The Pilot and Transcript.

"POWER IS ALWAYS STEALING FROM THE MANY TO THE FEW."

BY DUFF GREEN | BALTIMORE, TUESDAY MORNING, AUGUST 4, 1840. | VOL. 1....NO. 94.

THE PILOT & TRANSCRIPT.
is published at No. 11, Water street, Baltimore, nearly opposite Cheapside.

TERMS.—Daily, at Six Dollars per annum in advance, or Twelve and an half Cents per week payable to the carriers. Country, Five Dollars per annum payable in advance.

Extra, in pamphlet form and double Royal size One Dollar, for twenty-five numbers.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING

1 square	1 insertion,	$0 50	1 square	month	$4 00
1 do.	2 do.	0 75	1 do.	2 months	7 00
do.	3 do.	1 00	1 do.	3 do.	10 00
1 do.	1 week,	1 75	1 do.	6 do.	16 00
1 do.	2 do.	2 75	1 square per year,		$30 00

Cards of two lines only, $6 per annum, in advance.

☞*Ten lines, or less, make a square.* If an advertisement exceeds ten lines, the price will be in proportion. All advertisements are payable at the time of their insertion except yearlies, which are payable quarterly in advance. All advertisements ordered in till forbid will be charged fifty cents for each subsequent insertion.

THE PILOT

Letter to Samuel Annan, M. D., one of the Physicians at the Alms House,—a ruling Elder in the Third Presbyterian Church Baltimore, &c.

SIR:—From the 10th of March to the 9th of June, of the present year, you have devoted to me four most violent communications, several of them pretty long, in the political newspapers of our city. The last of these attacks, which my silence in regard to the rest, has caused to be the most virulent of all, you have used great efforts to get widely circulated. Besides printing it here, and distributing it privately through the country, you have endeavoured, and in part succeeded, in having it re-published elsewhere; and it would not surprise me to see the principal Pelagian, Papal, Abolition and Universalist newspapers in the country make a lion of you, and give you a great and most cordial notoriety. I congratulate you on your new company and prospects; and myself on the unerring instinct which leads those who hate me for truth's sake, to love one another.

Certainly you leave me no ground to undervalue your diligent malignity; and the contrast which it furnishes to your calm and measured zeal in the service of him whom you profess to have chosen as your Redeemer, is not a little edifying. It is, I think, a principle in the science, which you tell us you have had such remarkable opportunities of acquiring, that all morbid excitements are prone to lavish themselves, at last, upon the weakest part of the system; in which case, there is ground to hope that the existing preternatural of commotion of your vanity, egotism, and malevolence, may transfer itself to a far weaker development, and so your personal piety be unexpectedly stimulated.

The injuries of your former articles may go for what they are worth; I have passed them till now, without special notice—and will not recur upon them, farther than may be necessary, in explaining portions of your present attack. If my conduct in this particular should appear to need explanation, be so good as to read the fourth and fifth verses of the twenty-sixth chapter of the Book of Proverbs. The precepts there seem somewhat conflicting. I have tried to keep them both; without, however, applying to you, the whole force of their naked terms.

The attack which it is my present design to notice, divides itself into two general portions; the first, having reference to the Alms House; the second being entirely personal.

As it regards the state of the Alms House, I have little to say of a general kind, beyond what I have felt it my duty to publish; especially in the April No.; and in the notes to my prosecution for libel in the May and June Nos. of the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine. Those who have attended to the progress of this business, know that I have never meddled with the department of the Alms House with which you are connected, farther than for the purpose of showing *that Maguire and his deputies in receiving a sane man as a mad-man, and that not only without, but directly against law*, thereby justified suspicion as to the motive of their proceedings. And the only apparent object you could have had in writing your reply to my article in the April number of our Magazine—was to defend Maguire and propitiate the Catholic influence of Baltimore; unless we are forced to conclude that you were actuated by a vanity panting for notoriety on any terms—or a malignity which forbearance only stimulates.

The whole drift of the first division of your present article, is a masked defence of Maguire A man was let into the Alms House confessedly against positive law, and so treated as to accomplish a particular result; and you write and quote authorities of rule and precedent apparently to prove that it was well done, to take in Stazer as a mad-man when he was sane; to lock him up as such—and yet suppress his name from the physician's roll; to take him in as mad, and let him out as sane, without authority of law, or advice of a physician, in either case. Now, Sir, I shall not argue any of these questions with you. If you learnt at the hospitals of Edinboro' and London, of which you talk so familiarly, nothing better than that the pauper Hooper is competent, either in law or fact, to judge of Stazer's madness, I am sorry to say, you lost your time, your money and your advantages. By the way, if you were really at Guy's and St. Thomas's Hospitals in London, you know that neither of them are hospitals for insane persons; that in Guy's Hospital applications for admission (except where the applicant is suffering from an accident), are received only once a week: and that admission to St. Thomas's (except as above) is only on petition signed by one of the governors: both hospitals being for "the sick poor and those maimed by accident." So that nothing whatever, in either, has any relation to the case of the *mad-man* Stazer, or the irregular and illegal treatment, of a Papist wishing to turn Protestant,—so laboriously defended by you. A great many things, besides true knowledge and a love of truth and justice—may be *caught* in a hospital.

In every part of your present publication there is a method of dealing with facts which is very embarrassing to me. Take an example from the portion now under consideration. You say, "Stazer was seen and conversed with by the senior student *at the time*." Now hear all the students under oath. "*Dr. Turner*, a resident student, has no distinct recollection of ever seeing Stazer in the Alms House." Again: "*Dr. Reynolds*, also a resident student, testified to the same effect as Dr. Turner." Again: Mr. Skipwith, a resident student, was absent when Stazer was said to be there." Mr. Hall, the only remaining student sworn, says not a word on the subject—(See pp. 251—3, of this Magazine; or any report of the trial for libel). Now how am I to treat this extraordinary disregard of established truth?

Take another example on the same subject.—You use the name of Dr. Thomas E. Bond, in such a way as to induce those who have not examined the subject to suppose that he approves what you approve, in regard to the facts and circumstances of this part of our controversy; indeed, in such a way as to make him, in some sort, responsible for the whole case. Now hear Dr. Bond, speaking on oath: "*No person is permitted to see a mad-man without a medical man in the Alms House consenting, no person is confined as a mad-man without the concurrence of some one of the medical attendants. No person was permitted to be discharged by the keeper without an order of the Board of Trustees, nor can they be received by the keeper without such order, except in extreme cases.*"—(Page 261 of this Magazine, for June, or any report of the trial for libel.) Sir, it is painful to me to make these exposures, and useless to comment on them.

Before I pass to the purely personal part of your letter, let us settle a matter which in so many ways, you have endeavored to work up to the furtherance of your purposes. I allude to the case of Dr. Horwitz, Dr. Morris and myself. The facts are few and simple. Dr. Horwitz wished to publish an article in vindication of his views of the Cosmogony of Moses: which views differed materially from those of Dr. Morris; and coincided with my own. I declined publishing his article without such alterations as my respect and friendship for Dr. M. prompted; these were agreed to, as far as I then considered necessary, and the article published during my absence in the west, in our December number for 1839. When I read the article, in Kentucky, I found it contained expressions in regard to Dr. M., which gave me great pain; and I immediately wrote for publication, and addressed to him a letter which was "*entirely satisfactory*" to him; all which was published over his signature and my own, in our number for February, above a month before you abused me so grossly, pretending falsely to do it on the account of Dr. M.—Now to show you the true posture of this matter, notwithstanding all your well meant efforts to entangle it; let me say to you, that I have before me, a letter from Dr. M. post-marked two days before my trial began, and therefore just two days before your unbridled public villification of me commenced; couched in terms of friendship and sympathy most honorable to my character and grateful to my heart; and in terms of commendation, which modesty forbids me to repeat.

Sir, you are as utterly incapable of appreciating the character and conduct of Dr. Morris, as you are of grappling with the learning and abilities of Dr. Horwitz. When you force the public to contrast you with the one, you run the risk of making yourself odious; when with the other, ridiculous.

There is another point which had perhaps better be settled here, also. I said in the note on page 253 of our Magazine, which has furnished the occasion for your last attack, that you had made such a publication, as to render it necessary, publicly to explain away portions of it, or give up your eldership; and that you had done the former, "so far as regarded a portion of your printed praises of papal priests and papism in general." You devote three paragraphs, making together a third of a column of a newspaper, to this particular matter. You say, "this is new to me." What is new? Not that you printed praises "of papal priests and papism in general?" The whole city knows this is true; and you do not deny it. Not that a most serious, extensive and decided spirit of dissatisfaction was manifested at these "printed praises,"— in the congregation to which you belong? For I know, and I presume you also know, on unquestionable authority, that this was the fact. Not that you did really make a public explanation of those "printed praises"—as you had before found it necessary to do, of a misstatement in regard to the editor of the Patriot, on another part of these same general attacks on me? For your explanation has been published with your signature attached. Not new, *to you* surely, that an elder can lay aside his office without having charges brought against him before the church courts? For there is on file with the session clerk of the Second Presbyterian church, written evidence, of no recent date, that you at least think he can. What is it, then, that is new? I will tell you, sir, what is bran new to me, in this whole case. It is, that a man writing himself Christian or gentleman, should solemnly, deliberately, and with all the sanctions of a public covenant with God and man, declare his sincere reception and adoption of a Confession of Faith, which explicitely declares the Pope of Rome to be Antichrist, the man of sin, the son of perdition, and which, by an irresistible implication, pronounces the church of Rome a synagogue of Satan; and then should publicly speak and write both as to time, manner, and matter, in such a way that all men who hear and read without knowing the secrets of his position and designs, understand him to "praise papal priests and papism in general." Yea, so that his own defence of himself, goes only to this, that he is *neutral*, or at least *moderate*, on these very questions! This, sir, is *new*. And I sincerely hope that it may remain entirely unparalleled, at least as it regards the ruling elders of our ancient and upright church.

In a matter so grave as this, into which your unsparing bitterness has driven me, it seems to me that all attempts at pretending diction and ornament of style, are worse than idle; they are contemptible—almost wicked. I do not accuse you of having made them; and am ready to suppose, that your elegant leisure has been filled up with the study of the *Humanities*, as they call them in Scotland, where you inform us you have had such advantages; and that the habits of refined society and literary effort, make quotation such a second nature with you—that the aptest thoughts in the best terms, suggest themselves so forcibly as not to bear rejection. There is a deep and living instinct in the breast of man, which oft-times leads us to do marvellous strange things. Even without the force of habit, and doubly with its aid, he who does a noble action, is most likely to recall some noble parallel, and speak perhaps the sentiments, perhaps the very words of some great and virtuous man: while he who is about to do some deed of tripple baseness, would just as naturally recall from the stores of his memory, corresponding deeds and words to match. Dare I say, Sir, that one of the oddest things in your whole case, is, that when you were in the very act of accomplishing what you intended should be the murder of my good name, you should quote the very words which the very worst character conceived in English literature, uses on an occasion precisely similar? "*Honest, honest Iago*," preaches the value of a "good name"—and stabs his victim with both hands! You, Sir, by a strange fatality of instinct, quote his words, with almost his own conviction and sincerity—and then perform his office of deliberate rancour, with nearly the same cool effrontery. "*Honest, honest Iago*" thought like yourself, that men "will as tenderly be led by the nose, as asses are."

Let me now turn to that "portion of this discussion," which you say is "much more disagreeable;" viz:, to that part which, as you say again, "is altogether personal." Now, Sir, whose fault is it—first, that we have any "personal discussion," and secondly that it should be conducted publicly? I will state the facts, as I understand them, and let the public judge.

For more than five years before the publication of our Magazine for December, 1839, I cannot remember that we had any private intercourse, beyond the occasional and most general civilities of life; except on a single occasion, when I carried a letter for you to your brother, whom you expected I would meet at one of our Synods; and when I came back to Baltimore, you allowed yourself to write me an insulting note—demanding the letter back, under a pretence that you thought, as I had brought back no answer, I must have neglected to deliver it.—When after December, 1839, and in reply to an article in our number for that month, you undertook to write and publish newspaper essays nominally treating of a scientific topic; but using my name, and speaking of the journal of which I was the senior editor, with marked disrespect, and of the opinions held by the work and its conductors, and of the arguments by which they were supported—with supercilious scorn: you can hardly expect the public to believe that in a warfare thus begun, and continued through four subsequent, seperate, personal attacks on me, through the political press, you could be in any sense the defendant, and I the aggressor. In our Magazine for March, 1840, I published a page and a half, noticing in respectful terms, your first and second numbers—all I had then seen; and noticing them at all, as I clearly stated, merely to show the light in which I viewed the whole question as made by Dr. Horwitz, viz., as a pure question of Hebrew criticism, and not of geology at all. The re-publication of this short article in the Post, for which you hold me responsible—was without my knowledge; nor did I know the fact till long after it was done; so that your insinuations that I did it through another person—are characteristic alike in their error and their incivility; and the argument set up on those suspicions, to prove me the general aggresser, is at once idle and false. In reply to this, you attacked me by name, instead of attacking the work of which I was only one of two editors, contrary to the usual civilities of literary warfare: you did this in such a way as to make me personally odious if possible—not for my ignorance only, nor for my presumption only in differing from you, but for *Dr. Horwitz's treatment of Dr. Morris*, in December, 1839, and which had been fully, publicly, and satisfactorily explained in our February number; you did this in a daily newspaper, on *the very day* on which my trial for libel commenced—you being at the same moment a colleague of my prosecutor, and a witness in the case! To that publication I have never replied: a moderation which you have attributed to timidity, or conviction of error; and have since, three times in addition, and without any formal reply from me, gone on to write and publish the most malevolent and unjustifiable accusations against me. I declare to you, sir, that I have met with nothing, even in your conduct, more surprising, than that in such a state of case you should venture to assert that you have acted throughout, only on the defensive.

After all, however, you have shrunk before the naked facts of the case, even when set in the very weakest light in which your utmost ingenuity could place them; and consequently you fortify your absurd accusations by statements which are untrue, and reasons which are ridiculous. Thus you say of the first and second numbers, published in the Post, and headed Geological Discussion, (being the two noticed by us, in our March number,) "Dr. B. knew full well that they came from my pen; and so knowing, assailed you "with the most offensive personalities." These statements are both incorrect; for there is no personality, much less an offensive one, against any body, much less against you, in the article to which you allude: and I did not know, when I wrote it, that you were the author of the other papers; nay, I did not believe it when I first heard it. Dr. Horwitz showed me those two papers, and also an extremely severe article in manuscript against you as their author; which, I must say, being their author, you richly deserved.—But I urged him not to publish his answer, assuring him that, in my opinion, you could not be their author; since you not only professed to be a Christian, but had in the most solemn manner declared your belief in the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, and recorded your testimony against the fatal heresies of the church of Rome; whereas, in these two papers, the author appeared to me, to rank enlightened defence of scripture truth in the same category with papal persecution, and actually used in regard to the Bible not only the arguments, but the gibes of infidels. The first certain knowledge I had that you wrote these article, I got in a curious manner, on my way from Frederick to Hagerstown, in the latter part of March, (after my trial was over) from a gentleman who told me, he heard you, during the progress of that trial, while its issue was uncertain, boasting of being the auther of the attack made on me, the day it commenced!

But you support this fact by a reason. It is a novel process in logic, to establish a *fact* by a *reason: proof* being heretofore considered the only method by which a *fact* can be established. That a gentleman who thinks he can gather the sense of a Hebrew text, better in the bowels of the earth, than in the Bible, should attempt to *prove* a false *fact* by a childish *reason*, is not, however, altogether out of character. You say, "my papers were signed L. N." What then?—L. N. stands for many things more naturally, than for *Samuel Annan;* as, for example, they stand for *Lusus Naturæ*, (moral as well as physical); also for *Liquet Non*, a form of speech (*non liquet*) in constant use by the ancients, when they went to say *ignoramus;*—and in plain English for even a plainer phrase, *Literal Nonsense*. But you say again, they are "the final letters of my name." And what of that?—They are "the final letters" of many hundreds of names in our good city, besides the name *samueL annaN*; from the name of SAMUEL ECCLESTON, "Archbishop of Baltimore," who sitteth on his throne, down through every possible gradation to that of poor *samueL browN*, the colored water in Fayette street, (p. 79, of the Baltimore Director,) or his namesake, the colored laborer, in Forest street (p. 80). So to settle the matter, you add, "the signature was patent to him when he wrote and published his paper against me." Here then is the *proof* on which you assert, as a positive fact, that I knew you to be the author of pieces, which in point of fact, I did not believe you wrote, viz., that L. N. are '*patent*' for *Samuel Annan*, and that I must necessarily know it! And upon this you proceed to attack me, with renewed bitterness, personally in the newspapers; and upon this, rely to prove, that I am the aggressor! A more extraordinary exhibition of unruly passion, and over-weaning vanity and self-conceit, certainly never came under my notice.

I have been the more minute with these matters, because they constitute the sum and substance of all our *recent* relations; and clearly show the utter futility of the reasons urged by you to justify your persevering abuse of me, at a time and under circumstances, when every man, (but especially every Presbyterian elder,) having the heart of a Christian freeman, or even of a Protestant gentleman, in his bosom, might naturally have been expected to feel and act in a manner so different. Sir, your personal feelings and opinions, at this time, are to me, if I know myself, matters of supreme indifference; indeed I am not sure, but that I should have more hope of pleasing God and meeting the approval of His people, when falling under your displeasure, than when winning your approbation. And therefore I think it is without the least mixture of personal animosity, that I declare to you, I consider your conduct in its personal relations, absolutely infamous; as it regards the cause of Christ, shocking treachery; and as a whole, worthy of the abhorrence of every good man. If any still doubt, let them read on.

You do not, however, rest wholly in the defence set up, bad as it is; but go back seven years, for your original cause of offence, and for proofs of my being the agressor from the beginning. The admitted cause of your earliest displeasure with me, then is nakedly confessed to be this, *that my family did not employ you as physician, when we settled in Baltimore.* Sir, it is a very great satisfaction to me, that we agree at least on the ultimate cause of offence taken and given; and I will add, it is a singular gratification to my feelings, that even ingenious malevolence has not been able to produce one more serious in its character.

There is said to be a rule amongst our savages, that before any conjurer can prescribe for any of his tribe, he must begin by taking portions of all his own physic. You have reversed the rule; and require as a condition precedent, that your pastor shall not only take your physic, but also make his family, and to his ability persuade all others to do so too. It is not easy to say, whether the Indian rule is harder on the doctors, or yours on the preachers. I decidedly consider theirs the more reasonable of the two—since it is far more logical to conclude that physic which does one man good may not hurt another; than to infer that one man is fit to preach, therefore another is fit to physic—yea, the fittest of all. Just establish your rules as a general truth—and there is an end of the pastoral relation on earth.

But, Sir, let us be somewhat more precise.—You say, "the next charge of Dr. B. is, that I left his church by his kind advice, *because his family would not employ me as their physician.*" Is truth so offensive to you that you cannot copy it from a printed page? This is what I said:—"When the traverser settled in this city, as pastor of the Second Presbyterian church, Dr. Annan was a ruling elder in it; but taking offence that his pastor's family had not engaged him as their physician (as he avowed)—he allowed the matter so decidedly to affect his feelings and behaviour, *that to save him from difficulty and bring an unpleasant matter to a close*, the pastor kindly advised him *either to give up his unhappy animosity, or if he could not*, to seek some other church connexion where his happiness and usefulness would probably be greater. He preferred the latter course."—(See Magazine for June, p. 253, note.) Are you not ashamed to pervert the simplest statements in so gross a way? The original sentences on which all this part of the matter rests are such as these: "It is very manifest that with your present feelings towards me, you can hardly expect to be profitted by my poor ministrations; while with your present temper and conduct it would be folly in me, to expect any advantage to result to us, from your continued connexion with our congregation.—*But, is separation from the church, or repentance and return to the exercise of long neglected duties, the proper remedy?*" Again—"I am not able to perceive how your connexion with our session can be of the least advantage to you or to us, so long as you neglect every duty incident to that connexion."—(Letter to Dr. Annan, of July 19, 1833.) Now, can any thing be plainer than that you have mis-represented, both the original facts of 1833, and my statement of them in 1840?

But let us suppose that I was in the wrong not to force my family (for the original offence was mine, only by imputation,) to employ you as our physician. This whole matter was distictly explained to you seven years ago, and intentional offence disavowed in writing; for I said to you as far back as my letter of July 15, 1833, that "the employment by my family, of another member of my congregation to be their family physician" was done "under providential circumstances;"—and again, in my letter of the 19th of the same month, thus: "I regret that Dr. Annan should have taken offence originally, and still more the tenacity with which he perseveres in it; and not less than either, the conduct to which it prompts him, and the temper which induces him to justify it. As to the ground of that offence, I will only say, that if any disinterested person in the whole world, who is acquainted with the facts, can be found who will say that there was the least possible just occasion for offence, I will make whatever atonement that person shall direct." What more could I have done?

And still farther, the records of the Session of the Second Presbyterian church show that you were *satisfied* seven years ago, not only on that, but on the other point of complaint now again renewed against me, and of which more presently; for the whole correspondence between us was laid before the session, and the result was, that *you withdrew your letters, and remained for eight months, after all difficulties were settled*—not only a member, but an elder of that church! If seven years will not bar a matter of complaint like this, fully investigated and finally settled, there must surely exist a passionate desire to do damage to me, or service to your new allies.

But still farther, you assign directly contradictory reasons for your own conduct. In 1840, you say in print, that when I came to the city you supposed I would employ you, and proceed thus: "This I expected as a mark of confidence and friendship. *I did not anticipate any pecuniary compensation*, because it is not our custom to charge the pastors of congregations," &c. Again: 'He did not employ me. *Of course I felt hurt that I had so little of his confidence and friendship*," &c. Now hear some of the reasons of 1833: "It is true I did feel myself agrieved in relation to the circumstances to which you refer, *and that it was impossible* after what I *considered an injury in, to me, a vital point as regards the things of this world, viz: my subsistence*, that I could have the same cordiality of feeling towards *the author of the injury whether intentional or not!*" Again: "*I considered myself very seriously injured in my profession.*"—(Dr. Annan's letter of July 17, 1833.) I declare, Sir, I consider these passages nearly as much alike as black and white.

You say expressly, in 1840, that you did not leave the church on account of the matters stated above; and then use the language, "I continued a member for eighteen months after he took charge of the congregation; and is it probable that if I had been so grievously offended I would have remained for such a length of time? On the contrary, I had not the least intention of leaving the church, until I received what I regarded as a public insult from the pulpit, on the sabbath day. One of the gentlemen who usually went round with the bag, on the days of the monthly collection, sat opposite to me, and on a certain occasion he nodded to me, and whispered that I should take his place. I declined, because I did not wish to interfere with the performance of his duty. Some delay occurred in consequence. Dr. B. observed it, jumped up, and in his most peremptory manner, spoke as follows:

"I have always thought it was the duty of the elders to take up the collection. If I have been mistaken, I will take care for the time to come to have persons employed to attend to it, so that it may be performed without delay, and that all things may be done decently and in order in the house of God." "If the offence had been ten times greater than it was, the pulpit was not the place to give utterance to such a reprimand. I wrote him a note the next morning, stating that I would not submit to such an indignity, and that I would prefer quitting the church. He informed me in his answer, that I could not leave his church without his permission, and that of the session. I sent him another note, in which I said I would leave his church whenever I pleased. Shortly afterwards he sent two of the elders as a committee of the session, to effect an adjustment, and get me to remain. I declined, giving as my reason, that I found nothing but the most abject submission to his dictation would enable me to avoid quarrels. This I could not submit to, and it was therefore better, quietly to remove out of his way. In a short time I paid my pew rent and abdicated."

In my course through life I have been obliged to examine and expose, not a few extravagant and wicked misrepresentations; but I cannot remember that I have ever seen as many untruths in the same number of lines, as are contained in the foregoing quotation. And I feel obliged, one by one, to point out many of them, and prove their falsity, which I shall do, from the written correspondence between you and myself, and from the records of our church session.

In the first place, let me say, there was never but *one correspondence* between us, about these troubles; that consisted of two letters on each side, all written in July, 1833, and they all related to your "*injury*" and to your "*public insult.*" That correspondence was laid before the church session on the 6th of August, 1833 (*See Session Book*, p. 66;) the consideration of it laid over: Archibald George and John Wilson appointed "a Committee to wait on Dr. Annan and have a conversation with him."—September, 3, 1833. "The Committee appointed to wait on Dr. Samuel Annan, reported that after a conversation held with him, *they obtained his consent to withdraw his letters.* It was ordered, on motion, that the Session Clerk hand over the same to Dr. Annan," (p. 69.)—October 1, 1833. "The clerk reported that he had complied with the order of the Session by returning to Dr. Samuel Annan his letters." (p. 69)—May 6, 1834. "Application was made by Dr. Samuel Annan, through George Carson, for a dismission, to join the third Presbyterian church here, which was granted, and the clerk ordered to give a certificate of the same" (p. 79).

Now, Sir, look at these frightful records and then read your miserable statements. "This I could not submit to," says Dr. A. He consents to withdraw his letters, says the committee!!—In a *short* time I abdicated," says Dr A. From and before September 3, 1833, to May 6, 1834, says the record, Dr. A. remained, pretending to be satisfied and reconciled.—Is it probable I would have remained such a length of time, demands Dr. A. The record replies, there was *only one correspondence, one* dispute; that occurred in July, 1833, and you left in May, 1834; which gives just the same number of months, days, and hours, whether you apply them to your "*injury*" or to your "*public insult;*" and your letter of July 17, 1833, says expressly, "I never have made complaints" of the former, till after you made them of the latter!!!—Dr. A. says the insult was *to him*, and gives the *personal* circumstances. His letter of July 17, 1833, says, "the public reprimand" was given to "some members of the session."—You now say, that you wished to leave *the church*, for the "*public insult:*" but in 1833, you wrote that you only wished to resign the eldership, and "*would gladly avoid*" "*withdrawing altogether*"!!—Now you say, "I wrote him a note the next morning (after the reprimand), stating that I would not submit to such an indignity, and that I would prefer quitting the church." But the correspondence shows, that your first letter was of a totally different kind; and was so vague, as to the ground of offence, as to be misunderstood; and that you had no wish to quit any thing but the eldership.—You now say, "He informed me in reply, that I could not leave his church without his permission, and that of his session:" whereas my first reply says not one single syllable about your leaving the church at all; but relates to your resigning your office only.—You proceed: "I sent him another note, in which I said I would leave his church whenever I pleased;" whereas that second note, a copy of which lies open before me, was intended to open more fully your grounds for wishing to resign your eldership, only; and you therein distinctly say, "*I would prefer continuing a simple hearer in your church*"!! You say again, "*He sent two of the elders*," &c.: whereas the records of the Session show that I never met that body from July 2, till November 19, 1833; that is from before the date of your first letter to me, till after the return of your letters to you by the session clerk; the fact being, that I was dangerously ill or absent from the city, for nearly four months. "To effect an adjustment, and get me to remain. I declined;" these are *your statements*. The *facts* are, you did *not* decline, if their object was that stated by you,—for you remained eight months: and the 'adjustment' submitted to you was just this, to take back your letters and behave yourself, or expect to be dealt with; and such was the impression your conduct produced on the minds of the session—that when you asked for a dismission eight months afterwards—there were very serious difficulties about granting it, and but for my urgent interposition in your behalf, it probably would not have been granted; and was at any rate (unless I greatly err) granted in an unusual and qualified form.

This is an appalling catalogue; but it is not complete; and one of your statements demands a more particular refutation. You say, "Dr. B. observed it, (that is your refusal to take up a collection,) jumped up, and in his most peremptory manner, spoke as follows: "I have always thought it was the duty of the elders to take up the collection. If I have been mistaken I will take care for the time to come, to have persons employed to attend to it, so that it may be performed without delay, and all things may be done decently and in order in the house of God." This scene occurred, as you say, on the day before the date of your first note, therefore if you are correct, on the 14th of July, 1833. Let us see the *minute* errors which here, as every where, vitiate every thing you say. For example, you say "*monthly* collection;" whereas there is a sessional record (p. 64) on the 4th of June, not only proving that the collections were *weekly*, but also appropriating them to such objects as would appear to commend themselves to every loyal Christian heart, viz: the first Sabbath in the month, to contingent expenses of the church; the second, to the poor; the third, to the Sunday Schools; the fourth, to the cause of tract distribution. Again: there were at that time, *ten* Ruling Elders in the congregation; while there were but *three* bags for collection, at that time, in the body of the church; so that some arrangement and designation of persons was indispensable; and you, Sir, being the youngest elder, and the most unprofitable in all other respects, might have been justly expected, by the other elders, to aid in this service; and the notion of its being somebody else's duty, and not yours, (which is the reason you give for refusing to perform it) —is strange enough.

But, Sir, let me say, *first:* that whatever weakness I might have been guilty of, and whatever offence I may have committed, you, the youngest and least reputable of *ten* elders, were the only one that ever suggested to me, that they were grieved at what I said; you, one of the most unprofitable of a church, numbering then about three hundred members, were the *only one* that ever complained to me of the particular act under review; you, were the *only person*, in a congregation amounting then to six or seven hundred souls, that ever called me to account about it, while with one accord, *all* of them who have known, have condemned your conduct. *Secondly:* as soon as I knew you were offended, I disclaimed all intention to give you offence; as soon as I heard your false statement, now renewed in a new form, at the end of seven years, I assured you, you were in error; you were induced by the session to acquiesce in the view which they and I, and every body else but yourself, took of the matter, and to withdraw your letters; and yet, at this distant period, you reiterate the original mis-statement, in a more exaggerated and obnoxious form than at first—and urge it against me, as though it had never been denied, disapproved, settled, acquisced in for eight months, and your withdrawal permitted under the impression of these facts.

But, sir, above all—you have distinctly, deliberately, and I fear, with full knowledge, misstated the facts, as it regards my conduct on the 14th of July, 1833. In my letter of the 19th of that month, the matter is fully explained; let me quote the passage:

"The ground on which your last letter places your proposed resignation, is different from what I surmised. But even now it is wholly personal; and what is worse, founded on a mis-statement injurious to me. You say it is 'simply on account of the public reprimand,' which, as you assert, I gave to 'some of the members of the Session on last Sabbath forenoon,' and which was, you suppose, intended principally for you. The statement to which I suppose you have allusion, was, as nearly as I can remember, in words, and exactly in substance this; 'that I had observed for a short time past, some delay and confusion in taking up our weekly collections; that I felt a deep interest in these collections, because they constituted the principal part of our contribution, to several important objects; that I was not sure it was the duty of the elders to take up collections; and if they thought it was not, or from any other cause wished to decline it, I had reason to hope our deacons would do it; that as the elders had heretofore done it in this church, I hoped they would take the subject into consideration, and decide it before next Lord's day; so that all things might be done in order in God's house; and that this suggestion was publicly made, rather than in a meeting of the Session, because many of the elders rarely, and some never attended our sessional meetings.'—Now, Sir, I will not attempt to express the surprise with which I learn, that it is '*simply*' to protect yourself from the repetition of this, or such a reprimand, that you insist on putting off duties, assumed with all the solemnities of ordination vows."—I will quote another passage from this letter: it is the closing one. "This correspondence, on my part, is at an end; and if your resignation is not withdrawn, before the time indicated in my former letter, I shall of course, according to your request, cause it to be laid before the session, together with this correspondence, embracing any thing you may wish farther to advance; leaving the whole subject, in that case, to take whatever course our excellent standards may require."

Now compare your statements in 1833, with mine of the same period, and both with your account of the same transaction, in 1840: remember, it was *my* conduct that was to be explained, and of course by all possible laws, if I was willing to *explain away offence*, I was to be allowed to do it; remember the explanation was given on the *fifth* day after the act, and therefore when every thing was fresh;—that you did not by word or deed deny the literal truth of that explanation;—that the Session, with full and personal knowledge of all the facts, proceeded on the admitted, exact truth of my statement; yea, and that you acquiesced in the conclusion to which they came, withdrew your letters, and remained eight months, in your former relations; remember, Sir, all these overwhelming facts—and then ask yourself, what ought every honest man to say of your present conduct and statements—the result of seven years of meditation! I protest, that the whole seems to me, to stamp upon your proceeding, a character eminently disreputable—nay, flagitious.

And now, Sir, I have performed a duty, most painful to me. a duty which I have put aside, to the farthest degree that my judgment and sense of propriety would allow: pretermitted till my forbearance appeared to myself a weakness, and was scoffed at by you. I have done it with perfect conviction, and simply as an office required at my hands, by my character, my position, my Master—To that Master I appeal, with humble, but with absolute confidence. I beseech him to judge between you and me. I call him to witness that, while I have given myself to his service, in constant, difficult, self-denying, and sometimes dangerous labors; you have not only failed to stand forth for his name and cause, as became your calling and station, but you have cruelly, falsely, malignantly, endeavored to hinder, yea, to destroy me. May the Lord Jehovah judge between us, even as he has judged between me and all who have heretofore hated and pursued me for his sake.

Yours, in sincere pity,
ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE.
Baltimore, July, 1840.

MASTER HUMPHREY'S CLOCK.

BY CHARLES DICKENS.—PARTS X. XI. XII.

THE OLD CURIOSITY SHOP.

THE OLD CURIOSITY SHOP.

Business disposed of, Mr. Swiveller was inwardly reminded of its being nigh dinner-time, and to the intent that his health might not be endangered by longer abstinence, despatched a message to the nearest eating-house requiring an immediate supply of boiled beef and greens for two. With this demand, however, the eating-house (having experience of its customers,) declined to comply, churlishly sending back for answer that if Mr. Swiveller stood in need of beef perhaps he would be so obliging as to come there and eat it, bringing with him, as grace before meat, the amount of a certain small account which had been long outstanding. Not at all intimidated by this rebuff, but rather sharpened in wits and appetite, Mr. Swiveller forwarded the same message to another and more distant eating-house, adding to it by way of rider that the gentleman was induced to send so far, not only by the great fame and popularity its beef had acquired, but in consequence of the extreme toughness of the beef retailed at the obdurate cook's shop, which rendered it quite unfit, not merely for gentlemanly food, but for any human consumption. The good effect of this politic course was demonstrated by the speedy arrival of a small pewter pyramid curiously constructed of platters and covers, whereof the boiled-beef-plates formed the base, and a foaming quart pot the apex; the structure being resolved into its components parts afforded all things requisite and necessary for a hearty meal, to which Mr. Swiveller and his friend applied themselves with great keeness and enjoyment.

"May the present moment," said Dick, sticking his fork into a large carbuncular potato, "be the worst of our lives! I like this plan of sending 'em with the peel on; there's a charm in drawing a potato from its native element (if I may so express it) to which the rich and powerful are strangers. Ah! 'Man wants but little here below, nor wants that little long!' How true that is!—after dinner."

"I hope the eating-house keeper will wait but little and that he may not want that little long," returned his companion; "but I suspect you've no means of paying for this!"

"I shall be passing presently, and I'll call," said Dick, winking his eye significantly. "The waiter's quite helpless. The goods are gone, Fred, and there's an end of it."

In point of fact, it would seem that the waiter felt this wholesome truth, for when he returned for the empty plates and dishes, and was informed by Mr. Swiveller with dignified carelessness that he would call and settle when he should be passing presently, he displayed some perturbation of spirit, and muttered a few remarks about "payment on delivery," and 'no trust,' and other unpleasant subjects, but was fain to content himself with inquiring at what hour it was likely the gentleman would call, in order that, being personally responsible for the beef, greens, and sundries, he might take care to be in the way at the time. Mr. Swiveller, after mentally calculating his engagements to a nicety, replied that he should look in at from two minutes before six to seven minutes past, and the man disappearing with this feeble consolation, Richard Swiveller took a greasy memorandum-book from his pocket and made an entry therein.

"Is that a reminder, in case you should forget to call?" said Trent, with a sneer.

"Not exactly, Fre'd," replied the imperturbable Richard, continuing to write with a business like air, "I enter in this little book the names of the streets that I can't go down while the shops are open. This dinner to-day closes Long Acre. I bought a pair of boots in Great Queen stre