, often reviews the intrinsic merit and memorable effects of your writings in favor of the independence of the United States.

“The books, you say, that compose the New Testament were voted by yeas and nays, to be the word of God, as we now vote a law, by the popish councils of Nice and Laodicea about 1450 years ago. This vote may appear authority enough to some and not authority enough to others. It is proper, however, that every body should know the fact.” You also affirm that “Bishop Watson acknowledged this fact.”

This, sir, is an extraordinary paragraph. But the mild and forbearing spirit of the gospel and the example of its benevolent author forbid me to use the language here, which to many, it may seem to merit. Far am I from charging you with the base crime of intentional falsehood. I shall not ascribe to you, an ignorance of ecclesiastical history which would be a reproach to a school boy professing to have read it. I shall impute to inadvertence, or precipitation, or some less culpable cause a statement in this paragraph, which is absolutely false.—The idea which you mean to convey and impel in (in your own words extracted from the age of reason) that “there was no such book as the New Testament till more than 300 years after the time that Christ is said to have lived” or that the origin of that book was not believed to be divine before the council of Nice or Laodicea.

You well know, sir, that Clements, Ignatius, and Polycarp were cotemporary with the apostles themselves. You well know that Justin, Irenaeus, Theophilus, Melito and Tertullian lived in the second century immediately succeeding those who were the companions of the apostles. You are not ignorant that Julius Africanus, Ammonius, Origen and Dionysius of Alexandria lived and wrote before the year 300. And if, when writing to Mr. Adams, you had called up your historical knowledge you would have been perfectly convinced that by the writings of these distinguished men collectively taken, the following propositions are proved to be true; viz. from the time of the apostles the books which compose the New Testament, were quoted and alluded to with peculiar respect as books sacred, divine and infallible—they were collected into a distinct volume; publicly read and expounded in religious assemblies; commentaries on them written and formal catalogues of them published long before the council of Nice and Laodicea. In the year 178 Melito expressly distinguishes the Old Testament from the New. About 200 years later this volume is by Tertullian called “the New Testament.” And yet unfortunately you have in the age of reason, asserted, and in your letter to Mr. Adams, insinuated that no such book as the New Testament existed till more than 300 years after the time of Christ. These propositions I without any hatred, affirm to be true. “And it is proper that every body should know the fact.”

Bishop Watson, you observe, has acknowledged the truth of your assertion. Permit me, sir, without impeaching your veracity, to correct your misconception of the meaning of that eminently learned and pious prelate, whose candor in controversy, is a most amiable pattern to infidels and to christians. He tells you that 27 books or parts compose the New Testament: that respecting seven (and those the shortest) of these parts some doubts were at first entertained, and that the question concerning them might be decided, as all questions concerning opinions must be, by vote. But he tells you further (and gives you authority for

what he says) that “the other twenty parts were owned canonical at all times and by all christians.” “I hold it,” faith he, “to be a certain fact that all the books of which the New Testament is composed, were written, and most of them received by all christians, within a few years after his death.” Is it what you call an acknowledgment that the books which compose the New Testament, were voted by yeas and nays to be the word of God about 1450 years ago?

And what if your assertion were literally true? What if, not only seven but all the books which compose the New Testament had been actually decreed, by a vote of the council of Laodicea, to be the word of God? Would this be any reasonable ground either of doubt to the believer, or of triumph to the infidel? Would this prove either that these books did not exist, or were not acknowledged to be divine prior to that event?

Suppose the sophistry of ingenious and industrious infidels could, in some individuals or churches in the United States, shake the credit with which the holy scriptures are, at this day, regarded. Suppose these individuals or churches should, for their own satisfaction, submit the question to the investigation and decision of the general convention of the episcopal church in May next. Suppose that convention, after a learned, full and free discussion should by their votes declare that the New Testament is the word of God, and a perfect rule of faith and practice. Would this vote imply, or would it prove to succeeding generations, that the divine authority of the New Testament was never acknowledged “till voted by the episcopal convention of 1803”? The answer to this question is so obvious, that the expression of it would insult your understanding. Nor need I, to guard the feeble intellect against the fallacy of your argument, say, that notwithstanding such a vote, it would be an eternal truth that for many hundred years before that convention, the New Testament was received as divine by all christians, in all countries, and of every denomination.

You address to Mr. Adams a scripture phrase for those clergymen who have cooperated with certain statesmen to abolish our representative system of government: “But those ministers, you say, such as Doctor Emmons, curie ruler and people both, for the majority are politically the people!”

I am one of those whom you are pleased to often to honor with the name of priests. And yet I perfectly coincide with you in reprobating the part which too many of them have acted during the political animosities which, for a few years, have convulsed, and at one time, endangered the existence of our government. Nor can the severity of your censure easily exceed their deserts. Some of them have doubtless been deceived.—Others impelled by native pride, or aristocratic principles, or the prospect of gain, or the hope of elevation, have exerted all the influence attached to their profession in behalf of a faction combined for the destruction of our excellent constitution, and the establishment of a monarchy on its ruins. On your return to this country they raised against you, what you call “the war-whoop of monarchial preachers,” but what I call the voice of federal hypocrisy. Your infidelity was the ostensible, your republicanism the real ground of their alarm.

For no one desiring the name of a minister of the gospel can seriously believe, what they affected to fear, that the religion of Jesus can be materially affected by the presence or absence of Mr. Paine. In the book which bears the name (but not the evidence) of the Age of Reason, they have seen your most poisoned arrows, aimed with your utmost skill, and exerted with all your might against that religion. They have seen in that book, but little more than the objections, I had almost said cavils and quibbles, which for ages past, has often been raised by infidels, and as often vanquished by the force of reason. They have seen, in that book, nothing new among those objections, except the boldness with which they are revived and the blasphemy of the language in which they are presented. They have seen that book, like its predecessors, made the talk of a day, and fallen into general contempt and universal neglect. And can those federal clergymen sincerely apprehend, from your return to America, a deadly wound to that religion which has already unpaired, unweakened, unfilled, unfilled the learning of Porphyry, the power of Julien, the eloquence of Bolingbroke, the rallery of Voltaire, the subtlety of Hume, and the blasphemy of Paine.

Under the administration of their favorite chief, their private enmities and their public prayers and eulogies in his behalf were abundant, and exceeded in extravagance by nothing but the profusion and malignancy of the abuse which they bestowed on those who were constrained by the force of reason and integrity, to disapprove some of his measures. But since the fourth of March, 1801, too many of them have omitted a weekly and public supplication for the first magistrate

of our country. They have zealously engaged in supporting an eastern newspaper, whose avowed object is opposition to his administration and to the great majority of the people. With all their professional strength they have twined the voice of calumny to stain his reputation, to enfeeble his hands, to subject to universal contempt him and the government, over which the providence of God has appointed him to preside.

But, sir, the number of these ministers is comparatively small, and if it were greater, their conduct, however reprehensible in itself, ought not to be viewed as a reproach to that divinereligion which declares the magistrate to be the “minister of God,” which commands us to “pray for all that are in authority”—to “render honor to whom honor is due”—and to be subject to the constituted authorities “not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake.” And yet I do not hesitate to say, that this conduct has done more injury to the cause of our Redeemer than the boldness and ridicule, and blasphemy which you display in mentioning his name, his gospel, and the office of his ministers.

“Thou shalt not revile the gods” is the first part of the verse which you quote. On this you say, “it makes no part of my scripture, I believe but one God.”

I am sure you will not esteem me uncandid when I say that you wish by this to insinuate that the Scriptures admit a plurality of Gods, and to contrast this folly with the wisdom of infidelity which acknowledges but one. Long, sir, did the world experience the utmost efforts of natural reason in investigating the nature and perfections of deity. And what were the effects of those efforts? Every temple even of enlightened Rome and philosophic Greece was crowded with gods; and the proud philosopher as well as the humble peasant, bowed in humble adoration to departed profligates and harlots, to bulls, to calves, and to reptiles. And can you imagine that, if you had been cotemporary with the sages of antiquity, your profounder researches would have corrected this predominant error; you would have banished from the minds of Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, &c. their doubts respecting the nature, number and perfections of the Gods, and of the soul’s immortality? No, sir. Your modesty renews with indignation, the imputation of a pretension so arrogant. In those pure ages you would probably have herded with the worshippers of Hebid’s thirty thousand gods; and, like the rational and venerable Socrates in the moment of death, the gratitude of your heart would have inclined you piously to offer a cock to Aesculapius.

Whence then, let me ask, do you derive those sublime conceptions of the deity for which you say, you are complimented by the bishop of Landaff? From those very scriptures which you despise, and which you here charge with teaching the doctrine of a plurality of gods.—“Thou shalt not revile the gods.” Is it unknown to you that in all languages, many words are used not only in a literal, but also in a figurative sense? In a figurative sense the inspired writings often apply the term god, or gods, to celestial angels; to men as primes, justices, or judges; to satan who is called “the god of this world.” And the learned apostle Paul speaking of some enemies of the cross of Christ, says that their “idols are their god.” I do not adduce this last example to insinuate that this is the “one god” which you exclusively acknowledge. Such a supposition is precluded by the exemplary temperance with which you profess to “nourish your health.” And if a knowledge of the Bible had made a part of the “abundance” with which, you tell us, you furnish your “mind,” I should have been saved from the necessity of informing you that we need only open that book to see the unity of God inculeated, and idolatry punished: to learn that, “I am God and there is none else—the Lord our God is one Lord,” were the voice and response which pervaded the camp, the tabernacle, the temple and nation of the Jews: to read that saint Paul, in presence of the supreme court of Athens, boldly maintained the unity of God against the learned philosophers of that city; and, by saying, “they be no gods which are made with hands,” roused the persecuting power of Ephesus, a city devoted to the worship “of the great goddess Diana and the image which fell down from Jupiter.”

I intended to have glanced at some less important sentiments, in yours to Mr. Adams. But I have already exhausted your patience, and transgressed the limits which I had prescribed to this letter. I cannot, however, conclude without expressing my regret that (although christianity has nothing to fear from your talents or industry) your hostility to it may render some pious republicans more easily deceived by those hypocritical federalists who cunningly connect the ideas of republicanism and infidelity and affirm that the object of republicans is the extirpation of the gospel. The religion of Jesus, neither in its origin nor its progress, has ever been indebted, for its glory, to the elevation or worldly greatness of its patrons. To counteract this political tendency of your enmity against

I shall nevertheless, embrace the opportunity of communicating to those pious republicans, through the medium of this letter to you, one of the sublimest eulogiums that ever was expressed on the reasonableness of the Christian religion. I shall give it in the very words of a republican “with whose intellectual greatness your diffidence would blush to be compared—whose influence is unrivalled and who fits this day, at the head of the free, happiest, and most enlightened government in the world.

“Reason and free inquiry, faith he, are the only effectual agents against error. Give a loose to them they will support the true religion by bringing every false one to their tribunal, to the test of their investigation. They are the natural enemies of error and of error only. Had not the Roman government permitted free inquiry, christianity could never have been introduced. Had not free inquiry been indulged at the era of the reformation, the corruptions of christianity could not have been purged away.” That is to say, the reasonableness of christianity was so gloriously repugnant that it confounded the wisdom of heathen philosophy, and dissipated the darkness of papal superstition.

I am, Sir, with due respect,  
Your very humble servant,  
JOHN GEMMIL.

Mr. Thomas Paine,  
Washington.

† Thomas Jefferson.  
‡ Note on Virginia.

The following petition is at present before the house of assembly of this state. It is the speech of an Indian named the Farmer’s Brother, and was originally delivered in 1798. The Farmer’s Brother and the Young King with one or two others, great Albany, waiting the event.

The Sachems, Chiefs, and Warriors of the Seneca nation, to the Sachems and Chiefs assembled about the great council fire of the state of New York.

BROTHERS,  
As you are once more assembled in council for the purpose of honor to yourselves and justice to your country; we, your brothers, sachems, chiefs, and warriors of the Seneca nation, request you to open your ears and give attention to our voice and wishes.

BROTHERS,  
You will recollect the late contest between you and your father, the great king of England: that contest threw the inhabitants of this whole island into great tumult and commotion, like a raging whirlwind which tears up the trees, and tosses to and fro the leaves, so that no one knows from whence they come, or where they fall.

BROTHERS,  
This whirlwind was so ordered and directed by the Great Spirit, as to throw into our arms two of your infant children, Jasper Parish, and Horatio Jones; we adopted them into our families and made them our children; we loved them and nourished them; they lived with us many years. At length the Great Spirit spoke to the whirlwind, and it was still; a clear and uninterrupted sky appeared; the path of peace was opened and the chain of friendship was once more bright.—Then these our adopted children left us to seek their relations.— We wished them to remain among us, and promised, if they would return and live in our country, we would give them each a seat of land for them and their children to sit down upon.

BROTHERS,  
They have returned, and have for several years past been serviceable to us as interpreters. We still feel our hearts beat with affection for them, and now wish to fulfill the promises we made them, and to reward them for their services. We have therefore made up our minds to give them a seat of two square miles below Black Rock, at the mouth of Schooguwady Creek.

BROTHERS,  
We have now made known to you our minds. We expect, and earnestly request, that you will permit our friends to receive this our gift; and will make the same good to them, according to the laws and customs of your nation.

BROTHERS,  
Why should you hesitate to make our minds easy with regard to this our request? To you it is but a little thing; and have you not complied with the request and conferred the gift of our brothers the Oneidas, the Onondagus, and Cayugas, to their interpreters! And that we ask and not be heard?

BROTHERS,  
We fend you this our speech; to which we expect your answer before the breaking up of your great council fire.

Signed by  
HONAWASHIS or Farmer’s Brother,  
HONNESKAYONET or Red Jacket,  
and thirty-two others.

November 11, 1795.  
A mine of zinc ore, of a very superior quality, has lately been discovered at Pennsauken, in Cornwall; it consists of 47 parts in 100 of zinc, when reduced to a metallic state; whereas the zinc from carbonate in it only 4 in 100.