



Wm. M. M. M.

AN

1838

ACCOUNT

OF

THE LAW-SUIT

INSTITUTED BY

REV. G. A. M. ELDER,

PRESIDENT OF ST. JOSEPH'S COLLEGE,

AGAINST

REV. N. L. RICE,

PRESBYTERIAN MINISTER,

FOR A PRETENDED LIBEL ON THE CHARACTER OF

REV. DAVID DUPARQUE,

A ROMAN PRIEST.

TOGETHER WITH SOME REMARKS ON CELIBACY
AND NUNNERIES.

BY REV. N. L. RICE,

PASTOR OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN BARDSTOWN.

LOUISVILLE, KY.:

D. HOLCOMB & CO., PRINTERS.

.....

1837.

Digitized by Google

BX
1765
R5

INTRODUCTION.

THE present little volume would never have been obtruded upon the public, but for the recent efforts of the Roman clergy of Bardstown to ruin the author by a civil suit for a pretended libel upon the character of a priest. Providentially located in Bardstown several years since, he found Popery in power there. The Roman clergy, by means of the number of their adherents, their wealth, their literary institutions and their political power, exerted an almost irresistible influence. Circumstances made it his duty to deliver several lectures in defence of Protestantism, which had so long been misrepresented by them. This step on his part brought down upon him the wrath of the establishment. A controversy of considerable length ensued. They finally retired from the public discussion, and published against him a very abusive book, under a fictitious signature. Soon after this, they commenced the publication of the Catholic Advocate in Bardstown. In self-defence, he thought it necessary also to publish a paper. He therefore commenced the publication of the Western Protestant, a paper which he still edits. Several articles published in the Protestant, concerning a Nun who had disappeared under suspicious circumstances, afforded the priests an opportunity, which they greedily embraced, to injure him by a civil suit. The principal

design of this little volume, is to present to the public the evidence introduced into Court in the trial. The evidence was taken down from the mouths of the witnesses, and read and signed by the Court. As this is the first suit of the kind that has occurred in our country, and as the testimony will throw some light upon the true character of Nunneries, the author has, at the solicitation of a number of friends, presented the evidence to an inquiring public.

In addition to this, the reader will find some remarks, in the first part of this work, on the subject of Celibacy, Nunneries, &c., designed to show the immoral tendency of such establishments, and the impropriety of educating young females in them. That the motives of the author will be impugned by Papists and their tools, is what he is induced by the past to anticipate. For that, however, he is not particularly concerned. He has for a length of time been convinced, that the public were deceived in relation to the true character of Nunneries; and he feels it to be his duty to submit his views, formed after considerable examination, to a candid public, that they may judge of their correctness and act accordingly. The advantages in favor of Protestantism, resulting from the controversy thus far, reconcile him to the abuse which has been heaped upon him by the clergy and some of their misguided votaries.

CELIBACY.

"It is not good for man to be alone," was the language of God, when he first created him. Accordingly he made for him "a help mete." This doctrine was believed and acted upon from the creation until the church of Rome discovered that celibacy was a holier state than matrimony. The priests who officiated at the altar under the old Dispensation, were required to be holy; but they were never forbidden to marry. The apostles of Christ were expected to be "examples of the believers, in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in purity;" (1 Tim. 4: 12;) yet they claimed the right "to lead about a sister, a wife," and the "brethren of the Lord and Cephas" exercised that right. 1 Cor. 9: 5. It is rather remarkable, that Jesus Christ should have chosen a married man for the first Pope; for Peter certainly had a wife. "And Simon's wife's mother was taken with a great fever." Luke 4: 38. It is true, Paul recommended in time of persecution, that those who could safely do so, should remain single: "I suppose, therefore, that this is good for the *present distress*; I say, that it is good for a man so to be." 1 Cor. 7: 26. Yet in the verse preceding he says, "Now concerning virgins *I have no commandment of the Lord;*" and so well was he acquainted with human nature, that after having said "It is good for a man not to touch a woman," he immedi-

ately gives this advice: "Nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband."

1 Cor. 8: 1, 2. And so far from forbidding clergymen to marry, when directing Titus in the election of men to be ordained bishops he says, "If any be blameless, *the husband of one wife, having faithful children,*" &c. Titus 1: 6. Writing to Timothy he says, "A bishop must be blameless, *the husband of one wife.*" 1 Tim. 3: 2.

Such is the plain and simple teaching of the word of God upon this subject. But the Pope and his clergy have become wise "above what is written." They have made the discovery, it would seem, that by marriage, which God says "is honorable in all," men contract a degree of impurity so great, that they are wholly unfit to exercise the office of the ministry. They have thought fit to annul or deny the doctrine of Paul, and to say, a bishop must *not* be the husband of one wife, must *not* have children. They would even depose a man from the ministry, who should be as *impure* as Peter was, and as Paul claimed the right to be! Nay, they will not even allow the lowest order of *deacons* to be as *unholy* as the apostles of Christ were! For it should be observed, that the Roman church does not require celibacy of her clergy merely as a matter of *expediency*, but because it is a *holier* state. The council of Trent says, "Whoever shall affirm, that the conjugal state is to be preferred to a life of virginity or celibacy, and that it is not *better* and more conducive to happiness to remain in virginity or celibacy than to be married; let him be accursed." And the Catechism of Trent says, "As it is the duty

of the pastor to propose to himself the holiness and perfection of the faithful, his earnest desires must be in full accordance with those of the Apostle, when, writing to the Corinthians, he says, 'I would that all men were even as myself;' that is, that all embraced the virtue of continence." p. 225.

This doctrine is somewhat singular, when we consider that marriage is one of the seven sacraments of the Roman church. "Whoever shall affirm that matrimony is not truly and properly one of the seven sacraments of the evangelical law—and does not confer *grace*—let him be accursed." Matrimony is a sacrament which confers grace; and yet we have more grace by refusing, than by receiving it! It is worthy of remark, in passing, that in reference to the ability of all persons to live virtuously in a state of celibacy, the council of Trent flatly contradicts the word of God. They say, "Whoever shall affirm, that all persons may marry who feel that though they should make a vow of chastity, they have not the gift thereof; let him be accursed—for God does not deny his gifts to those who ask aright, neither does he suffer us to be tempted above that we are able." Here we are taught that all persons can obtain the gift of chastity, as they call it, if they choose. But what does the Saviour say? "His disciples say unto him, 'If the case of a man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry.'" This looked something like a squinting at Popery. "But he said unto them '*All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given.*'" Math. 18: 10, 11. Paul says, "I would that all men were even as I myself; but every man hath his proper

gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that." 1 Cor. 7: 7.

But suppose we admit that Paul really desired that all men should abstain from marriage, and of course that the human race should become extinct; and that he did *advise* all to remain unmarried; would this justify the church of Rome in positively *commanding* what God did not command? Paul says expressly, "Now concerning virgins I have *no commandment* of the Lord." And again, "But and if thou marry, *thou hast not sinned*." 1 Cor. 7: 25, 28. Paul had no commandment on this subject; but the Pope has. Paul says, if thou marry thou hast not sinned. The Pope says, thou hast sinned. Paul was enabled by inspiration to look into futurity and see the origin of Popery; and he mentions as a characteristic of the great apostasy, "forbidding to marry." 1 Tim. 4: 3. God says to his ministers, you may marry; the Pope says, you shall not; I will depose you from the ministry if you do. Nay, more; God says, "Nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man (priest and all) have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband." The Pope says, this is very bad advice—it is easy to avoid fornication without marriage; or rather, marriage is worse than fornication! Paul says, "I will, therefore, that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully; for some are already turned aside after Satan." 1 Tim. 5: 14, 15. But the Pope says, I will that the younger women marry *not*, that they be nuns, that they take the vow of "poverty, chastity and obedience," that they serve the clergy;

for it is not true, but a malicious slander, that "some are already turned aside after Satan! Do not these contradictions of God look something like the *man* "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped?"

If God had required all his ministers to live unmarried, doubtless he would have enabled them to do so. But are we to imagine, that he will restrain and subdue the passions of men to enable them to observe one of "the traditions of men"—a law directly in the face of his word? It was but reasonable to anticipate the shameful immoralities which have prevailed, as the inevitable consequence of the arbitrary and unscriptural law of celibacy. It is not surprising, that in every age licentiousness has been the crying sin of the Roman clergy. The following dark picture of the morals of the Popes and inferior clergy at the beginning of the 11th century, is drawn by Rev. Joseph Reeve, a Roman Catholic historian:

"Simony and incontinence had struck deep root among the clergy of England, Italy, Germany, and France. The evil began under those unworthy Popes, who so shamefully disgraced the tiara by their immoral conduct, in the tenth century; the scandal spread, and had now continued so long, that the inferior clergy pleaded custom for their irregularities. Many even of the bishops were equally unfaithful to their vow, and with greater guilt. Hence the corrupt laity, being under no apprehension of a reproof from men as deeply immersed in vice as they, gave free scope to their passions. To

stem the torrent of so general a licentiousness which then deluged the Christian world, required the fortitude of an apostle." *Church Hist.*, vol. I, Sec. 9.

This is but one example of what has constantly occurred, to a greater or less extent, in consequence of the law of celibacy. All history proclaims the licentiousness of the Roman clergy. Robertson, the historian, says, "The severe and unnatural law of celibacy occasioned such irregularities, that in several parts of Europe the concubinage of priests was not only permitted, but enjoined." *Charles V.*, Book 2, p. 136. We would by no means assert, that all the Roman priesthood violate their vow; but we do say, that occurrences of this kind must inevitably be very frequent, so long as the law of celibacy exists. Young men, who know little of themselves or of the temptations that await them in life, are induced to take the vow and enter the priesthood. They may be very sincere in their resolution to keep the solemn vow they have taken; but they who are acquainted with human nature, and who know the strong temptations to which they must be exposed, will greatly doubt whether their resolution may not fail. Such would naturally be our apprehensions, even without any knowledge of facts; but when Roman historians inform us, that the church has been *deluged* with the crime of licentiousness—that Popes, bishops, priests, and inferior clergy have fallen and broken their vow, and that by their example the people were corrupted; and when we know, that in Europe, South America and Mexico, incontinence pre-

vails even now among the clergy of all grades—how can we resist the conviction, that even in our own country they are not all chaste? I cannot withhold from my readers the following painfully eloquent testimony of Rev. J. B. White on this subject. He was for many years a priest in Spain, and speaks what he personally knows:

“That my feelings are painfully vehement when I dwell upon this subject; that neither the freedom I have enjoyed so many years, nor the last repose of the victims, the remembrance of whom still wrings tears from my eyes, can allay bitter pangs of my youth—are proofs that my views arise from a real, painful, and protracted experience. Of monks and friars I knew comparatively little, because the vague suspicions, of which even the most pious Spanish parents cannot divest themselves, prevented my frequenting the interior of monasteries during boyhood. My own judgment, and the general disgust which the prevailing grossness and vulgarity of the regulars create in those who daily see them, kept me subsequently away from all friendly intercourse with the cowed tribes; but of the secular clergy, and the amiable life prisoners of the church of Rome, few, if any, can possess a more intimate knowledge than myself. Devoted to the ecclesiastical profession since the age of fifteen, when I received the minor orders, I lived in constant friendship with the most distinguished youths who, in my town, were preparing for the priesthood. Men of the first eminence in the church were the old friends of my family, my parents’ and my own spiritual directors. Thus I grew up, thus I continued in

manhood, till, at the age of five-and-thirty, religion, and religion alone, tore me away from kindred and country. The intimacy of friendship, the undisguised converse of sacramental confession, opened to me the hearts of many, whose exterior conduct might have deceived a common observer. The coarse frankness of associate dissoluteness, left no secrets among the spiritual slaves, who, unable to separate the laws of God from those of their tyrannical church, trampled both under foot, in riotous despair. Such are the sources of the knowledge I possess: God, sorrow, and remorse, are my witnesses.

A more blameless, ingenuous, religious set of youths than that in the enjoyment of whose friendship I passed the best years of my life, the world cannot boast of. Eight of us, all nearly of the same age, lived in the closest bond of affection, from sixteen till one-and-twenty; and four, at least, continued in the same intimacy till that of about thirty-five. Of this knot of friends, not one was tainted by the breath of vice till the church had doomed them to a life of celibacy, and turned the best affections of their hearts into crime. It is the very refinement of church cruelty to say they were free when they deprived themselves of their natural rights. Less, indeed, would be the unfeelingness of a parent who, watching a moment of generous excitement, would deprive a son of his birth-right, and doom him, by a voluntary act, to pine away through life in want and misery. A virtuous youth of one-and-twenty, who is made to believe Christian perfection inseparable from a life of celibacy, will

easily overlook the dangers which beset that state of life. Those who made, and those who still support the unnatural law, which turns the mistaken piety of youth into a source of future vice, ought to have learned mercy from their own experience: but a priest who has waded (as most do) through the miry slough of a life of incessant temptation—falling, and rising, stumbling, struggling, and falling again, without at once casting off Catholicism with Christianity, contracts generally habits of mind not unlike those of the guards of oriental beauty. Their hearts have been seared with envy.

I cannot think of the wanderings of the friends of my youth without heart-rending pain. One, now no more, whose talents raised him to one of the highest dignities of the church of Spain, was for many years a model of Christian purity. When, by the powerful influence of his mind and the warmth of his devotion, this man had drawn many into the clerical and the religious life, (my youngest sister among the latter,) he sunk at once into the grossest and most daring profligacy. I heard him boast that the night before the solemn procession of *Corpus Christi*, where he appeared nearly at the head of his chapter, one of *two* children had been born, which his two concubines brought to light within a few days of each other. The intrigues of ambition soon shared his mind with the pursuit of pleasure; and the fall of a potentate, whom he took the trouble to instruct in the policy of Machiavel, involved him in danger and distress for a time. He had risen again into court influence, when death cut him off in the flower of life. I had loved him when both

our minds were pure: I loved him when Catholicism had driven us both from the path of virtue: I still love, and will love his memory, and hope that God's mercy has pardoned his life of sin, without imputing it to the abettors of the barbarous laws which caused his spiritual ruin.

Such, more or less, has been the fate of my early friends, whose minds and hearts were much above the common standard of the Spanish clergy. What then need I say of the vulgar crowd of priests, who, coming, as the Spanish phrase has it, from *coarse swaddling clothes*, and raised by ordination to a rank of life for which they have not been prepared, mingle vice and superstition, grossness of feeling, and pride of office, in their characters? I have known the best among them; I have heard their confessions; I have heard the confessions of young persons of both sexes, who fell under the influence of their suggestions and example; and I do declare that nothing can be more dangerous to youthful virtue than their company. How many souls would be saved from crime, but for the vain display of pretended superior virtue, which Rome demands of her clergy."

Such is the testimony of White, and such the uniform testimony of all who leave the Roman priesthood.

DANGER FROM CONFESSION.¹

It is a wise arrangement of Divine Providence, that we can know the thoughts and feelings of our fellow-creatures, only so far as they choose to reveal them. There is in every one's bosom a sacred retreat, within which none can intrude; and this is one of the chief safeguards to virtue. Every mind has its thoughts and feelings, which should be known only to the Searcher of hearts, and which that delicacy which God has implanted in the bosom, forbids us to reveal to any. Into this sacred temple of the soul the church of Rome bids her priests to enter. She teaches the absurd and impious doctrine, that the clergy have the power to forgive sins, and that this forgiveness "is not to be considered as merely a ministry, whether to publish the gospel or to declare the remission of sins, *but as of the nature of a judicial act, in which sentence is pronounced by him (the priest) as a judge.*" *Council of Trent, Chap. 6, on Penance.* Hence the same council makes the following declarations: "For it is plain that the priests cannot sustain the office of judge, if the cause be unknown to them, or inflict equitable punishments if sins are only confessed in general, *and not minutely and individually described.* For this reason it follows that penitents are bound to rehearse in confession *all mortal sins*, of which after diligent examination of themselves they are conscious, *even though they be of the most secret kind*; and only committed against the two last precepts of the deca-

logue." *Ib.*, Chap. 5, of *Confession*. But the penitent is required to do more than enumerate all his mortal sins in confession. The Catechism of Trent says "With the bare enumeration of our mortal sins, we should not be satisfied; that enumeration we should accompany with the relation of *such circumstances* as considerably aggravate or extenuate their malice. Has any one imbrued his hands in the blood of his fellow-man? He must state whether his victim was a layman or an ecclesiastic. Has he had criminal intercourse with any one? He must state whether the female was married or unmarried, a relative or a person consecrated to God by vow." Pp. 194, 195, *Donovan's Translation*. If any one neglect to confess any mortal sin of which, after careful self-examination, he is conscious; "he not only does not obtain the pardon of his sins, but involves himself in deeper guilt," and "profanes the sanctity of the sacrament." Great fault is found with those, "who yielding to a foolish bashfulness, cannot induce themselves to confess their sins. Such persons are to be encouraged by exhortation, and to be reminded, that there is no reason whatever why they should yield to such false delicacy." *Ib.*, pp. 195, 198.

Such is the *infallible* doctrine of the church of Rome in regard to confession to a priest. Every Roman clergyman is an unmarried man; and yet he must hear the confessions of all classes of females; and they must, at the peril of their souls, rehearse to him every mortal sin, even the most secret, with all the attending circumstances; and this is to be done *in private*. Need I do more than simply mention these facts, to

convince every one that the confessional presents the strongest possible temptations to licentiousness? And is it not equally manifest, that it affords to the dissolute priest the fairest opportunity to ruin his female penitents? We must give the Roman clergy credit for much more holiness than we suppose others to possess, if our confidence in their virtue be not shaken by these considerations; and we must regard the present generation as far purer than their predecessors in the ministry. Nay, we must suppose that their own standard writers have slandered them. The following is the language of LIGORI (who has been sainted) on this subject: "In hearing the confessions of women, and in holding communications with them, let him (the confessor) exercise that austerity which is proper, according to prudence; and therefore let him refuse small presents; let him avoid familiarity, and all other things which can be cause of attachment. (*Adhesionis.*) *Oh, how many confessors, on account of some negligence about this, have ruined (perdiderunt) their own souls, and the souls of their penitents.*" *Moralis Theol.* vol. 9, p. 172. We presume, it will scarcely be maintained, that St. Ligori has slandered his brethren; and he declares—for the exclamation is equivalent to a declaration—that very many confessors have ruined their penitents in the confessional! Parents may well tremble for the virtue of their daughters, when such is the testimony, not of enemies, but of standard writers and saints. And why are this temptation to the priest and this exposure of female delicacy necessary? Only because in their presumption the Roman clergy have

claimed authority which belongs alone to God: authority to forgive the sins of men!

We have made these remarks to show that there are just grounds for withholding from the Roman clergy that unlimited confidence which they claim; for since they have the superintendence of female academies, and are establishing institutions throughout our country, into which young females are enticed under the pretence of living a more religious life, the public are interested in knowing how far they may safely confide in them. We have no objection that men who prefer a state of celibacy should embrace it; nor do we suspect their purity on that account. Many of the most respectable men, men whose characters are above reproach, are unmarried. But the thing to which we object, as mischievous in its tendency, is *compelling* young men, before they can enter the ministry, to bind themselves by a most solemn oath to a mode of life for which they are not fitted. Let it be matter of choice to every one to marry or not, as he pleases, and when he pleases; and our objections cease.

Still more do we object to the doctrine which compels females to confess to such unmarried men all their mortal sins. This places temptation before them in its most dangerous form; while it offers impunity to dissolute conduct. The doctrines of celibacy and of auricular confession can never exist together, without producing, in many instances, results the most disastrous. If ministers of Protestant denominations choose single life, they have no auricular confessions to tempt them to depart from the path of virtue. And it is well worthy of re-

mark, that whatever failings or sins may have been observable in Protestant ministers, there never has been a period when they have been chargeable, to any considerable extent, with the sin of licentiousness; or when the Protestant churches have been "*deluged*," as Reeve says of the Roman church, with that sin. For this difference between Roman and Protestant clergymen, there are two important reasons—the latter are allowed to marry if they choose, and they hear no secret confessions.

NUNNERIES.

The female convents established in our country by the Roman clergy, are now become objects of attention, both because of their number, and because they are proposed as places of education for our daughters. Their character as literary institutions, and their moral influence, are proper subjects of inquiry. The precise number of Nunneries, properly so called, in the U. States, we do not know; but we learn from the Catholic Almanac of 1837, that there are *twenty-three* Female Religious Institutions and *thirty-seven* Female Academies, with a number of charitable institutions, under the care of the various orders of Nuns. That these institutions, annually multiplying, exert a powerful influence upon society, cannot be doubted. The *charac-*

ter of that influence every patriot and every Christian is interested to know. I am convinced, after considerable investigation of this subject, that their tendency and their influence have been, and ever must be, injurious, wherever they exist. I will briefly give some of the reasons by which I have been led to this conclusion, and leave the candid to weigh their importance.

In the first place, it is proper to remark, that such establishments were unknown to the primitive church. We read nothing concerning them either in the Old or in the New Testament—so that we may safely oppose them, without opposing Christianity. Monkeny had its origin in that absurd maxim of ancient Philosophy, “that in order to the attainment of true felicity and communion with God, it was necessary that the soul should be separated from the body even here below, and the body was to be macerated and mortified for that purpose.” The adoption of this erroneous principle in the third century “drove many into caves and deserts, where they macerated their bodies with hunger and thirst, and submitted to all the miseries of the severest discipline that a gloomy imagination could prescribe.” This wild fanaticism had its origin in Egypt and the surrounding countries, and was doubtless strengthened by the peculiarity of the climate. In a form considerably modified and mitigated, it was introduced into Europe, and soon caused most deplorable evils. An institution founded upon a principle so very absurd, could scarcely be supposed to be favorable to religion or science.

Second.—We object to the monastic system because of the vows imposed on its votaries. Young females, unacquainted with themselves and with the world, are induced, under the influence of romantic feelings and superstitious notions, to forsake their homes and their parents, and to bind themselves by a religious vow to a certain mode of life during the rest of their days. Their vow is “poverty, chastity and obedience.” In many instances they bind themselves to live and die upon the spot where stands their prison, and never to leave its gloomy walls. Have they the right thus to dispose of themselves for life? Suppose their parents, in the afflictions of declining age, should need their filial attentions. Reason, affection, and the law of God, require them to go and comfort them; but their blind guides have imposed on them an oath that forbids them to obey. It was conduct based on this principle that the Saviour so severely condemned in the Scribes and Pharisees. “For God commanded, saying, Honor thy father and mother: and he that curseth father or mother, let him die the death. But ye say, whosoever shall say to his father or mother, It is a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me, and honor not his father or his mother, he shall be free. Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your traditions.” Math. 15: 4, 6. Just so, if the parents of a veiled Nun need her assistance, she can say to them, “It is a gift”—I am consecrated to God—I cannot honor my father and mother. Or suppose the health of a Nun, who has taken the veil for life, should fail, and might be restored by leaving the convent; her vow

binds her to the prison, and compels her to break that commandment, "Thou shalt not kill." Or suppose she is unhappy in the cloister; she may weep bitter tears in her cell, but she is chained to the spot by a most solemn vow, if by no more powerful means. Besides, were she to break her vow and return to the world, she must meet the withering scorn of all her relations and former friends. Detained by motives so strong, if not by physical force, many a delicate female has in wretchedness pined away, and found an early grave. But my readers will be more interested by the following remarks of Rev. J. B. White, than by any thing that I can say:

"The picture of female convents requires a more delicate pencil; yet I cannot find tints sufficiently dark and gloomy to portray the miseries which I have witnessed in their inmates. Crime, indeed, makes its way into those recesses, in spite of the spiked walls and prison grates which protect the inhabitants. This I know with all the certainty which the self-accusation of the guilty can give. It is, besides, a notorious fact, that the nunneries in Estremadura and Portugal are frequently infected with vice of the grossest kind. But I will not dwell on this revolting part of the picture. The greater part of the nuns whom I have known, were beings of much higher description—females whose purity owed nothing to the strong gates and high walls of the cloister; but who still had a human heart, and felt, in many instances, and during a great portion

of their lives, the weight of the vows which had deprived them of their liberty. Some there are, I confess, among the nuns, who, like birds hatched in a cage, never seem to long for freedom; but the happiness boasted of in convents, is generally the effect of an honorable pride of purpose, supported by a sense of utter hopelessness. The gates of the holy prison have been forever closed upon the professed inhabitants; force and shame await them wherever they might fly; the short words of their profession have, like a potent charm, bound them to one spot of earth, and fixed their dwelling upon their grave. The great poet who boasted that "slaves cannot live in England," forgot that superstition may baffle the most sacred laws of freedom: slaves *do live* in England, and, I fear, multiply daily by the same arts which fill the convents abroad. In vain does the law of the land stretch a friendly hand to the repentant victim: the unhappy slave may be dying to break her fetters; yet death would be preferable to the shame and reproach that await her among relatives and friends. It will not avail her to keep the vow which dooms her to live single: she has renounced her will, and made herself a passive mass of clay in the hands of a superior. Perhaps she has promised to practise austerities which cannot be performed out of the convent—never to taste meat, if her life were to depend on the use of substantial food—to wear no linen—to go unhosed and unshod for life; all these and many other hardships make part of the various rules which Rome has confirmed with her sanction. Bitter harassing remorse seizes the wavering mind of the

recluse, and even a yielding thought towards liberty, assumes the character of sacrilege. Nothing short of rebellion against the church that has burnt the mark of slavery into her soul, can liberate an English nun. Whereto could she turn her eyes? Her own parents would disown her; her friends would shrink from her as if her breath wafted leprosy; she would be haunted by priests and their zealous emissaries; and, like her sister victims of superstition in India, be made to die of a broken heart, if she refused to return to the burning pile from which she had fled in frantic fear.

Suppose that the case I have described were of the rarest occurrence; suppose that but one nun in ten thousand wished vehemently for that liberty which she had forfeited, by a few words in one moment; what law of God (I will ask) has entitled the Roman church thus to expose even one human creature to dark despair in this life, and a darker prospect in the next? Has the Gospel recommended perpetual vows? Could any thing but a clear positive injunction of Christ or his apostles justify a practice beset with dangers of this magnitude? Is not the mere *possibility* of repenting such vows a reason why they should be strictly forbidden. And yet they are laid on almost infants of both sexes. Innocent girls of sixteen are lured by the image of heroic virtue, and a pretended call of their Saviour, to promise they know not what, and make engagements for a whole life of which they have seen but the dawn.

To what paltry shifts and quibbles will not Roman Catholic writers resort to disguise the cruelty of this practice! Nuns are described as

super-human beings, as angels on earth, without a thought or wish beyond the walls of their convents. The effects of habit, of religious fear, of decorum, which prevented many of the French nuns from casting off the veil, at a period when the revolutionary storm had struck awe into every breast; are construed into a proof of the unvariableness of purpose which follows the religious profession. Are nuns, indeed, so invariably happy? Why, then, are they insulted by their spiritual rulers by keeping the very guards and precautions, which magistrates employ to secure external good behaviour among the female inmates of prisons and penitentiaries? Would the nuns continue, during their lives, under the same privations, were they at liberty to resume the laical state? Why, then, are they bound fast with awful vows? Why are they not allowed to offer up, day by day, the free-will offering of their souls and bodies?

The reluctant nuns, say you, are few. Vain, unfeeling sophistry! First prove that vows are recommended on divine authority, that Christ has authorized the use of force to ratify them when they are made; and then you may stop your ears against a few sufferers. But can millions of submissive, or even willing recluses, atone for the despair of those few? You reckon, in indefinite numbers, those that in France did not avail themselves of the revolutionary laws. You should rather inquire how many, who, before the revolution, appeared perfectly contented in their cloistral slavery, overcame every religious fear, and flew into the arms of a husband as soon as they could do it with impunity. *Two hundred and ten nuns were se-*

cularized in Spain during the short-lived reign of the Cortes. Were these helpless beings happy in their former durance? What an appalling number of less fortunate victims might not be made out by averaging, in the same proportion, the millions of females who, since the establishment of convents, have surrendered their liberty into the hands of Rome!

Cruel and barbarous, indeed, must be the bigotry of the policy which, rather than yield one point of discipline, sees with indifference even the chance, not to say the existence, of such evils. To place the most sensitive, innocent, and ardent minds under the most horrible apprehensions of spiritual and temporal punishment, without the clearest necessity; is a refinement of cruelty which has few examples among civilized nations. Yet the scandal of defection is guarded against by fears that would crush stouter hearts, and distract less vivid imaginations, than those of timid and sensitive females. Even a short leave to quit the convent for the restoration of decaying health is seldom given, and never applied for but by such nuns as unhappiness drives into a disregard of public opinion. I saw my eldest sister, at the age of two and twenty, slowly sink into the grave within the walls of a convent; whereas, had she not been a slave to that church which has been a curse to me; air, amusement, and exercise might have saved her. I saw her on her death-bed. I obtained that melancholy sight at the risk of bursting my heart, when, in my capacity of priest, and at her own request, I heard her last confession. Ah! when shall I forget the mortal agony with which, not to disturb the dy-

ing moments of that truly angelic being, I suppressed my gushing tears in her presence; the choking sensation with which I forced the words of absolution through my convulsed lips; the faltering steps with which I left the convent alone, making the solitary street where it stood re-echo the sobs I could no longer contain!

I saw my dear sister no more; but another was left me, if not equal in talents to the eldest (for I have known few that could be considered her equals,) amiable and good in no inferior degree. To her I looked up as a companion for life. But she had a heart open to every noble impression—and such among Catholics, are apt to be misled from the path of practical usefulness, into the wilderness of visionary perfection. At the age of twenty she left an infirm mother to the care of servants and strangers, and shut herself up in a convent, where she was not allowed to see even the nearest relations. With a delicate frame, requiring every indulgence to support it in health, she embraced a rule which denied her the comforts of the lowest class of society. A coarse woollen frock fretted her skin; her feet had no covering but that of shoes open at the toes, that they might expose them to the cold of a brick floor; a couch of bare planks her bed, and an unfurnished cell her dwelling. Disease soon filled her conscience with fears; and I had often to witness her agonies at the confessional. I left her, when I quitted Spain, dying much too slowly for her only chance of relief. I wept bitterly for her loss two years after; yet I could not be so cruel as to wish her alive."

The vow by which they bind themselves, makes them the slaves of the clergy. They vow to be poor. They can, therefore, possess no kind of property, nor even receive a present of trifling value, unless by the permission of the superior. Yet, the life of a Nun is a life of constant labor, and, in many instances, of very great hardship. Their vow binds them not only to poverty, but to *obedience*—obedience the most servile. A Nun has no will of her own, but is in the hands of the superior, as clay in the hands of the potter. It is his prerogative to *command*—it is her duty to *obey*. It is common for labors to be imposed on Nuns, to which the female constitution is wholly inadequate. In Kentucky they have been seen in the harvest field, putting up fence, driving the ox-cart, and the like, with a priest acting as overseer. And when the priest returns home, it is their *privilege* to take his horse! One cannot but be astonished, that in this land of boasted liberty, public sentiment has allowed foreign priests to enslave the daughters of freemen, under cloak of religion. In all countries where the light of revelation has not shone, woman has ever been the slave, not the companion, of man. But the uniform effect of the Gospel has been, to elevate the female character to its proper place in society. Popery, which is a semi-pagan system, adopts a system of *religious* slavery, by which deluded females become for life the servants of the clergy. The austerities of the cloister are practised, and its hardships endured, as religious *penances*—a satisfaction to divine justice—and the deluded inmates are consoled by the consideration, that if present sufferings

are great, they will shorten their stay in the fires of Purgatory.

Thirdly.—Nunneries in our country are grand *speculating establishments*. The clergy erect splendid buildings, adapted to accommodate from one hundred to two hundred boarders; they place a parcel of Nuns in them—some of whom are to be employed as teachers, while others can do the coarser work. Some can figure in the school-room and in the parlor—others in the kitchen and corn-field. Thus prepared, they invite parents to commit to them the education of their daughters. Their establishments are filled with multitudes of boarders; and thousands of dollars annually flow into them. Suppose we take Nazareth, near Bardstown, as an example. This institution is located on a large farm. Perhaps there are generally in the establishment from thirty to fifty Nuns, to perform the necessary labors. The institution has had about one hundred boarders. Suppose their board and tuition to average one hundred and fifty dollars per annum—and this is certainly a moderate estimate—their annual income will be fifteen thousand dollars. What becomes of all this money? Do the Nuns receive a just reward for their labors? No—their vow binds them to *poverty*. It goes into the coffers of the clergy. Other literary institutions in our country do nothing more than support themselves; but these Nunnery academies enrich their owners. We hold it to be the duty of every philanthropist to throw the whole weight of his influence against establishments which by superstitious delusions deprive females of their liberty, and

then by their hard labor enrich a parcel of pretended clergymen. Such institutions are in the strongest sense of the terms *anti-republican* and *anti-christian*. Their whole discipline is despotic. The Nunneries of Kentucky have been one of the chief sources of the immense wealth now possessed by the Roman clergy in this state.

For these reasons we object to Nunneries as female academies. We are not reduced to the necessity of patronising institutions based on principles so absurd, and in their operation so cruel, in order to educate our daughters. Our country is capable of rearing up and sustaining literary institutions against which no such objections lie—institutions congenial in their principles with the spirit of the American Constitution. If our daughters are to be the worthy descendants of the mothers of the Revolution, they must not be educated in establishments of which despotic authority and servile obedience are the characteristics. The only obedience the Scriptures prescribe for females, is, as daughters, obedience to parents—as wives, obedience to their husbands, “in the Lord.”

Fourthly.—We dislike Nunneries as places of education, because it is impossible that Nuns can be qualified to give such an education as female youth should have. It is a great mistake, to suppose that the proper training of youth consists simply in teaching them a few abstract branches of science. One of the main objects to be secured in a good education, is to discipline the mind to think and investigate for itself: then having acquired in school the elementary principles of knowledge, it may afterwards build the superstructure upon this foundation, and

during life continue to extend the limits of information. A proper training gives to the mind a taste for literature and science, by which it is prompted to further investigations, while its invigorated powers, like the body accustomed to athletic exercises, enable it to surmount obstacles by which others are wholly discouraged. The lack of such training in our public institutions, is the grand reason why the great majority of our youth, male and female, instead of adding to the limited stock of knowledge acquired in the academy or college, soon lose much of that little stock. Now we ask any reflecting man, whether Nuns are likely to adopt such a course of instruction as shall develope and strengthen the powers of the mind, and lead it out into the wide field of truth? Of all Papists they are the most superstitious; and upon none is the despotic discipline of the church of Rome so strictly enforced. They are forbidden to attempt the investigation of moral and religious truth. In reference to all that class of truths, which more than all others awaken the interest, elevate the affections, and enlarge the views of the virtuous mind, the Nun must place implicit confidence in the *dictum* of her priest. Her mind is occupied with her prayer-book, her legendary tales, counting beads, &c. Would you go to such persons—females thus trained from childhood—to have your daughters taught to *think*? The doctrine of church infallibility and the claim of the Roman clergy to withhold the Scriptures from the people and to dictate to them their faith and morals, are the main causes of that almost universal ignorance which has ever characterised Ro-

man countries. The most powerful motives to seek knowledge are taken from the people. And if these causes operate upon all classes of the people, they operate with a ten-fold power upon the secluded inmate of the cloister. As the unfledged bird opens wide its mouth to receive the food which its dam may chance to give it—so does the deluded Nun receive on trust her faith. Such persons are not qualified to teach those who are destined to be the wives and the mothers of freemen.

This is not the only difficulty. Female youth should receive an education by which they will be fitted for the important stations they are soon to occupy in society. They are not designed to become the inmates of the convent, but to go forth in society, and to perform well their parts as daughters, wives and mothers. The duties arising out of these relations, are both arduous and important. Upon the suitable performance of them depends, to a great extent, the happiness of families, and the prosperity and usefulness of the succeeding generation. And to whom do we commit our daughters to be qualified for these momentous duties? We place them under the care of females, who from the days of childhood have been secluded from the world; who must to a great extent be ignorant of its manners and habits; and whose duty it is to eradicate from their bosoms all those feelings and sentiments which in our daughters should be cherished? We commit their education to those who profess to believe, and whose conduct is based upon the principle, that the holiest and happiest life is to be found in the seclusion of the convent, and that it is the duty

of all to aspire to this state! These individuals are to teach our daughters, what? To perform their part in society with which they themselves are wholly unacquainted, to regard as sacred those filial ties which they have forever sundered, to perform the more delicate and important duties arising from conjugal and maternal relations, which they regard as so inferior to a single life! Would the man act more inconsistently, who should place his son with a painter in Italy to study the canon law? or who, to prepare him for an elevated stand at the bar, should trust his training to a country pedagogue? If our daughters are to be fitted to perform their part in society, let them be instructed by those who are acquainted with its manners and habits. If they are to be taught to be a solace to their parents, commit their education to those who have never forsaken their father's house for the guardianship of a priest.

We are aware that we shall be pointed to many females who have been educated in convents, and who have been ornaments to society. Admit it true; but this fact does not prove that their education has been conducted on the best plan, or that they have received no injury from their instructresses. That they are the ornaments of society, is owing far more to their training in their father's house, than in the Nunnery. This objection has the greater force in relation to females who are to be placed in a boarding-school, at a distance from home.

Fifthly.—But one of the greatest objections to Nunneries, as literary institutions, is, that they are designed to be, and are in fact, *prosely-*

ting establishments. The church of Rome, unlike the most of Protestant denominations, claims to be the only true church; and concerning her faith she says, "This only true catholic faith, *out of which none can be saved.*" It Romanists really believe, as they profess, that salvation is to be obtained only in their church, is it wonderful that they compass land and sea to make one proselyte? And is it to be supposed, that the Pope and his clergy will expend thousands of dollars annually in establishing female institutions, without any view to the promotion of their religious faith? Is it not notorious, that they display no such zeal in establishing female academies in South America, Mexico, or Spain, as in our country? And who does not know, that in point of education those countries are a century behind ours? If, therefore, they are actuated, as they would have us believe, simply by a desire to promote general education; why are not their exertions for the instruction of their brethren at least as great as for educating us heretics? The people of the United States appear to be the peculiar objects of their sympathy; and the Pope and the Emperor of Austria send their funds, and their nuns and priests, to raise us from our ignorance and degradation! The promotion of literature is not the main object to be attained by those institutions—that is altogether a secondary matter.

We are aware, that in every prospectus for a female school they are careful to publish to the world, that they do not interfere with the religious principles of their pupils. But whatever may be the truth or falsehood of such pledges, we know from their own publications

what is the main design of these institutions. What says Bishop Flaget, of Bardstown? "Still, had I treasures at my disposal, I would multiply colleges, and schools for girls and boys; I would consolidate all these establishments, by annexing to them lands or annual rents; I would build hospitals and public houses: in a word I would compel all my Kentuckians to admire and love a religion so beneficent and generous, *and perhaps I should finish by converting them.* The directors of the association for the faith ought not to scruple sending abundant alms to bishops, whose wants plead more eloquently than their letters." What says the publication of the association? "Mgr. Flaget has established in his diocese many convents of nuns devoted to the education of young females. These establishments do wonderful good." Now, stop here, reader, and inquire in what way these establishments do wonderful good. By promoting general education, one would suppose. No—this is not even mentioned. But they do wonderful good *in this way*: "Catholics and Protestants are admitted indiscriminately. The latter, after having finished their education, return to the bosom of their families, full of esteem and veneration for their instructresses. They are ever ready to refute the calumnies, which the jealousy of heretics loves to spread against the religious communities; *and often, when they have no longer the opposition of their relations to fear, they embrace the catholic religion.*" This is the way in which these institutions do good. Bishop Flaget expresses himself as greatly consoled by the fact, that "more than two hundred young women, who have taken their vows in these

institutions, (viz. the Lovers of Mary, the Sisters of Charity, and the Dominican Nuns,) are principally devoted to the education of persons of their own sex."

That the main design of Roman schools is to promote Popery, is manifest also from the following letter from the Bishop of St. Louis to the Leopold Society: "On coming to this land we felt sensibly the want of proper schools, *for furthering the propagation of our holy religion.* At present, a college is connected with the Seminary at St. Mary, at Barrens, &c. It may be objected, perhaps, that the establishment of these institutions is not connected with the progress of religion. But when we consider that thus not only is religion prevented from suffering important injury; but also furnished with numerous and important advantages, we shall be convinced, that we are indeed laboring, for the growth of the faith, when we call into life such institutions. I will only say, that our universities, colleges, nunneries, hospitals, and orphan houses, *give Protestants the most favorable and exalted opinion of our religion,*" &c. Can we be mistaken when we assert, in view of these statements from Roman bishops, that the main design of Roman schools is, to promote Popery? They are not established by societies for the promotion of *education*, but by the society for the propagation of the *Faith*, and by the Leopold Foundation, a governmental society in Austria, headed by the Emperor, for the same purpose. Unless, therefore, we are willing to contribute to the extension of the impious and destructive errors of Popery; we cannot patronize such institutions. So far as we do so,

we contribute to the establishment of a system of religion, whose fundamental principles are at war with our free institutions, and destructive to the best interests of society.

All who know any thing of human nature, will admire the wisdom of the plan by which Protestantism is to be undermined, and Popery established in our country. The Roman clergy depend not so much upon the defence of their system before an intelligent public, as upon preoccupying the minds of the youth of our country with their errors. The youthful mind is unsuspecting; it readily believes persons what they profess to be, and forms strong attachments to those who act as friends. Its religious sentiments are not firmly established; but its susceptibilities lay it open to enduring impressions. There is therefore, no class of persons who wield a more extensive influence upon the morals and upon the prospects of a nation, than those to whom is entrusted the education of youth.

Even if we admit, that the Nuns, according to promise, avoid any attempt *directly* to influence the religious faith of their pupils; it is still true that the influences under which they are necessarily placed in Nunneries, are such as in very many instances to secure their conversion to Popery; and it is well known, that an indirect influence, where any prejudice exists, is generally more likely to be successful, than direct advances. Let us look at some of the sources of influence.

In the first place, one of the first efforts of the Nuns is, to gain the confidence and the affections of Protestant pupils. To succeed in

this, is ordinarily not difficult. Children, removed to a distance from their parents, easily become attached to those who show them kindness. Unacquainted with the arts of a deceitful world, they believe that kind actions proceed from as kind a heart. Indeed it is desirable, both for the comfort and the improvement of the child, that the Nuns should succeed in gaining the affections; for we know that children must be very unhappy, when at a distance from their parents and friends, if they feel an aversion to those in whose charge they are placed; and we also know, that in order to be successful in instructing, the teacher must have the confidence and affections of the pupil. But when he has succeeded in this object, he has prepared the mind of the pupil to give a favorable reception to his religious sentiments. Even though no persuasion be employed to influence our minds, we almost imperceptibly to ourselves regard with favor the religious opinions of those whom we respect and love. If this principle operates on those of mature age; it is far more efficient upon the minds of youth. Their religious principles are not established, nor are their judgments mature; and both their opinions and conduct are governed more by the ardor of youthful feelings, than by the dictates of cool reason. Such particularly is the influence exerted upon the minds of children by their teachers, who, next to their parents, occupy the highest place in their affections. They naturally suppose their instructors to be better informed than they; and, therefore, with little examination adopt their principles. How extremely careful, then, should parents be in se-

lecting those who are to be the instructors of their children; especially when we reflect, that impressions made in early youth are generally the most lasting. They will to a great extent mould the character and fix the destiny of the soul.

Secondly: All that children see and hear in Nunneries, is calculated to lead them to the belief of Popery. Our ideas are originally obtained through the medium of the senses. We are naturally affected by what we see and hear. What, then, will our daughters see in Nunneries? They see decorated altars, splendid paintings, imposing rites and ceremonies. It has long since become proverbial, that *example* is more powerful to influence, than *precept*. When, therefore, young persons, little acquainted with the sublime simplicity of true religion, look upon those imposing appearances, and witness the apparent devotion of the votaries of the system; is it wonderful if they be captivated? And if the scribes and pharisees in ancient times could, by the show of religion, deceive the people; why should not the appearance of extraordinary devotion in the inmates of a cloister, have a similar effect on the minds of children?

But what do children in the Convent hear? They hear, that the church of Rome is the only true church, out of which there is no salvation; that the Reformers of the 16th century were among the vilest men that ever lived. They are taught that in the sacrament the bread and wine are changed into Jesus Christ, "body, blood, soul and divinity;" and they see their teachers bow down and worship the wafer and the wine, as the Lord Jesus Christ.

These things they hear and see; for they must, according to the rules of all such institutions, attend their religious exercises, morning and evening, and on the sabbath. Yes, and they too must bow the knee before the host—the bread and wine. They hear of miracles wrought as evidence of the truth of Popery; they see and hear their teachers praying to all saints and angels. Do parents expect their children to see and hear such things for months and years, and not be affected by them? Nothing is more absurd. Let them place their children for the same length of time in the company of the profane; and they will be convinced of the power of example. And are children in less danger of imbibing error, than of becoming profane? Not at all. Is it not passing strange, then, that parents will place their children under such influences, just at that critical period of life, when they are receiving impressions and forming principles never to be eradicated? We would appeal to those pious parents who have promised God to train up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and ask them, if such exposure of their children be consistent with their vows? Do they believe that their children will receive in Nunneries any good moral or religious impressions? Or is not their only hope in reference to them, that they will escape injury? And is not this hoping against hope? They pray, and they teach their children to pray, “Lead us not into temptation;” and yet they do deliberately place them in temptations which they are wholly unprepared to resist. They pray, and teach their children to pray, “De-

liver us from evil;" and yet they compel their children to bow down and worship saints, and to adore bread and wine!

These remarks are made on the supposition that in Nunneries no attempt is made *directly* to influence the religious sentiments of pupils. And they who are acquainted with the internal arrangements of Nunneries, will rather wonder that so few young females are proselyted, than that so many embrace the religious faith of their teachers; and a much larger proportion do imbibe strong prejudices in favor of Popery, than most persons imagine. But we have already proved, that such institutions are designed to be proselyting establishments; and, as might be expected, every thing is done that can be safely done, to accomplish the object. There are many ways in which errors may be cautiously instilled into the minds of youth. We have known instances in which Bibles have been taken from Protestant children, and instances in which they have been received into the Roman church without the knowledge of their parents. In a succeeding part of this work, my readers will find two examples of such conduct, not in female schools, but where it perhaps less frequently occurs, in colleges. That such high-handed measures do not very frequently occur, is owing, I apprehend, more to policy than to a regard for the wishes of parents and guardians.

We admit most cheerfully, that Romanists have the right to establish female academies in our country, and in them to make as many proselytes as possible; but they have not the right

to deceive the public by pledges given that they will exert no sectarian influence. It is notorious, that by such promises, so solemnly and repeatedly made, many parents are induced to patronize their schools, who, if they knew the truth, would never so expose their children. Honesty requires them to stand before the public under their true colors—laboring by their literary institutions most effectually to promote the cause of Popery. In Europe it is proclaimed that their female institutions “do wonderful good” by converting Protestants; while in this country it is pretended that no such influence is exerted.

It is a fact worthy of remark, that the Roman clergy in our country have turned their attention specially to *female* education. They have now between fifty and sixty female schools, located principally in the Valley of the Mississippi. In this they are certainly wise, because female education has been very much neglected by Protestants, particularly in the Great Valley. They have directed their efforts principally to the establishment of colleges for males. If I am not greatly mistaken, an undue preference has been given to male education. Females, it is true, are not called to act in public life, or to take part in political matters; but in every age and country they have exerted a tremendous influence for good or for evil. The fall of man was occasioned by female influence. The flood was brought upon the world, in part, by the same cause. “The sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose.” These intermarriages con-

tributed rapidly to multiply those corruptions by which the wrath of God was kindled against the world. When all the arts and enchantments of Balaam against Israel failed, the people were led into idolatry by "the daughters of Moab;" "and those that died of the plague were twenty and four thousand." Num. 25. The Philistines prevailed not against Sampson, till they bribed Delilah.

But where female influence is of the proper kind, it is one of the main safeguards of public morals, and a main-spring in the efficient operations of the church. In no country can the standard of morality be raised higher than female character places it. Tell me the character of females in any country for intelligence and virtue; and I will tell you the character of that country. In our country female influence is now one of the most powerful restraints upon vice.

But if females exert an extensive influence as daughters and as wives; they exert a more important influence as *mothers*. It is in infancy and childhood that the mind receives those impressions, and imbibes those principles, by which its future character and destiny are to be most seriously affected, if not finally determined. To assist in developing the powers, regulating the passions, and directing the inquiries of the infant mind, is a delicate and responsible task, for which few are qualified. This task is necessarily committed, to a great extent, to the mother. And if we could pry into the secret causes that operate in the formation of character, we should discover that very frequently, if not in the majority of instances, those men who

have blessed or cursed their country or the church of Christ, have imbibed on the mother's lap the principles which in mature life have governed them. It is certainly true, that many of the most eminent ministers of Christ have owed their piety and their usefulness, under God, to the early instructions, prayers, and example of pious mothers.

If these remarks be well founded, is it not true, that whilst we have labored with a laudable zeal in erecting and endowing colleges and seminaries for our sons, we have culpably neglected the training of our daughters? Female education has been left almost exclusively to *individual effort*. The consequences have been, 1st, that our female schools have been *fluctuating*. Teachers are generally without capital; and in the majority of instances an attempt to establish a school upon private responsibility proves a failure, either in consequence of the fickleness of the teacher, or for lack of the necessary support, until the institution acquires a character. Whatever may be the cause, it is certainly true, that there are in our country very few permanent female institutions. 2d. Another consequence of this state of things, is, that our schools are generally of an inferior character. Teachers commencing on their own responsibility have not the means to procure such assistance as will make an institution what it should be—consequently it never acquires a character. Indeed, the inducements have not been, and are not now such as to engage the necessary amount of talent and learning in female instruction. Consequently few qualify themselves for this purpose; and those who are

qualified find more inviting offers and wider scope for usefulness elsewhere. 3d. A third evil consequence is, that the minds of youth are seriously injured. It is seldom the case, that any one school continues long enough for any one pupil to complete an education. More frequently there is a change of teachers at least once a year. Then new class-books must be commenced, and the mind is to become accustomed to new modes of instruction. It requires no argument to prove the evil resulting from these circumstances. 4th. Where education is left very much to circumstance, it frequently becomes necessary to commit the instruction of children to teachers whose moral characters are far from being good. This is a most serious evil, when we consider the moral influence which every successful teacher must exert upon his pupils. 5th. Finally, the price of tuition is of necessity high. Such must be the fact, where an individual is compelled to bear the whole expenses of an institution. One important object in erecting and endowing public institutions, is so to reduce the price of tuition as to bring it within reach of the poor; for amongst the poor are many of the finest minds—minds which, under proper cultivation, would prove an ornament and a blessing to society. Why, then, are there so few public female institutions? Why do we take the young man from the humble cottage to prepare him, by proper training, for usefulness, and leave there the sister, possessing a mind not inferior to his, and destined to occupy a place in society no less responsible?

A foreign priesthood have observed our neglect, and are with untiring zeal filling our land with Nunneries, designed as female academies. It is a fact worthy of attention, that they erect three or four female institutions to one college. In the United States they have *fourteen* colleges and about *sixty* female schools. Their buildings are generally both splendid and spacious, calculated to attract, and adapted to accommodate large numbers of boarders. If many are opposed to their religious principles, they still admire the splendor and permanency of their institutions. In pursuing their present course, the Roman clergy are wise; for they succeed in making more proselytes in Nunneries than in colleges; and if the mother of a family be a Papist, it is not difficult to predict the religious faith of her children.

The Roman clergy are equally wise in the *location* of their institutions. All of their most celebrated establishments are in the South and West. Of fourteen colleges, *twelve* are in the South and West. Of twenty-three Nunneries, every one is in the South and West, viz.: in the Diocese of Baltimore 3, Bardstown 5, Charleston 2, St. Louis 6, Mobile 1, Detroit 2, Vincennes 1, New Orleans 3. Of 37 female academies, 34 are in the South and West. I mention these facts to show Protestants the importance of turning their attention much more to female education. If our daughters are to be educated in Nunneries, Popery must prevail in our country.

Sixthly. The last objection I urge against Nunneries, is *their immorality*. All who have ever lived amongst Roman Catholics, know how

little regard they pay to the Sabbath. In all Roman countries the Sabbath, after mass, is a day of amusement and dissipation; and so it is with Papists in this country, so far as public sentiment will allow it. Who does not know that in New Orleans, for example, Sunday is the day for the mustering of the militia, and Sunday evening the time for the opening of theatres? That the whole community approve of these things, is certainly not true; but that Romanists do approve of them, is certain. The fact is, the priests are among the foremost in our country to encourage this desecration of the Sabbath. And in some Nunneries, Nazareth for example, the common amusement for the pupils on the Sabbath, is playing at cards. Now I doubt if even those who are most indifferent to the claims of religion, would be willing to place their children under such influence.

But this is not the worst. Nuns are unmarried women, many of whom, while young and inexperienced, have under the influence of romantic feelings bound themselves to the cloister for life. The priests who live under the same roof, or upon the same premises, are unmarried men—men who indulge themselves quite as much as even irreligious men, and who, while young, were induced to take the vow that binds them for life to a state of celibacy. That young females should leave the protection of their parents and thus place themselves under the guardianship of young priests, who live with them, is a public scandal, and would be so considered in any other persons. Let any Protestant minister build such an establishment and place unmarried females in it, and invite the

public to commit to him the education of their daughters—and what will be the result? His character and theirs will be blasted by the very fact; and he will be suspended from the ministry.

But there is another peculiarity about these establishments. The young women are bound, as we have already proved, to confess to the priest, from time to time, all their sins, even the most secret, with every aggravating circumstance. And they are exhorted, if they desire perfection, to attend to the duty of *secret* confession very frequently. Now it is vain for any one to attempt to convince the thinking portion of society that such a state of things can possibly exist without causing most deplorable evils. I am aware that it will be said, that licentiousness may exist *out* of Nunneries. Admit it. If, then, such is human nature, that notwithstanding all the guards that society can throw around the virtue of individuals, many will still err; does it follow that we should wholly remove those guards, and bring persons into the strongest possible temptations? It requires no argument to prove that young persons placed in such circumstances as I have mentioned, will in all probability yield to the temptation.

These temptations, in themselves too powerful for depraved human nature, are much strengthened by the facilities for the concealment of crime, which are peculiar to Nunneries. The seclusion of the inmates of the cloister from the observation of the world, renders it almost impossible to detect even *prevailing* vice. If any thing of the kind occurs, every individual connected with the establishment is

interested, for the credit of the institution and of their religion, to conceal it. And who does not know, that where there are some twenty or fifty Nuns, it is perfectly easy to conceal any one or more of them for months, without exciting a suspicion? Besides, those acquainted with Nunneries know that very frequently, if not generally, a young woman on taking the veil assumes a *new name*—the name of some saint—by which she is afterwards known. Thus in a short time she may become unknown to all around her. Then it is common for Nuns to be removed from one Nunnery to another, for reasons known only to the clergy. It is, therefore, perfectly easy by timely removals to prevent any discovery of existing licentiousness. The fact is, **SECRECY** is the uniform characteristic of Nunneries. Hence the avidity with which the multitude of every class listen to the disclosures of an eloped Nun, or of a converted priest. Why were so many copies of “Six Months in a Convent” and of Maria Monk’s “Disclosures” immediately sold? It is because of the suspicious darkness in which the doings of Nunneries are involved. The community desire to know, and they have a right to know, their character; and if slanders are published and believed concerning them, the fault is theirs. “He that doeth the truth, cometh to the light.” The only source from which we can learn the present character of Nunneries, is the report of those who desert them; and the public will rely upon the best evidence they can gain.

It is fair, however, to judge of the character of Nunneries by their past history. I have already noticed the fact, that in every age

licentiousness has been the crying sin of the Roman clergy; and I have shown by the testimony of Rev. Joseph Reeve, a Roman historian, that in the beginning of the eleventh century the church was *deluged* with that crime—that Popes, bishops, priests and people, were alike involved in it. What must have been the character of Nunneries during that period? Were nuns purer than Popes and bishops whom they almost worshipped? True, we call the periods preceding and succeeding that alluded to, the *dark ages*; but Romanists do not so consider them. At the close of the eleventh century, the Duke of Tuscany ordered an inquiry into the state of the religious establishments in his dominions, which was conducted by Ricci, bishop of Pistoia. The result was, that gross immorality and licentiousness were found to prevail in them. It is worthy of remark, that this inquiry was not instituted by the Pope in whose immediate vicinity the evil existed, or by the clergy—the proper guardians of the purity of the church, but by the *civil authority*. There is an obvious reason why such an inquiry into the moral character of Nunneries will never be instituted by the clergy: they are the very men who are the authors of the corruptions that exist. The inquiries instituted by Henry VIII. of England disclosed similar corruptions, and within a few years those establishments have been suppressed by Catholic Spain and Portugal. If those countries, already so depraved in morals, cannot endure them; shall they be patronized in our free and enlightened country? Shall we make them the nurseries in

which our daughters shall receive their training?

I am willing to concede to the Roman clergy what an enlightened public sentiment allows to other men. But when they choose to live in such a way as in others would be deemed scandalous, and yet claim our entire confidence; it is time to protest. When their own historians tell us of the licentiousness of their predecessors, and yet claim perfect purity for the present generation, similarly situated; we cannot have faith in them. When we know the shameless corruption of the European and S. American clergy, and are yet required to believe that a voyage across the ocean or the Isthmus purifies them; we object.

I now dismiss this subject, on which much might be said, in order to present to my readers an account of the law-suit instituted against me by President Elder; the history of which will throw additional light on this subject.

THE LAW-SUIT.

The public are extensively informed of the fact, that in the autumn of 1836, Rev. Geo. A. M. Elder, President of St. Joseph's College, instituted a civil suit against me for a pretended libel on the character of Rev. David Duparque,

a Roman priest. The suit has now been tried, and the verdict of an impartial jury has proclaimed to the world their conviction of the truth of all that I have published. Here I might, perhaps, safely let the subject rest; but as the suit is in its character and bearings singular—being the first of the kind that has occurred in our country—and as the evidence adduced in the case is calculated to exhibit the true character of Nunneries, now multiplying among us; I have regarded it as proper to publish a brief, but complete account of its origin, progress and termination. It is the more important to do so, because the Roman clergy design making a publication on the subject, the character of which their past conduct may enable us to anticipate.

Duparque had been for a number of years Superintendent of the Nunnery of Calvary, near Lebanon, and recently of the Nunnery established in Lebanon. In the winter of 1835—'36 he had a very serious difficulty with some of the inmates of the latter Nunnery, the precise nature of which I have not been able to learn. The consequence, however, was, that the mother, and perhaps some others, became disgusted with conventual life, and returned to the world. Soon after this occurrence, and, as many believe, *in consequence* of it, it was thought expedient that Duparque, who is a European, should return to his native land. He left the United States suddenly, and has not since returned. Whether he ever will return, is not for me to say. Perhaps, however, since the unsuccessful termination of the suit, he may deem it proper to remain where he is.

In April, 1836, there appeared in the *Protestant Vindicator*, a paper published in New York, an article headed "NUNNERY AT BARDSTOWN," in which gross immoralities were charged upon the Nunnery of Nazareth; and the editor called on me for information on the subject. The article was read in Court. I had never before heard of the facts here stated; and I very much doubted their truth. My impression at the time was, that the writer had possibly got an incorrect account of the case of Milly McPherson. I therefore made the following reply, in the *Western Protestant* of May 7th:

"NUNNERY AT BARDSTOWN."

In reply to the queries of the *Vindicator* in reference to an occurrence said to have taken place in this vicinity, we can only say now that we have never before heard of it. Possibly the writer of the information may have reference to a circumstance which occurred some three or more years since, not far from this. The general facts are, we believe, these: A young lady who had been in the nunnery, how long we know not, left it; and alledged as a reason for doing so, the improper conduct of a priest towards her. She went to a magistrate, an acquaintance of ours and a man of reputation, and having stated the facts, wished to make oath to them, which, however, he discouraged, thinking it unnecessary. She remained in the neighborhood a short time and suddenly disappeared. Inquiries have been made, but nothing has since been heard of her. These facts, together with others which we do not recollect with sufficient distinctness to state, we had some

time since from the magistrate himself. The thing is well known, and we have often heard it spoken of in that neighborhood. It looks mysterious; and persons whom we have heard speak of it, have strong suspicions, knowing the feelings of some towards her. Particulars could easily be obtained.

Nuns have frequently become dissatisfied and left the Nunneries in this region. The particular causes of dissatisfaction we do not know. The affairs of Nunneries are kept very much in the dark, and we hear of things frequently that sound very much like the severest tyranny. We have no confidence in such places. We think with a Roman Catholic physician, who remarked to a friend, who asked his opinion of Nunneries, that he supposed, if the clergy were allowed to marry, they would be broken up. We consider it but just, however, that we should never state any thing as a fact, which cannot be clearly proved.

Here it will be observed, I mentioned no names, but simply stated the prominent facts, as I recollected them. I did not at that time know the name of the priest implicated, or of the nunnery from which the woman had withdrawn. The occurrence I regarded as one which demanded more attention than it had received. That a woman who was a Roman Catholic, should so strangely disappear, after leaving a Nunnery and charging her priest with immorality, was rather mysterious. It looked something like the proceedings of the "holy Inquisition."

A few days after the publication of this article, I received the following letter from President Elder:

St. Joseph's College, May 9, 1836.

REV. N. L. RICE,—

Sir—There are two articles in your last paper, which have induced me to address you this letter: the articles are “Nunneries at Bardstown,” and “Roman Schools.” The circumstances, in both these articles, are too injurious to be passed over in silence. I believe both the stories to be substantially false. It is the first that I have heard of either of them. But, true or false, the public having now been told so much, will have a right to ask more of the particulars. These, you state, may “easily be obtained.” May I, then, as one of the many deeply concerned, ask you, to obtain and make known the following particulars: 1st. Who that young lady is; 2d, the Magistrate’s name; 3d, Who the priest is that behaved so badly; 4th, What that “improper conduct” was; 5th, What is the neighborhood from which that lady “suddenly disappeared;” 6th, Whom you have often heard speaking of it in that neighborhood; 7th, Who is the “Roman Catholic physician” that made that pretty speech.

I do not believe that you can prove the facts alleged in either of those articles; but the public have certainly a right to expect, that you will expose the guilty. I, for one, want to know the parties.

With due respect, yours,

GEO. A. M. ELDER.

Aware of the unfriendly feelings of Mr. Elder towards me, I suspected, on reading this letter, that he designed attempting to injure me by a civil suit. I regarded him as having forfeited, by his past ungentlemanly conduct, any claim to such a reply as he called for. I therefore replied as follows:

Bardstown, May 17, 1836.

REV. GEO. A. M. ELDER,—

Sir—Absence from home has prevented an earlier reply to your letter of the 9th, which I had the unexpected honor to receive through the hands of Mr. Nourse. I say, *unexpected*, for from almost the commencement of the controversy in this place, in which you have taken part, you have affected to treat me and whatever I might say, with contempt. And in the anonymous book with which you have honored me, and which, if not written by yourself, has at least received your sanction, you have published to the world your determination not to notice me; and however contradictory the statements it contains, still your dignified contempt is repeatedly expressed. And, sir, it seems to have been understood for some time past, that you and your Reverend coadjutors have determined to maintain your lofty dignity. May I inquire, how it has happened that one recently so contemptible, has now risen to such importance as to attract the notice of the President of St. Joseph's, and to receive from him a letter in reference to the contents of his paper? Shall we conclude, that having failed to sustain yourself in fair discussion, and having injured your character and your cause by your unmanly an-

onymous book, you assumed a *dignified* silence to wait till you could see something of which you could take hold? Or has public sentiment compelled this involuntary attention on your part!

You are pleased to object to two pieces which appeared in the last No. of the Protestant; and you express your belief that they are "substantially false," and call for particulars in reference to one of them. Had your conduct toward me, sir, been such as one gentleman has a right to expect from another, I should have been altogether disposed to reply to your queries, so far as they are proper. But when a man so far forgets the rules of propriety and of common courtesy, as to publish his determination to treat another with contempt, and continues thus to act as long as public sentiment will allow him, he certainly forfeits all claim to the attention of such individual. You cannot expect to assume a *dignified* silence and an air of contempt when your cause is in difficulty, and to claim attention when you please. Your position is indeed sufficiently mortifying; but, sir, I am compelled to say, that I cannot recognize in you any right to call on me for proof of any statement I may make, in which you are not *personally* implicated. Still, sir, I am responsible for all I have said; and no one, allow me to say, has a better right than yourself to know, that I am not in the habit of making statements at random. But until evidence shall be asked for by those who have a better right than yourself, I must be allowed to pursue my own course.

With due respect,

N. L. RICE.

To this, Mr. Elder wrote the following reply:

St. Joseph's College, May 18, 1836.

REV. N. L. RICE,—

Sir—I thank you for taking the trouble to write me so long a letter. You mistake me: it was not my intention to ask in my own name; but only to signify that the Catholics generally are anxious to know all about those matters embraced in your last paper, under the two captions “Nunnery at Bardstown,” and “Roman Schools.” This is all. Let the public know this; and care nothing for the “anonymous book” or my former neglect. These have nothing to do with the present matter.

When I shall have heard who they are to whom you alluded, I will then explain why I notice you *now*, though, as you say, I formerly neglected you.

With due respect,

GEO. A. M. ELDER.

This correspondence immediately became known to the public; and the interest awakened on the subject demanded of me farther particulars. Disposed fully to satisfy all proper enquiries, I lost no time in going to the neighborhood in which the father of the Nun lived, about eighteen miles distant, and obtaining names and particulars, which I published in the next number of the paper, as follows:

A REMARKABLE OCCURRENCE.

To satisfy the public more fully in reference to the unpleasant circumstance mentioned in our last No., under the caption of “Nunnery at

Bardstown," we consider it proper to make some farther remarks. The statement, it will be recollected, was made in reply to a query of the Protestant Vindicator under that caption. We have not been disposed to publish things of this kind; and therefore, though we have known the fact more than two years, we have never mentioned it publicly more than once, and that in a public lecture in our own church. But it is no secret: it has been matter of common remark in at least two counties, for three or four years past. That Mr. Elder has never heard of it, is truly remarkable. It should have been investigated long since, for the sake of the young woman, if her story be true; and for the credit of the Romanists, if it be not.

In reference to the matter, we have stated three facts on respectable authority: 1. That a young woman left the nunnery at which she had been staying. 2. That she alleged, as her reason for so doing, the improper conduct of a priest toward her. 3. That she disappeared from the neighborhood, and has not since been heard of. The unfortunate young lady's name is, we learn, Milly M'Pherson. Her father lives about five miles from Lebanon. She went to a nunnery in Washington county, designing, as she stated, to continue there. Having remained a short time, she returned to her father's house; but in consequence of the great dissatisfaction of her family with her, (they are Romanists,) she left home and went to the house of a near neighbor, Mr. Whitehead, an aged Baptist minister. She appeared greatly distressed, wept bitterly, and entreated Mr. Whitehead not to let her be taken from his house by force, saying that her

life had been threatened. At her request, Mr. Whitehead went and persuaded Mr. Lloyd Ray, a magistrate, to go to his house, informing him that Milly McPherson was there, had left the nunnery, and wished to state on oath her reasons for so doing. Mr. Ray at first refused, but at last consented to go. She told Mr. Ray and Mr. Whitehead, that she left the nunnery in consequence of an attempt of the priest (Rev. Mr. Du Parque) to seduce her, when she went into his room on an errand. After remaining a short time at different houses in the neighborhood, she was missing, and since that time nothing has been heard of her. Her father, we are told, knows nothing of her, but supposes she is dead. He has recently made his will, in which he has left her nothing.

We make no charge against the priest. All we say is, that the unfortunate young woman left the nunnery, and that she alleged as her reason for so doing, the lewdness of the priest. We pretend not to decide whether her story is true or false. We believe it, because we cannot conceive why she should fabricate such a falsehood in order to bring herself into certain trouble. Others will of course believe it or not, as they please. One thing is certain—it corresponds with what we hear from every quarter, both in our own country and in others.

Again, we do not say that Roman priests, or any one else, has offered personal violence to her. We only say, that she professed to fear for her own safety, and under the strange circumstances she disappeared; and so far as we can learn, has not since been heard of. If she can be found, some of her friends will be very glad

to see her, and ask her where she has been the last four years. If she cannot be found, the public will form their own conjectures. She disappeared, we are informed, in the fall of 1831.

Mr. Elder and his friends can now take their own course. We are ready to prove more than we have said. We have testimony which, we have no doubt, will fully satisfy the public. We are fully ready to meet the matter in any way in which it can be brought up; and if it can be explained satisfactorily, we shall be glad to see it done.

The reader will observe, that in this article every fact is given so as to afford the fairest opportunity of exposure, if I had published any thing false. I was well aware that in a law-suit the Roman clergy would have many advantages over me; but I was also confident that what I had published, could be proved to the satisfaction of the public. In the ninth number of the Protestant I also published the following article:

NUNNERIES.

No account has yet been given of the unfortunate young woman mentioned in our two last papers. Possibly President Elder is preparing his documents; but why this delay? If the facts we have stated are false, the neighborhood is but a few miles distant, and little time is required to obtain all necessary information. We expect no satisfactory explanation of the mysterious circumstance, but we shall wait and see. The subject has been agitated for several years in the neighborhood of Lebanon, and inquiries

have been made for the young woman: and no information has been obtained concerning her. It is scarcely to be expected that now every thing should be cleared up. In the mean time, the gentlemen of the Advocate ought to know, if they do not, that the public feeling is not to be laughed down. The whole thing must be explained; or it will open the eyes of many. The day has not yet come, when those who may incur the displeasure of the clergy, may disappear without inquiry being made for them. If she can be found, and the charges she has made, can be met, we shall readily publish the fact.

We are perfectly aware that the course we are pursuing, exposes us to the hatred of those whose prejudices blind them; but though we would not willingly wound the feelings of any, we have more important duties to perform, than that of pleasing men. To those who think that our suspicions of the purity of nunneries, are unfounded and uncharitable, we can only say, that we are willing to concede to Roman priests and their establishments all that public sentiment allows to any other men. We do not suspect them because they choose a life of celibacy. Many others, male and female, of all denominations and of no denomination, do the same, and are respected as much as others.— But suppose any unmarried man, professor of religion or not, minister or layman, should settle in Bardstown and take several females, not related to him, to live in his house; what would be the immediate result? His character and theirs would be blasted forever; and such conduct would be justly considered a public scandal.— But are not the Roman clergy in the constant

habit of doing this very thing? And who but priests have access at all times to every part of those places?

Besides, what men, but Roman priests, ever thought of requiring females, married and unmarried, to detail to them *all* their sins from time to time? And who does not see that this must prove a powerful temptation to immorality? If we knew no facts to show the immoral tendencies of such institutions, it should ever be considered scandalous for any unmarried men to live in such concealed intimacy with unmarried women; and in any other men it would be so considered. We know not how to account for it that public sentiment has been so lenient in regard to a particular set of men, unless it be, that it is supposed of course that they must be allowed to be more loose in morals than others. They boast of their celibacy. Then let them live to themselves as other unmarried men; and none will suspect them. But so long as they pursue a course which in other men would be considered scandalous, so long shall we consider it the duty of every friend of morality to oppose them; and those who take time to investigate the subject will be very far from committing to such persons the training of their daughters.

But if nunneries were ever so free from the suspicions which now rest upon them, we would oppose them still. We live in a free country; and we utterly protest against the right of any set of men under the cloak of religion to enslave the sisters and daughters of free men. Is it not notorious that nuns are often compelled to perform labors to which the female constitution is

utterly inadequate? Are they not seen laboring in the harvest field or making fence, and the like? . And in whatever way they may be employed, do they receive and enjoy the fruits of their labors? What becomes of the thousands of dollars that annually flow into the nunneries of Nazareth and Loretto? They fill the purses of the clergy, and with this money, doubtless, they are enabled to purchase so many farms, houses and lots, &c. The nuns are, to all intents and purposes, the slaves of the clergy. Never while we live, will we cease to expose the tyranny that degrades the female sex from the important stand in society assigned them by the Gospel of Christ. If the nuns will go, as do other females, and instruct youth, they will be respected and patronized; but if a priest is to be overseer, keep them concealed from the public, and receive all the money, their schools ought to sink. We have sisters, and we love them; and we shall never live to see them in a nunnery, under the tyrannical domination of a priest. We oppose such establishments *on principle*. They are, in the strongest sense of the word, *anti-republican*; and they are, in a still stronger sense, if possible, *anti-christian*. CRUELTY lies at the very foundation of them; and the day of Judgment will reveal terrible things concerning those gloomy abodes of human wretchedness.

On these three articles, as containing actionable matter, the suit was founded. After publishing the second article, in which the names of the nun and priest were given, I very soon learned that my suspicions of the design of Mr. Elder were well founded. I learned that he

had consulted able lawyers, and had determined to bring suit. On the 2d of July he published a *handbill* in which he boastingly proclaimed his intention to have a legal investigation of the charges against Duparque. That he felt or feigned great confidence in the result of the suit, is manifest from the following declarations: "I have entire confidence that the verdict of a jury will place the accused, in that eminence which his virtues had secured him in public estimation." Again, "To conclude, fellow citizens, suspend your judgments till you have the legal evidences to aid you; then you will judge righteously, in relation to the Rev. Mr. Duparque. His friends very confidently await the issue of the trial." In a little pamphlet which he soon after this published, he speaks even more boastingly. He says, "We feel satisfied that what has been published is untrue. A public investigation, before a judicial tribunal, is what we desire. Then Mr. Rice will have a fair, full, and impartial trial before his country. An opportunity will be afforded him, to make good his accusations; and if he fails, the verdict of the jury, and the judgment of the court will proclaim him to the world, as a malicious libeller. It is not his *money* we are in pursuit of, but a public trial of the truth or falsehood, of what Mr. Rice has asserted. Let me assure Mr. Rice, that he is surely to be cited before the court of this place for his libel." Such "great swelling words," coming from the President of St. Joseph's College and from under the eyes of the Rt. Rev. Bishops, Chabrat and David, might have appeared rather alarming to a small man, had I not before learned the difference between

saying and doing. All who placed confidence in the bold declarations of Mr. Elder, expected of course to see Rice demolished. Considerable experience, however, had taught me, that priests and mitred heads, as well as others, find difficulty in fighting against *facts*.

Whether Mr. Elder & Co. really expected to bring suit, when they first threatened, is doubtful. The probability is, that they expected to frighten me into a retraction of what I had published. Possibly they felt confident that by their tremendous influence, and by the aid of legal quibbles, they would be able to ruin a troublesome adversary. Be that as it may, after considerable delay the suit was instituted, a few days before the September term of the Nelson County Circuit Court. Mr. Elder, the prominent man in this thing, brought the suit in the absence of Duparque, and without his knowledge. Of course it was not legally instituted. I had the right, therefore, to non-suit him without going to any expense; but as he had said, that he simply desired "*a public trial of the truth or falsehood of what Mr. Rice has asserted,*" I determined to afford him an opportunity of trying it. Accordingly, I employed counsel, and prepared to investigate the matter fully. So soon, however, as it came into court, I discovered what I had confidently anticipated—that his sole object was to *prevent* a discovery of the truth, and to obtain by legal quibbles a forced verdict in favor of Duparque and of Nunneries.

The interpretation put on my language by Mr. Elder's counsel, made me assume to prove, that Duparque had attempted to seduce Milly McPherson and afterwards murdered her. Ev-

ery reader of common sense knew that I had made no such charges; but the priests designed to take advantage of legal technicalities in order to compel me to prove what I had not said—thus giving a fair specimen of priestly morality. The amount of damages claimed for Duparque, was *ten thousand dollars!* Such a sum, if they could obtain it, would probably enable them to establish another Nunnery or two. At any rate, it would have been a pretty good speculation; and besides, it might have crippled the operations of a troublesome adversary. How far the clergy were influenced in fixing the damages by the exorbitant prices of all articles of trade, I know not; but really I thought they had greatly overvalued the priest's character; and so the jury thought.

The counsel of Mr. Elder labored to obtain from the Judge a decision which required me to prove *the fact* that Duparque did attempt to seduce Milly McP., and that he did afterwards murder her, or cause her to be murdered. Now even the most stupid reader could not but see, that I did not pretend to assert either of these facts. I shall notice this point again in the proper place. The Judge did decide, that I was bound to prove, not that the Nun had made the charge—the fact which I stated—but that he was in fact guilty of attempted seduction. To prove this *legally*, the Nun was the only competent witness; and she had disappeared. And strange to tell! his decision also required me to prove that she had been *abducted*. The reader will perceive, that I was required to prove not only what I had never said, but what in the nature of the case it was impossible to prove!

Determined to let the public see, that I was prepared to prove all that I had published, I publicly made to Mr. Elder the following proposition: *That if he would allow the whole testimony, on both sides, to come before the jury, and permit the jury to find a verdict according to their own convictions, unrestrained by the technicalities of the law and the instructions of the Court; I would not require him to show authority to institute suit, but would undertake to prove Duparque guilty, and would give him the first and last speeches before the jury. If I failed to satisfy the jury, I was ready to abide by their decision. I was ready to waive my legal rights, and to prove more than I had said.* Was this proposition fair? Was it not more than fair? Mr. Elder had said, he desired simply to know "*the truth or falsehood*" of what I had published. I proposed to convince twelve impartial jurors, acting under solemn oath, that all I had published, *and more*, was true. He declined this offer of a "full, fair, and impartial trial," and clung like a drowning man to the decision of Court, which excluded the whole testimony, and required me to prove what I had never affirmed. Indeed, if he had believed, that I would be required to prove only what I had published, the suit never would have been instituted. He knew perfectly well, that it was true.

When this proposition, the perfect fairness of which was obvious to all, was rejected, I required the priests to bring the suit *legally*; and they were allowed until the next term to show authority to prosecute. In order to obtain this continuance, Mr. Elder swore, that he had reason to believe that Duparque's agents at Lebanon had the right to bring suit for his character!

Yet, although those men were but a few miles distant, Mr. Elder had never enquired whether they had a power of attorney, but had sent a letter to Europe in order to obtain it from Duparque!!! What must we think of a man, professing to be a Christian minister, who could take such an oath to secure an object? Could any man of common sense believe, that an agent appointed simply to dispose of property and transact business of that kind, had the right to sue for the character of the man for whom he acted? As I expected, nothing more was heard of the power of attorney possessed by Duparque's agents; but at the next term a *private letter* from him was produced, as authorizing Mr. Elder to sue for his character. The suit was continued at the cost of Mr. Elder & Co.; as they preferred paying costs to allowing a fair trial!

THE TRIAL.

At the May term of the Nelson Co. Circuit Court, this suit, which had caused much excitement, was terminated. And unpleasant as it was to be engaged in such an affair, I thank God for the much good it has already done, and is likely to do. The evidence adduced has already opened the eyes of many to the true character of Nunneries, and to the impropriety of educating young females in them. Hitherto

those establishments have enjoyed a reputation they do not merit. It is now my privilege to present to the public evidence in reference to them, which must be admitted. It is only to be regretted, that we were confined by the law to this particular case, and were thus prevented from exhibiting much evidence of the corruptions of priests and Nunneries, which could have been readily procured.

The trial commenced on Monday, June 5th, and continued till the Monday following. From the commencement to the termination the Court House was crowded to overflowing with anxious spectators. I rejoice that so many heard the evidence and the pleadings in the case. Great advantage has resulted to the Protestant cause from this circumstance. There appeared to be but one opinion amongst the unprejudiced as to what the verdict should be.

The first day was occupied principally in obtaining a jury. Each individual, before he was allowed to sit on the jury, was required to state on oath whether he had formed an opinion, or felt any prejudice in favor of either party. There was neither a Presbyterian, nor a Roman Catholic on the jury. Though a few Roman gentlemen, who were on the pannel, seemed anxious to be jurors, the most of them candidly acknowledged their incompetency to decide impartially. The jury was composed of two Methodists, two Lutherans, and eight gentlemen who were not members of any church. It is proper to remark, *that each jurymen was received by Mr. Elder's counsel, before my counsel expressed any opinion concerning him.* I mention this fact particularly to show, that Mr. E. has no right

to find fault with the jury. About three days were occupied in the examination of witnesses, and about the same length of time in the addresses of the lawyers to the jury.

The jury retired early on Monday, the 13th, but did not agree upon a verdict until Tuesday morning. The large majority were in favor of finding for the Defendant; but some thought, that the instructions of the Court required them to give, at least, *nominal* damages. On Tuesday morning they came into Court to ascertain the precise meaning of the instructions; and learning that they could not find for the Defendant without disregarding them, they found for the Complainant damages to the amount of **ONE CENT!** *One cent* instead of *ten thousand dollars!!!* The disappointment and mortification of the priests at this verdict, after all their boasting and parade, may be conceived. For more than a year they had cherished the fond hope, that they should be able by this suit to ruin one whom they so cordially hated. During the week they had impatiently waited the result. If they had been unable to sustain their cause in the discussion into which they had entered with him, they now hoped to be avenged. How fully they displayed the true spirit of Popery. They well knew, that every word I had published, was literally true; but their craft was in danger. Their beloved Nunneries were shaking; and the public were beginning to discover that they were not suitable places for the education of young *females*. The end sanctified the means; and they had collected a large number of their own people and several of their slaves—the Nuns—to testify to suit them.

Ab! had our government only been *catholic*; so that they could have stopped the Western Protestant and delivered Rice over to the *secular arm*. But after all the efforts made, an impartial jury gave them ONE CENT!!!—*just one copper!*

They well knew, that greater disgrace cannot be inflicted upon a man, than to give him *one cent* for his character. Yet they, at first, endeavored to conceal their mortification, and published in the Catholic Advocate the following notice of the suit:

“THE LAW SUIT.

“Our readers are (at least many of them) apprised, that this affair, which has for the last twelve months excited so much attention, was terminated on Monday last, as sensible and impartial men saw from the beginning, in favor of the plaintiff, Rev. Mr. Duparque. We hope that those who have made themselves his enemies, and whom the law of the land has branded as slanderers, will be in future more charitable, more truthful, or at least more cautious. We understand that a correct account of the whole affair will be shortly offered to the public.”

The reader will observe, that in this notice they did not publish the verdict—*one cent*. Why did they omit this? If they had gained \$10,000, or even \$1000, would they not have been a little more communicative? Is it not perfectly obvious that they omitted the verdict, because they knew it would flatly contradict what they had said—that the suit was terminated in favor of Duparque—and that their object

was, to make a false impression? The man is as truly guilty of telling a falsehood, who tells but *part* of the truth, so as to convey a false idea, as he who tells no part of the truth. Here we have a fair specimen of priestly veracity. This article was so irreconcilably inconsistent with the following, in the 43d No. of the 1st vol. of the same paper, that one could scarcely imagine that both came from the same men.

“Unless persons, who print, as editors, can be made responsible, and unless, in an aggravated case, smart damages are given, the courts are but mere mockeries.

* * * * *

“No country possesses better laws than ours, yet no country puts them into execution as badly, when a franchise is violated, which only exists in mental contemplation, and cannot be valued at market prices—and we seem to look on the quiet, and orderly man, who throws over him the shield of legal protection, rather than kill, as a pitiful creature, unworthy our regard, and hoot him from the courts to which he appeals, with a verdict against him, or with one for *one cent*. Such verdicts are a disgrace and a shame to justice,—they deserve the indignation of the honest—and the finders of them, when not justified by the facts, the scorn of all society. They are blots, that too often occur in our courts upon the purity of public records, and are stains, too often, on that law, which permits a jury to violate instructions, and disregard strict justice.”

Here the reader will remark, they make the value of the verdict to consist in *the amount of damages given*. "Unless, in an aggravated case, *smart damages are given*, the courts are but *mere mockeries*." And observe what they say of verdicts *against* one who sues for his character, or for *one cent*. "Such verdicts are a disgrace and a shame to justice—they deserve the indignation of the honest—and the finders of them, when not justified by the facts, the scorn of all society." Yes—and when such a verdict is found, they here plainly say, that the man is "*hooted from the court*." This article was published with special reference to the suit; and the jury could understand what would be their reward, if they did not find a verdict to suit the priests. The gentlemen of the jury, however, regarded their oath more than the implied threat of the Rev. clergy. Yet, although Duparque, according to their views, was hooted from the Court with *one cent* for his character; they (surely not without a blush) proclaim to the public, that the suit was terminated *in his favor*! Nay, more—they even say, it terminated "*as sensible and impartial men foresaw from the beginning*!" In this I perfectly agree with them. But what shall we think of the consistency and the morality of such men?

The editor of the Cincinnati Daily Gazette volunteered to aid them in their perplexities. He has heretofore proved himself, if not an obedient son, at least a sincere friend, of the Pope. The gentlemen, thankful for even small favors in their extremity, copied from the Gazette the following remarks:

"The Cincinnati Daily Gazette contains the following judicious reflections, in answer to some impertinent and highly characteristic remarks of the Western Presbyterian Herald, with regard to the late suit for defamation.

"By what rule of propriety the suit is denominated a suit *"by the Roman Catholic Clergy of Bardstown,"* I do not understand. So to state it, is neither more nor less than a misrepresentation of very near relation to falsehood. And this misrepresentation is made for the discreditable purpose of involving all the Bardstown Catholic clergy, in the alledged standard value of character, set up by the Herald! And this assumed standard is also an imposition. In an action for defamation, a verdict for the plaintiff necessarily fastens upon the defendant the character of a *False, Scandalous and Malicious Defamer*. A nominal amount of damages is often given because of the impotency of the slander to inflict injury. The jury may estimate the plaintiff as invulnerable to the malice of the defendant, and this is as often as any other, the ground upon which nominal damages are given. But whatever the damages, a verdict for the plaintiff brands the defendant a calumniator.'"

These remarks of the editor of the Gazette the priests call "*judicious reflections*." Of course they are pleased with them. Now the first thing worthy of notice in these reflections, is the denial that the suit was instituted *by the Roman clergy of Bardstown*. They appear now to be ashamed of the boasted suit, and would fain have the public believe that they were not

concerned in it! And who instituted the suit? Not Duparque; for he is in Europe and knew nothing of it. President Elder was the prominent man in this business; but he was not alone. His brethren aided him. Let them bear the reproach. But the editor of the Gazette gives them a new idea concerning the damages. "A nominal amount of damages," he says, "is often given because of the impotency of the slander to inflict injury." Sure enough, say the priests; we verily thought that Duparque and the Nunneries were very badly hurt, to the amount of *ten thousand dollars*; but may be, we were mistaken, and they were only injured to the amount of *one cent*! This is a "judicious reflection." But how did the priests come to make such a mistake about Rice's power to injure them. They were pretty well acquainted with him. President Elder said in his pamphlet, "I have long closely observed Mr. Rice's course;" and he thought, after long and close observation, that he was a very mischievous character, and though he thought he told a great many falsehoods, he always contrived to make the people believe them! "And, what is the worst feature in him," says Elder, "his confident manner would almost persuade a man he cannot err; whilst he seems to make every adversary of his a liar." Yes, and the President was very much alarmed, lest Rice should ruin those important institutions, Nunneries; and therefore he in his handbill said, "And as the reputation of the female academies may suffer at a distance, if they bear the charges made, I would suggest to the trustees the necessity of calling for close legal investigation in their behalf."

And he took the deposition of a Southern gentleman, designed to prove that I had seriously injured the Nunnery institutions. He was even so much alarmed for Nazareth, which, he had said, "is the best known community or family in all Kentucky," that he took the deposition of *one* (only *one*) of the physicians who had practised in that institution, in order to sustain its character! But the "judicious reflections" of the editor of the Gazette have set the gentlemen right. If he had only sent them his reflections a little earlier, he might have saved them much expense and trouble! Such is the consistency of our Roman clergy; but a drowning man will catch at a straw.

The priests could not long conceal their disappointment and indignation. They soon published a Pamphlet of 64 pages, abounding with the most vulgar abuse of the editor of the Western Protestant, and making such insinuations against the gentlemen of the jury, that they in self-defence made the following publication:

"TO THE PUBLIC.

"Some short time since, there appeared a small pamphlet, under the name of William Sims, purporting to have been written by some person of that name. Whether it was written by Sims, or some other person or persons, we are unable to say; nor do we care who the writer is. We, the jurors who served on the late trial between Duparque and Rice, deem it our duty, in defence of ourselves, and also a duty we owe to the public, to correct so much of that publication as concerns us; as the writer of it has taken the liberty of making some remarks or

insinuations about the jury, which are untrue. He states, that, during the progress of the trial, no one of the jurors could step out of the court house, without being accosted by some of the worthies in Rice's employ, who were making efforts to draw them into private conversation. This we assert, so far as we are concerned, to be untrue—we saw nothing like this.

“He also states, that one of those worthies placed himself on the stairs, as the jury were going to their room, with what he calls some kind of a grin or smile, holding out his hand to the jury, as they passed. If there was any such person, we did not see him; nor did we notice that any such thing occurred.

“He again states, that one of the most intelligent of the jury has stated publicly, since the trial, that he was for damages or heavy damages. If there was any such juror on that jury, he kept his opinion to himself—he did not make it known to the other jurors, as he ought to have done. We do affirm, that *one cent* was the highest damages named by any one on that jury in our hearing; and we further state, that every one on that jury, who was for finding a verdict for the plaintiff, did state that he would glory in making each one pay his own costs, if it were in his power to do so. And we also state, that under all the circumstances, but for the instructions of the Court, we would have been compelled to find a verdict for the Defendant.

WILLIAM HEAVENHILL, CYRUS THOMPSON,
LEONARD TROUTMAN, HENRY STREIT,
DAVID MATTHIS, JOHN B. COX,
WM. C. KELLY, JOHN UNSEL,
THOS. L. THOMPSON.”

The Pamphlet which elicited this statement, charged some of my friends with attempting to tamper with the jury. This charge, so maliciously made, is here declared by the gentlemen of the jury to be utterly false. Their statement, it will be observed, takes away even the *one cent*, to which the priests and their friend of the Cincinnati Gazette attempted to cling; for at least *nine* of the twelve would have felt bound, but for the instructions of the Court, to have found a verdict for the Defendant. One of the jurymen, who lived at a distance, had not the opportunity to sign this statement; and another determined to treat their insinuations with contempt. And no one even *mentioned* higher damages than *one cent*. So far, therefore, as the jury are concerned, we have abundant evidence that they were perfectly satisfied, at least the very large majority of them, that I had substantiated all that I had published. But since the priests asserted, that the suit was terminated *in their favor*, and “as sensible and impartial men foresaw from the beginning;” it is for them to explain the cause of their malignity against them. President Elder even went so far as to obtain from a certain woman a certificate that an old gentleman, a reputable member of the Methodist church, who was on the jury, had attempted to seduce her! But the gentleman promptly brought the matter before his church, by which he was fully acquitted. Why did Mr. Elder obtain such a certificate?

I have made these remarks and presented these facts, that the public may see into what difficulties the priests felt themselves thrown,

and that they may see the means to which they were willing to resort, in order to sustain themselves and their Nunneries. I now return to the trial. It took place under circumstances the most favorable to the priests; so that if their cause had not been desperate, they must have succeeded. That such is the fact, will be obvious from the following remarks:

- 1. The *place* at which it was tried, was most favorable to them. BARDSTOWN has long been known as one of the strong-holds of Popery in the West. Here Roman Catholics are very numerous; and their influence is, of course, considerable. And all who know the almost unbounded authority possessed by the Roman clergy over the large majority, if not all, of their followers, will perceive that their influence must be very great in such a place. The merchant, the mechanic, the politician—all know that their interest would lead them at least to avoid offending the clergy. Besides, Bardstown is the episcopal residence; and in and around it are located several of the most celebrated Roman institutions. In the town is St. Joseph's College, the President of which was my prosecutor. Two and a half miles in the country is the Nazareth Nunnery, which is one of the most celebrated. Thirteen miles distant is the Loretto Nunnery. Four miles distant is their Theological Seminary. A considerable portion of the community had in past years patronized these institutions, and might therefore be expected to feel some attachment to them. Besides, they bring into circulation annually a considerable amount of money, and have been supposed, therefore, to be of much advantage

to the town. One of Mr. Elder's lawyers stated, that according to the best calculation he could make, the Nunneries in this vicinity bring into circulation not less than from *fifty to sixty thousand dollars!* This consideration was urged against me. If there is any place in the West, where they might expect to gain a decided victory over me, Bardstown is the place; for whilst their influence was so great, the number of Presbyterians was small, and their institutions in their infancy.

2. The *counsel* employed by the priests, were amongst the most distinguished members of the bar. Before instituting the suit, they had employed Hon. B. Hardin, Hon. John Rowan, and Benj. Chapeze, Esq., together with Messrs. Hite and Tucker; and those who were present during the progress of the suit, will bear them witness that they did ample justice to the cause of their clients. True, I do not pretend to say that their counsel were in any respect superior to mine. The counsel on my side were Hon. C. A. Wickliffe, Hon. J. J. Crittenden, Nath'l. Wickliffe and T. P. Lynthicum, Esqrs. Great ability was certainly displayed on both sides. Their failure, however, was not caused by any lack of legal aid.

3. The *position*, if I may so express it, which the suit occupied before the Court, was very favorable indeed to the priests. If I had been required to prove only what I had said; there would not have been the slightest difficulty. But, as already intimated, the Court required me to prove what I had never affirmed, and what in the nature of the case could not be proved. In the first place, I was required to

prove *the fact*, that Duparque had attempted to seduce the Nun. The following are my remarks on this subject; and I beg the reader carefully to examine them.

“We make no charge against the priest. All we say is, that the unfortunate young woman left the Nunnery, and that she alledged as her reason for so doing, the lowdness of the priest. We pretend not to decide whether her story is true or false. We believe it, because we cannot conceive why she should fabricate such a falsehood in order to bring herself into certain trouble. Others will of course believe it or not, as they please. One thing is certain—it corresponds with what we hear from every quarter, both in our country and in others.”

Such was my language. Did any one understand me to say, that *I saw* Duparque make the attempt; or that *any one else* but the Nun saw him; or that *I could produce her*—the only competent witness? No. Why, then, was I required to prove what I never asserted? True, I did say, that I believed the statements made by the Nun; but why did I believe them? The reason was assigned, viz: “*because I cannot conceive why she should fabricate such a falsehood in order to bring herself into certain trouble.*” Milly McPherson was by birth and education, as well as in feeling and heart, a Papist. Her parents and all her relations were Papists. She had been taught from infancy to venerate the priest as the vicegerent of Jesus Christ. She had often from the days of her childhood bowed at his knee, confessed all her sins, even the most

secret, and received absolution. She had become a Nun, and taken the vow of poverty, chastity and obedience. She had resided eight months in the Nunnery under Duparque's care, and had again returned to take up her abode there. Her parents and friends she knew were bigotted Papists, and would warmly resent any imputation cast upon a priest, and especially upon one whom they had long known. I could not believe that woman capable of trampling upon all the prejudices of early education, despising the faith she still held, and outraging the feelings of parents and friends—all without any possible cause—especially when she must have known, that by so doing she would inevitably bring herself into inextricable difficulties and troubles. They who know any thing of the veneration in which Romanists hold their clergy, will not readily believe that Milly McPherson would thus attack the character of Duparque without a cause. Here, then, are some of the reasons why I believed her charges against him. But in addition to these, her mysterious disappearance, and the credit given her statements by a number of her most intimate acquaintances, convinced me that all was not right. It is obvious, therefore, to the most careless reader, that I never did assume to prove the fact of Duparque's guilt, further than the *circumstances* proved it. The legal construction of my language was, therefore, unnatural, forced, and obviously incorrect. Whether the decision of the Judge was legal or illegal, is not for me to say. That it was *unjust*, is perfectly evident.

Again—The Court required me to prove, that Duparque had *abducted* Milly McPherson. The following are my remarks on that subject:

“Again, we do not say, that Roman priests, or any one else, have offered personal violence to her. We only say that she professed to fear for her own safety, and under the strange circumstances she disappeared; and, so far as we can learn, has not since been heard of. If she can be found, some of her friends will be very glad to see her, and ask her where she has been for the last four years. If she cannot be found, the public will form their own conjectures. She disappeared, we are informed, in the fall of 1831.”

In another number of the Protestant, I made the following remarks:

“The whole thing must be explained; or it will open the eyes of many. The day has not yet come, when those who may incur the displeasure of the clergy, may disappear without inquiry being made for them. If she can be found, and the charges she has made, can be met; we shall readily publish the fact.”

Now I ask the reader to examine these remarks, and say whether I assumed to prove that Duparque had abducted the Nun? I stated the facts—that she had left the Nunnery, made charges against him, and mysteriously disappeared; but I expressly declared, that I did not pretend to know what had become of her, but certainly thought it incumbent on the Roman

clergy to give some explanation of a circumstance so mysterious, connected with one of their Nunneries. If abduction or murder was implied, it was implied in the admitted facts, and was established by proving them. On this point also the legal construction of my language was forced and incorrect—requiring me to prove what I had not said.

To prove the first point, viz: the attempt to seduce, Milly McP. was the only competent witness. It was easy to prove, as I shall hereafter show, that she did make the charge against Duparque; but that was not sufficient—*she* must be in Court and testify. But where is she? She has long since disappeared; and her friends believed her dead. Mr. Elder, the man who prosecuted me, said, “When I shall stand in need of her, she shall appear, or her absence be satisfactorily accounted for.” From such language it was fair to infer, that he had my witness in safe keeping. Besides, one of the priests did say, that he could prove that *she had been safely conveyed out of Washington county*. Who conveyed her away; and to what place did they carry her? Indeed such was the legal construction of my language that *the very villany* of Duparque might have shielded him. Suppose it true, that he had murdered or abducted her; is it not obvious that by his cruelty I am deprived of my witness, and he is shielded from censure? Such was the position into which the priests’ counsel threw the trial, by way of showing how much they desired to come at the *simple truth*! That the reader may see the correctness of my statements, I give the

instructions which, on motion of the Plaintiff, were given the jury. They are as follows:

1. "The Plaintiff moves the Court to instruct the jury, that the libels which are recited in the Declarations, are actionable; and if from the evidence they believe that Defendant wrote them and procured them to be published; he is liable in this action for so doing, unless he can prove under the plea of justification, that the same are true.

2. "That what Milly McPherson said, and the reports about Milly McPherson and Plaintiff, are no evidence to prove the truth of the libels, and are only admitted as evidence to mitigate the damages, under the plea of not guilty; and how far the same ought to lessen or aggravate the amount of damages, is for them to determine under all the circumstances."

"The Defendant moves the Court to instruct the jury,

1st. That *malice* on the part of the Defendant towards the Plaintiff, is necessary to the maintenance of this action; and that unless the jury are satisfied that it existed in this case, they ought to find for the Defendant.

2d. That the presumption of malice, from the mere fact of the publication of the libel complained of, in the Plaintiff's Declaration, is liable to be rebutted by evidence showing that no malice really existed on the part of the Defendant toward the Plaintiff; and if the jury are satisfied from the evidence in this case, that no such malice existed, they ought to find for the Defendant.

3d. That if the jury shall find for the Plaintiff in this case, they ought not in their assessment

of damages to take into consideration, or allow any thing for any injury or wrong done, or supposed to be done, by the publication complained of, to the religion of the Catholics, to their Nunneries, or other establishments, either literary or religious; but to confine themselves to the grievance which the Plaintiff has individually suffered in the premises, and for that alone to allow damages.

4th. That the libels complained of in this case, and given in evidence, import no such charge or imputation against the Plaintiff of having either murdered or killed the said Milly McPherson, as entitles said Plaintiff to maintain this action and recover damages for *that cause*."

The Court gave the above, with the qualification *that the libel imports a charge of abduction*.

Here the reader will perceive, that when I had proved every fact I had stated, the jury were still bound, according to the instructions of the Court, to find a verdict for the Plaintiff, unless I could produce Milly McPherson, and by her prove what I had never affirmed—the fact of Duparque's attempt to seduce her. But if she was *abducted*, which fact I was required to prove, it was of course impossible to produce her. The only possible ground on which the jury could have found for the Defendant, would have been that the publications were made *without malice*. But such a verdict might have implied the falsehood of the charges made. A verdict for Duparque for *nominal* damages was preferable; because such a verdict implies, either that the character of the prosecutor is worth nothing, or that the charges are proved to the satisfaction of the jury, though the evi-

dence is not precisely in accordance with legal technicalities. Such was the verdict in the present instance, as we have already seen by the published statement of NINE of the jurymen.

I am not satisfied that a charge of abduction, even if I had made it falsely, should be considered actionable; for, if I mistake not, the Roman clergy claim the right to *compel* Nuns to to keep their vows by physical force. The *infallible* council of Trent directed, "that Nunneries should be carefully closed, and egress be absolutely forbidden to the Nuns, under any pretence whatever, without episcopal license, on pain of excommunication—magistrates being enjoined under the same penalty to aid the bishops, if necessary, *by employing force*, and the latter being urged to their duty by the fear of God, and the eternal curse." It was also decreed, concerning monks and nuns, that "if they laid aside the habit of their own accord, they should not be permitted to make the complaint, *but be compelled to return to the monastery, and be punished as apostates.*" In view of such decrees I am not at all satisfied that a priest would not consider it his duty to compel an eloped Nun, who was making unfavorable reports, to return to the Convent. Certainly if he breathed the spirit of these decrees, he would. However this may be, the decisions of the Court were certainly most favorable to Duparque.

The *object* of the suit, as declared by Mr. Elder, and repeated again and again by his counsel, threw much additional weight in Duparque's favor. Mr. Elder's main object in

instituting suit was, not to defend Duparque's character, but to sustain the sinking reputation of Nunneries. "Our object," said he in his Pamphlet, "is to vindicate a citizen *and our institutions*. The only actionable matter is the charge against Rev. Mr. Duparque; and that was made by Mr. Rice, *to injure our establishments, and bring them into disrepute*." It is evident, therefore, that Duparque's name was used merely or mainly as a pretence for bringing a suit for nunneries. Indeed it was declared by one of Mr. Elder's counsel, that Duparque was not a drop in the bucket in this affair, and in their speeches to the jury the great utility of Nunneries was eloquently urged, in order to aggravate the damages. How far the jury were influenced by these considerations I know not; but since Nunneries were identified with the suit by Mr. Elder & Co., we do them no injustice in supposing that they were valued, together with Duparque's character, at *one cent*—especially as he was the superintendent of two Nunneries. The suit was obviously a desperate effort by the Roman clergy, to regain what they had lost by the discussion into which they had entered, and to put down the Western Protestant—that dreaded, hated paper. Indeed so deeply were they interested in the suit, that they seemed willing to throw themselves, as well as their beloved Nunneries, into the scales; if by so doing, they could gain heavy damages against Rice. The Court and the jury were honored and aided during the trial, by the presence of Rt. Rev. Bishop Chabrat, Rev. Mr. Abel, Rev. Mr. Spalding, Rev. Mr. Wathen, Rev. Mr. Powell, Rev. Mr. Lancaster, Rev.

President Elder, and several other Reverends, whom I did not know. These gentlemen left their duties to come and see Rice put down; and with alternating hopes and fears, joy and trembling, they waited the issue. All would not do. Notwithstanding all these advantages, only ONE CENT could be obtained!!! “*Mons parturiit, et mus ignobilis nascitur.*”

The reader may be surprised to learn, that after all the parade about the suit, *not one fact which I had published was denied or explained.* That Milly McPherson left the Nunnery of Calvary, that she made the charge alleged against Duparque, that soon afterwards she suddenly disappeared and was supposed by her relations to be dead—were facts which Mr. Elder did not call in question. Indeed, though near eighteen months have elapsed since the facts were published, Milly M’P. has not yet been found; and, so far as I know, she is not likely to be found. We are, therefore, naturally led to enquire with increased interest—what did Mr. Elder mean by saying, “*When I shall stand in need of her, she shall appear, or her absence be satisfactorily accounted for?*” Does he not stand in need of her now? Would it not be well for his cause, if he would produce her. The public are not satisfied that he has fulfilled the following promise boastingly made in his pamphlet: “If they (Rice and his friends) really wish it, (an investigation) they shall be gratified next term, *when they shall be very certainly assured, that all mystery will be cleared away to their souls’ satisfaction.*” Has all mystery been cleared away to the satisfaction of any one? Does any one know what is become of Milly McPherson? Let the verdict of

an impartial jury proclaim to the world how satisfactorily he has investigated this matter.—*One-cent damages!*

When he so earnestly called on his fellow-citizens to suspend their judgment in reference to the case, until they should see the result of a judicial investigation, and so positively promised to remove all mystery; many, and particularly the members of his own church, confidently expected to see Miss McP. produced in court to the utter confusion of Rice, "the malicious libeller." Indeed, it was again and again reported, and by many believed, that she was actually in town. Many left their business and attended court for an entire week to see the mystery removed. It yet remains, and is likely to remain until the day of Judgment shall reveal it.

The efforts of Mr. Elder were directed principally to the following points:

1. To exclude every particle of testimony that could by the most rigid technicalities of the law be kept out. I had proposed to him at the September term to throw aside legal technicalities and to allow the whole testimony on both sides to be heard, and to permit the jury, unrestrained by the instructions of the court, to find a verdict according to their own convictions. This proposition, the fairness of which is obvious to every one, was positively rejected; and we were given to understand, that he had the advantage, and intended to make the most of it. Was he not afraid to trust twelve disinterested men with his cause? And why was he afraid? Mr. Elder's counsel moved the court to exclude all the testimony concerning what Milly McPherson said against Duparque, unless the per-

son to whom she made the statement, communicated it directly to me before I made the publication. This attempt failed. They then attempted to exclude some of the most important depositions I had taken, simply because the notice to take them was given only to *one* of the lawyers of Mr. Elder, and not to the *three* whose names appeared in the declaration. This failed. They then attempted to exclude some of them, because the notice to take them was given to one of Duparque's lawyers, and not to Mr. Elder, his agent—who, by the way, was not then known to be an authorized agent. This failed; and the testimony was admitted under the plea of not guilty.

They did, however, exclude one of our depositions. It was that of Mrs. Gibbs. She is a widow lady, and, at the time, had a son lying, as was supposed, at the point of death, whom of course she could not leave. We proposed to read her deposition; but Mr. Elder's counsel objected, and it was excluded. In view of these facts I ask, was Mr. Elder's desire to *ascertain* the truth, or to *conceal* it? His conduct throughout is a striking comment upon the truth of his declaration, that he simply desired "*a public trial of the truth or falsehood of what Mr. Rice has asserted.*"

2. The second point to which Mr. Elder directed his efforts, was to prove that Milly McPherson was *insane*. How far he succeeded, we shall see, when we examine the testimony on that point.

3. His third attempt was, to prove that she has been teaching school in Indiana, since she disappeared from her father's neighborhood. In

the proper place we shall examine the testimony in reference to that point.

In the mean time, the fact that with so many advantages Mr. Elder could obtain but *one cent*, may show how far his testimony was satisfactory to an impartial jury, and may give us a clue by which to estimate the standing of priests and Nunneries, where they are best known.

THE EVIDENCE.

The main reliance of Mr. Elder & Co., in instituting the suit, manifestly was the expectation that, while I should be required to prove more than I had said, they would be able to exclude the whole testimony. To this point, as already remarked, their learned counsel directed their efforts. Unfortunately, however, most of the testimony relating to this particular case, was admitted in mitigation of damages, though not as ground of justification. For their pains to *compel* the jury, by legal instructions, to find a verdict for them, they received *one copper*!

It is now my purpose to present to my readers the testimony introduced on both sides, as it relates to the different points. They will keep in mind that the following are the facts which I published, viz: That Milly McPherson left the Nunnery at Calvary in the fall of 1831, and returned to her father's—that she assigned as her

reason for so doing, the lewdness of Duparque, the priest—that she professed to fear for her safety—that she soon afterwards disappeared from the neighborhood, and had not since been heard of—and that her father supposed her to be dead, and had made his will and left her nothing. These facts, and many others little creditable to the prosecutors, were abundantly substantiated, as we shall presently see, by the testimony. Indeed it appears almost superfluous to adduce the evidence, since the priests did not deny any one of these facts.

The testimony was taken down at the time of the trial, and, after having been read before the judge, received his signature. The first testimony to which the reader's attention is invited, is that of Mrs. Nancy Ray, wife of Esquire Lloyd Ray. Mrs. Ray was a very intelligent lady, whose character for veracity is unimpeached. Her testimony was taken under the most solemn circumstances. She was lying on her dying bed, and in the immediate prospect of appearing before the bar of the final Judge. She departed this life a few days afterwards. Having been long acquainted with Miss M'Pherson and the family, she was well qualified to bear testimony on the points at issue. Her testimony is as follows:

“Question by Defendant's Attorney: Were you, or were you not, acquainted with Milly McPherson, previous to, and after, her return from the Nunnery at Cavalry, and said to be under the care and charge of the Plaintiff, Duparque?”

“Answer. Yes, I was well acquainted with her at the time alluded to. She lived within half a mile of my residence.

“ Question by same. Do you or not recollect about the time she left the Nunnery and returned to her father’s, and this neighborhood?

“ Answer. It was some time in the fall of 1831 that deponent saw her, and she believes, within a few days, or a short time after she left the Nunnery.

“ Question by same. Did you or not see and converse with her after she left the Nunnery—if so, did she or not state to you, that the cause or reason of her leaving the Nunnery at Calvary, was or not on account of an attempt by plaintiff, Duparque, who was the priest, to seduce her in his (Duparque’s) room?

“ Answer. Yes, she told me that was the cause of her leaving the Nunnery—the attempt to seduce her by plaintiff, Duparque.

“ Question by same. Did or not the said Milly appear to be uneasy, and express her fears that the priests or some person would take her on account of what she had stated about Duparque’s conduct, and punish her, or do something with her?

“ Answer. She (said Milly) stated to me, that her life had been threatened on that account, and that she did not believe they knew where she was.

“ Question by same. Did or not said Milly, shortly after this conversation with you, disappear from the neighborhood, and from her father’s; and has she ever returned; and has it not been since that time reported in the neighborhood, that she was dead?

“ Answer. She (said Milly McPherson) did, shortly after the conversation alluded to, disappear from the neighborhood, and has not, as

deponent believes, been since heard of. The deponent has, since she disappeared, heard a number of persons say, that they believed she was dead; and among them her father and mother stated, that they believed she was dead. The last account that this deponent heard of her, was at Mr. John Roberts', in this county, about nine miles from where deponent lives."

The following question and answer were objected to by Duparque's counsel and rejected by the court, as not applicable to the points at issue:

Question. Did she or not state to you, after her return, that she had a very bad opinion of Nunneries?

Answer. She stated to me, that when she went there, she thought they were the gate to heaven; but when she left there, she did believe they were the gate to hell—or words to that import."

Such is the testimony of Mrs. Ray to the principal facts I published. Does it not sustain them fully? I shall have occasion again to refer to her deposition.

The next testimony to which I turn the attention of my readers, is the deposition of Mrs. Fanny Whitehead. Mrs. Whitehead is an aged Baptist lady, perhaps seventy-five years of age, the wife of the late Rev. Joseph Whitehead, a Baptist minister. She is a very intelligent woman—a lady whose character is above reproach. She testifies as follows:

Question by Defendant's Attorney. Were you or were you not, acquainted with Milly McPherson—if so, state how long, and how far she resided from you?

Answer. I have known Milly M'Pherson near

thirty years—her father lives within half a mile of where I have lived for upwards of thirty years.

“Question by same. Did she or not reside at the Nunnery some time in the year 1831?—if so, how long do you believe she was there?

“Answer. I can't say how long she was at that Nunnery; but I believe it was near two months. Deponent recollects of her starting to go there, and saw her when she returned. She came to her house (her husband was then living) shortly after she left the Nunnery.

“Question by same. Did she or not state to you and others, that the reason she left was on account of an attempt by the priest Duparque to seduce her?

“Answer. She was so understood by me and others with whom she conversed upon that subject. She talked very plain about it, and said that was the reason she left there.

“Question by same. Did she or not appear to be uneasy and distressed, and express fears that she would fall into the hands of the priests and others, whose vengeance she dreaded?

“Answer. She appeared to be distressed, and I believe was. The deponent believes that she was more fearful of her own connections. She (Milly) had told me, that after she had returned to her father's from the Nunnery, that her father wanted her to state the cause of her leaving the Nunnery. She said she agreed to do so, if he would send for Lloyd Ray and my husband, Joseph Whitehead—that instead of sending for them, he sent for his son, William McPherson, his wife and his grandson, Benedict Mattingly; and when they came, they shut the door on her.

She then sprang to the door and came off to her (deponent's) house. Her father, John McPherson, afterwards admitted to this deponent that he had done so, and assigned as a reason that he done so, in order to prevent the negroes and children from hearing her confession.

“Question by same. Did or not Milly McPherson, shortly after this, to wit, some time in the fall of 1831, suddenly disappear from the neighborhood; and has it or not been generally believed in the neighborhood, that she was dead?

“Answer. She did suddenly disappear, and I believe it was, and is, generally believed in the neighborhood that she was dead.”

In answer to another question, Mrs. Whitehead said, “I have heard her father, John McPherson, at first say, she had gone to Union county, and afterwards say, that she must certainly be dead, or he would have heard from her.” My readers will perceive that this testimony establishes several facts not mentioned by Mrs. Ray, and that the two witnesses prove every important fact published by me. I shall have occasion to refer to other parts of this deposition hereafter.

The next testimony I place before my readers, is that of Mrs. Fogle. She stated “that she had known Milly McPherson *more than twenty years*—lived less than a mile from her, and was intimately acquainted with her. She did not recollect precisely when Milly McPherson went to Calvary—she was at her father's (Mr. Whitehead's) who was a Baptist preacher, when Milly came from the Nunnery at Calvary. Milly McPherson came to her father's one evening, and requested her father to go for Mr. Lloyd Ray—

that she wanted to make oath before him, as a Justice of the Peace, of the cause why she had left the Nunnery at Calvary. Her father went; and Mr. Ray returned with him. She heard Milly state then, while at her father's, that the reason she left the Nunnery was, that Duparque, the plaintiff, had attempted to seduce her. She had more than one conversation with said Milly McPherson, in all of which she made the same statement, during the time aforesaid she saw her at her father's. She appeared not to be alarmed when she first came; she staid all night, and next morning begged her father, Mr. Whitehead, not to let them take her away by force. She disappeared from the neighborhood between three and four weeks after she left witness's father's house. Witness has never heard of Milly since. She was missing from the neighborhood, and witness never heard of her afterwards, except a flying report that she was at Mr. Roberts's and Mr. Austin's." The testimony thus far completely establishes all that I have published.

I now invite the attention of my readers to the testimony of Mr. Lloyd Ray, a justice of the peace. Mr. Ray is an intelligent and highly respectable man, as several of Duparque's witnesses stated—a man whose character stands unimpeached. He stated "that he was somewhat acquainted with Milly McPherson—had known her about twenty-five years—lived about three quarters of a mile from her father's—frequently saw her. She was often at witness's house, and wove and did other work there. He recollects Mr. Whitehead came to his house in the fall of 1831—told him that Milly McPherson

son was at his (Whitehead's) house—had had some difficulties with the priest Duparque, and wished to state it on oath. Witness did not wish to have any thing to do with it, but at length, upon the solicitation of Mr. Whitehead, consented to go. He did not intend to swear her. When he went, he found her conversing with the family. She, Mr. Whitehead and myself, went into another room; and she stated that, after being at the Nunnery some time, she went into Duparque's room, to ask him when he would hear confession. He (plaintiff) had a book in his hand—asked her business, and asked some questions which, she said, she did not understand what he meant by. He presented a book which she described as black on one side and red on the other—asked her which she would choose. She told him she did not understand him. Then he waved his hand; and witness understood Milly to convey the idea to him, and did so convey it, that she (Milly) understood Duparque as wishing to have carnal communication with her. She did not say so; but seemed by modesty to be restrained from fully communicating with witness in plain terms. I think she said, Charbrat had sent for her, saying, if her statements were true, he would protect her. He was not at Mr. Whitehead's more than an hour—saw Milly at witness's house two or three times afterwards. I don't recollect exactly when she disappeared; I think within three or four weeks—never have seen her since, that I know of—I thought she ought to be hunted up; perhaps she might be dead. Her father told me, he believed she had gone to Union county. I believed it, and therefore said nothing about it for some

time. The last place that I heard of her, was at Austin's. I wrote her father's will in February, 1836; and after finishing the will, or nearly so, finding that he had omitted to name Milly in his will, and wishing to know his opinion of her, whether she was dead or alive, asked him if he did not intend to leave Milly something. He said no; he believed she was dead.

Here I have the testimony of *four* highly respectable and intelligent witnesses, confirming every statement I have made. If I had no other testimony, this would fully justify me in publishing the facts. Certainly the occurrence was most extraordinary and mysterious—one which demanded explanation. Mr. Elder did not attempt to disprove any part of this evidence, unless the testimony of a priest by the name of Wathen was designed for that purpose. He stated that "a lady came to me at St. Charles, after church, saying she was Milly McPherson. She brought a lady with her whom she introduced as Mrs. Whitehead. Mrs. Whitehead remained in the room—Milly and witness in the same room, some distance off. She (Milly) remarked to witness, that some rumors had spread abroad concerning what she should have said against Duparque—that she wished me to state to the people, and tell Duparque, that she had not made the statements. Witness thinks Mrs. Whitehead did not hear the conversation. I never saw Mrs. Whitehead before or since, that I recollect of. I never heard any thing from Mrs. Whitehead, except that Milly called her up and asked her if she had heard her say any thing against Duparque. She said, she had not."

In this testimony there are two things worthy of notice. 1st. He says, Milly denied having made charges against Duparque. . . Whether she ever denied it, I know not; but certainly the persecution she endured both from her relations, and from her church, presented strong temptations to induce her to do so. 2d. But he also says Mrs. Whitehead denied that she had heard Milly say any thing against Duparque. This I do not believe, for the following reasons: 1st. Mrs. Whitehead was wholly disinterested in the testimony she gave, and could have had no conceivable motive to deceive. Mr. Wathen, as a priest, was deeply interested in vindicating his brother priest and the nunneries; and, as he himself stated, he went to Indiana last fall to take depositions for Mr. Elder in this case. He was an *interested* witness. 2d. Mrs. Whitehead is a very aged lady, who, as all affirm, has maintained a character unblemished for more than *seventy* years. Shall we, then, reject her testimony and receive that of a young priest, under the circumstances? It will be long before his testimony, weighed in honest scales, shall overbalance hers. 3. Mr. Wathen's memory, like that of some others, seemed to be in a strange predicament. He did not remember whether he heard the charges Miss McPherson had made against Duparque before the conversation; and yet he distinctly recollected that he did not ask what they were. Is it likely, if he had not heard them, that he would have felt so little interest as not to have inquired? How is it that his memory is so correct in reference to a part of the facts so intimately connected, and so treacherous concerning the rest? 4. But Mr. Wath-

en manifestly contradicted himself. When examined by the plaintiff's counsel, he said, "Mrs. Whitehead did not hear the conversation;" but he afterwards said, when examined by defendant's counsel, that Milly called her up to testify that she had said nothing against Duparque. Of course, then, she must have heard a part of the conversation! Mrs. Whitehead says, she did go to St. Charles with Milly, and that Milly had conversation with a priest; and "she said something to him—*what I do not know*. He did not seem to answer her. We came away. This is all I know of any importance, that happened on that day." From the above testimony it is clearly proved, that every fact I stated, is literally true.

The next fact which it was important for me to establish, was, that these facts concerning Miss McPherson and Duparque had been matter of common report in the neighborhood from which she disappeared, since the fall of 1831. This fact was proved by Mrs. Nancy Ray. "The deponent has, since she disappeared, heard a number of persons say, that they believed she was dead; and among them her father and mother stated that they believed she was dead." It was proved by Mrs. Fanny Whitehead.

"*Question.* Was or not, the circumstance related by her of Duparque, and her sudden and mysterious disappearance, frequently and often spoken of in the neighborhood of her father's, and generally believed?"

"*Answer.* It was, and has been frequently spoken of and was generally believed in the neighborhood. I have heard her father, John

McPherson, at first say she had gone to Union county, and afterwards say, that she must certainly be dead, or he would have heard from her." The same fact was proved by Mrs. Fogle, who said "Her disappearance was commonly spoken of, and the cause of her leaving the Nunnery." Lloyd Ray said, "The subject of her disappearance excited considerable conversation in the neighborhood." Wm. Wayne testified that "he was acquainted with Milly M'Pherson twenty-eight or twenty-nine years—lived three-fourths of a mile from her—heard of her being at Calvary and leaving it. It was common talk in the neighborhood about the cause of her leaving the Nunnery, viz: the attempt of Duparque to seduce her. She remained three or four weeks in the county before she disappeared—never has been back. He has seen no one who has seen her. Her disappearance was the subject of frequent conversation in the neighborhood." Turner Wayne testified, "that he was acquainted with Milly McP. since he was a small boy—heard of her leaving the Nunnery and the cause of it, viz: the attempt of the plaintiff to seduce her—often spoken of. It was the subject of common conversation in the neighborhood from the time she left it—has not been seen since in the neighborhood. He has heard her father say, he believed she was dead; for he could hear nothing of her." Gordon Whitehead testified, "that he knew Milly McPherson since he was a boy—he heard of her being at Calvary, and saw her after her return. The cause of her leaving the Nunnery, alleged by her, viz: Duparque's attempt to seduce her, was the subject of conversation by a good many in

the neighborhood. She remained in the neighborhood perhaps three or four weeks, and then disappeared. He has never seen her since—has seen no one who has seen her. The impression in the neighborhood was, that she was dead—he had heard it spoken of by several.” Daniel Jennings, of Lebanon, testified, “that before the controversy between Rice and the Catholics, he heard the subject of Milly McPherson’s leaving the Nunnery, &c., spoken of. The cause assigned, was the attempt of priest Duparque to seduce her. Her disappearance was also spoken of—various conjectures about what had become of her.” Dr. W. W. Wood, of Lebanon, testified, “that he heard the report of the charges of Milly McPheison against Duparque, the plaintiff, in attempting to seduce her while at the Nunnery, from the fall of 1831 to the present day, in different families in the neighborhood. He is satisfied that he has heard it in twenty or more families—as also the report that she was dead. He heard of her being dead from her father.” Stephen Riggs stated, “I did see her (Milly) very shortly after she returned, (from the Nunnery.) She was at my house. I heard the report stated in the neighborhood, that she left the Nunnery on that account, (attempt of Duparque to seduce her.) She did suddenly disappear, and was supposed to be dead. I felt uneasy and concerned about her, and sent word to her father by one of his family, if he would unite with me, I would raise some men and make search for her; but the old man her father returned no answer, and I heard nothing more about Milly until within a few months past; and have within that time heard some of her rela-

tions (who are Catholics) say, she was alive. One report, that she was in Europe—other reports that she was in Missouri. He is of the belief and opinion that she is not living. It was generally so believed and reported in the neighborhood that she was dead for several years. Until very lately, no other opinion was stated about her, as deponent heard of." Mrs. Elizabeth Riggs stated, "I often heard it stated in the neighborhood, as a general report, that she (Milly) did suddenly and mysteriously disappear from her father's and the neighborhood; and it was currently reported and believed, that she was dead."

The same fact was established also by the testimony of Catharine Riggs, Nicholas Ray, Richard Burks, Bartholomew Smith, Mrs. Wathen, and others; but lest I may weary the patience of my readers, I will close the testimony on this point by referring to some few of Duparque's witnesses who proved it. Rev. John Wathen stated, that "he heard it (the report about Milly and Duparque) of different persons in the neighborhood of St. Charles." Ignatius Medley, a Roman Catholic, said, "There was a report in the neighborhood that Milly had made charges against Duparque." Dr. Smith, of Springfield, a Roman Catholic, stated, "that he had heard the report coming from Milly McPherson, relative to Duparque's attempting to seduce her."

From this abundant testimony, coming from persons of different denominations, and from those of no denomination, from the nearest neighbors and most intimate acquaintances of Milly McPherson, as well as from Roman Catholics, we learn, that the facts which I published,

and which have so much excited Mr. Elder & Co. had been matter of common neighborhood talk, and were commonly believed several years before I published them. Duparque well knew that these reports were in circulation, and were injuring his character and the institutions of his church. Why, then, did he take no steps to remove the scandal—connected, as it was, with the mysterious disappearance of the Nun? “He that doeth the truth, cometh to the light.” It is fair to conclude, that if he could have given any satisfactory explanation of those very suspicious circumstances, he would have done so. But after he has allowed his character to wither for years under the influence of such reports, he comes and claims ten thousand dollars damages, because I have published what was before notorious! And how happened it, that Bishop Chabrat allowed this thing to pass without investigation? He then had charge of a Nunnery in that vicinity; and Miss McPherson had taken the veil in his Nunnery, Loretto. Here is something mysterious.

EVIDENCE OF THE SANITY OF THE NUN.

Thus far we had no difficulty. It was not denied that Miss McPherson went to Calvary to remain—that she left it—that she made charges

against Duparque—that she soon after disappeared from the neighborhood—that she was supposed to be dead, and her father had made his will without leaving her any thing.

But, says President Elder, she was insane. This was the ground we had expected him to take; for we knew that all nuns who forsake the cloister and make disclosures, become deranged, of course. We had heard of the insanity of Miss Harrison, of the Ursuline Convent, and of the insanity of Maria Monk; and we very soon learned, that the clergy had gone to her father's neighborhood to get proof of the derangement of Miss McPherson. Just at that time we received the following letter, purporting to be from John McPherson:

“MAY 30th, 1836.

“*Rev. Sir:*—You have, I understand, made yourself quite busy with the affairs of a poor unfortunate daughter of mine. You have said, that she left my house on account of the great dissatisfaction of my family with her. It is not the fact, as far as I ever knew or heard of. She was evidently deranged while she was at home, and had been so at times for several years. She never once at my house ever hinted that she believed her life to be in danger.

“You may wish to do me a kindness, for aught I know, but I cannot thank you even for your intention—because I have never asked any favors at your hands. God knows and sees all things—and this matter can at least be settled justly in the next world,* if not in this, where you will get nothing more or less than

your due for the share and interest you take in the matter. Yours, &c.

JOHN MCPHERSON.

"P. S.—You will put this letter in your next paper, if you please, and oblige yours, &c."

This letter was received soon after the return of some gentlemen who went in search of certificates to prove Miss McP. insane. The hand writing of the letter differed very much from the signature; so that it manifestly was not written by the old gentleman or by any of his family. It came by private communication, and was heard of in Bardstown two or three days before it was received by us. The bearer did not think proper to show himself, but threw it in the letter-box at the Post-office. We had no doubt that they had gone to the old man, naturally of weak mind, and now in his dotage, and had induced him to believe, or at least to say, that his daughter was deranged, for the purpose of exculpating Duparque, and they were kind enough to write the letter and get his signature to it. This letter sufficiently indicated the course Mr. Elder & Co. intended to pursue. When we come to examine the testimony as to the sanity of the Nun, we shall find sufficient evidence in McPherson's family, that she had reason to fear rough treatment in her father's house.

But says Mr. Elder, she was insane, and therefore could not be believed. If she was insane, it will be well for Mr. Elder to explain a few things concerning her. 1st. It appears remarkable that whenever nuns become insane, they tell of the wickedness of priests. Pru-

dence, it would seem, induces them, while sane, to conceal the secrets of the establishments; but when they lose their balance, they tell what they know. We do not find that the members of other families or societies tell such tales, when they lose their reason. Superstition, if we mistake not, generally gains a greater ascendancy in the mind bereft of reason. We should scarcely suppose that a Nun, even though insane, would make an attack upon the priest whom from infancy she has venerated as the vicegerent of Christ—the man who has so frequently forgiven all her sins.

2d. If she was insane, the conduct of the Nunnery towards her was cruel in the extreme. Mr. Elder says in his handbill, "Please to know that Milly McPherson, being without a home, was taken into Calvary as an object of charity, to stay as long as it might be advisable. The Nuns soon found she was not such as they could consistently keep, and dismissed her after seven days." She was without home, and was taken as an object of charity. Did she cease to be an object of charity, because afflicted by the loss of her senses? Was she then prepared to be thrown homeless upon the cold charities of the world? She was a Nun who had spent twelve months in the Nunnery at Loretto, and seven or eight at Calvary, as Mr. Elder's witnesses proved. We should like to inquire, whether it is common for those charitable establishments to drive from their roofs the unhappy nuns who are visited with the most distressing of human afflictions—the loss of reason? And who would wonder, if in those gloomy abodes such afflictions should be very frequent?

Mr. Elder says, this sister Catholic and sister Nun had no home; yet Miss Phillips, a nun from Calvary, testified, that Milly was unwilling to leave, but was *sent* away to her father's, which Mr. Elder says, was no home for her, with a black boy! Is this charity?

But we are curious to know what new discoveries the sisters at Calvary made concerning Milly, the last time she was there. She had been at Loretto twelve months, and had there taken the Nun's habit. Miss Phillips had known her in both institutions. No objections had been made to her. She left Loretto in consequence of feeble health, as the witnesses of Duparque proved. But now it takes them only *seven days* to discover that she is not one whom they can consistently keep! We expected the Nuns from Calvary to prove that she was perfectly insane; but they did not pretend to have discovered any derangement, while she was there. We tried to ascertain the cause of her being sent away. The testimony of Miss Phillips on this point was a little singular. She and the mother and Duparque were together, when Milly came. The mother wondered what old lady that was. Duparque said, it is Milly McPherson. She is coming into the Nunnery as an orphan—but she must not be a teacher.—The mother expressed an unwillingness to take her. Duparque told her she *must* take her, and keep her at work as other Nuns. She of course submitted and took her. But why was the mother so averse to receiving her? Why, says Miss Phillips, she was an old girl, not very healthy, and the mother did not wish to be pestered! Just now the mother did not know her;

but in the same conversation she seems pretty well acquainted. And she did not want an *old girl*. Why it would seem, that in Nunneries they are willing to have only the young, and perhaps the beautiful. But Milly was not *very healthy*—perhaps she could not bear as much hard labor as they wished to impose on her. Elder says, she was taken “as an object of charity;” but they seem to have concluded that an *old girl, not very healthy*, is not a fit object of their charity—“not such as they could consistently keep.” So they sent her away—too old and sickly to be an object of charity! But Mr. Crittenden inquired, “Is it common to send off a Nun, because she may not be a very agreeable or thrifty member?” No, said Miss Phillips, “unless they wish it for the improvement of their health.” But Milly did not wish to go, you say. The difficulty still remains; and we could not possibly ascertain why Milly was so unceremoniously dismissed, after having been received. Why could not they consistently keep her? There is a mystery about this, which it would be well for Mr. Elder to explain.

3d. If Miss M’P. was insane, the conduct of her father and family was most inhuman. A poor insane daughter is allowed to go wandering through the country, staying a week here and two weeks there, as she can get opportunity; and when she finally disappears, no search whatever is made for her! Mr. Ray and Mr. Riggs, two of his neighbors, both proposed to her father to make search for her; but no—no search is made, and her friends quietly and carelessly draw the conclusion that *she* is dead! Why, if the family dog had been missing, more inquiry

would have been made after him. It has been well remarked, that the affections of a parent are peculiarly tender toward the unfortunate child that has been deprived of its reason. If the family believed her insane, why was she not attended to, and why allowed thus to wander off, no one knew whither? Who ever before heard of an occurrence like this? It is a peculiarity of Christianity that it "turns the heart of the fathers to the children;" but Popery freezes the warm affections of a father's heart toward the daughter who dares offend a priest. She becomes an exile from "sweet home." Was Milly McPherson insane? Did her family believe it? Then are they cruel indeed! These considerations, aside from the direct testimony in the case, had weight with us in confirming the belief that the insanity of Miss McPherson is an affair contrived since her disappearance to shield the guilty.

From the remarks already made, my readers will more than doubt the alledged insanity of Milly McPherson. It was essential to President Elder's success, that he should clearly prove her deranged; for I proved, and he did not deny, that she had always sustained a good moral character. If she was a woman of sound mind, of good character, and a Romanist too, her testimony against Duparque must be believed. In reference to her good character I had the following testimony.

Mrs. Nancy Ray said, "her character was as good in every respect as any girl in the neighborhood. She was considered to be an industrious and truthful girl. She had worked for

Deponent in her house; and such was her general character in the neighborhood. The Deponent was acquainted with her for about twenty years previous to her disappearance from the neighborhood." Stephen Riggs said, "I was acquainted with her (Milly) for several years—have seen her frequently at my house. I lived adjoining her father's for several years. Her character was good in the neighborhood. I never heard any thing stated against her." Mrs. Elizabeth Riggs, being questioned concerning Milly's character, said, "she was a girl of good character. I never heard any thingsaid against her or her character, or mind, until after she left the Nunnery at Calvary." Mrs. Riggs had been acquainted with her, she states, "about 18 years." Catharine Riggs said, "I was raised within half a mile of her. I am about 23 years of age, and have known Milly ever since I can recollect. Her general character for truth and virtue is good. I never heard any thing said against her, until after she left the Nunnery at Calvary in 1831, where Plaintiff resided; nor did I hear any thing stated to the contrary, until after she left the neighborhood. I did then hear some of the Catholics speak ill of her." Concerning her character Mrs. Fanny Whitehead, who had known her "near thirty years," said, "I always thought it was very good. I never heard any thing against her until lately." Mrs. Fogle said, "Her character was that of a good, truthful, industrious girl." George Whitehead, who had known her "29 or 30 years," said, "Milly McPherson sustained a good character for truth and honesty." Such is the testimony of those (only two of whom were Presbyterians) who were

the near neighbors and intimate acquaintances of that unfortunate woman. Others of her neighbors would, if called on, have borne similar testimony; but her good character was not questioned by Duparque's counsel. It appears however, that after her disappearance, some of the Catholics did speak ill of her. None did so in Court. Having admitted the good character of the Nun, the only way in which Mr. Elder could possibly shield Duparque, was by proving her insanity. I have already remarked several facts which discredit such an idea. I will now examine the direct testimony on this point, and, if I mistake not, the candid reader will be forced to the conclusion, that her insanity was a thing gotten up, after her disappearance.

The first inquiry that suggests itself on this subject is, When did Milly McPherson become insane? Was she born an idiot; or did she lose her reason after arriving at mature age? Her father, John McPherson, says, "Milly had good sense before she was engaged to Rash Osburn." Her Brother, Wm. McPherson, says, "Milly had common sense, before this marriage affair." These witnesses stated, that Milly McPherson went to live with her sister in Union county, that while there, she made a matrimonial engagement with one Horatio Osburn, that learning that he was dissipated, she refused to marry him; and in consequence of this disappointment she became deranged. I believe, it is not very common for young ladies to lose their senses for such causes,—especially where they themselves break the engagement. However, I am perfectly willing to leave my readers to decide, whether it is

likely that her distress arising from this disappointment, caused her to become deranged.

It may be worth while to inquire, when did this very serious affair happen? Her father says, her sister has lived in Union—"may be 10 years;" but the old man made dreadful havoc of dates. He could scarcely tell when any fact occurred, to which he testified; and his repeated self-contradiction showed how little reliance could be placed on his testimony. William McPherson thinks his sister has lived in Union about 18 years. One would have supposed, that the date of so serious an affliction as the derangement of a member of the family, would have been very distinctly remembered. However, we can come pretty near it. The marriage contract between her and Osburn, which is now before me, is dated the 5th day of July, 1821. This then was the year in which she became insane. Now to show the *consistency* of their testimony, let us turn to a Deposition taken by Mr. Elder, but which his counsel very prudently declined reading in Court. I refer to the Deposition of John Lancaster, a Roman Catholic, a man of more intelligence, than any who testified for Duparque in Court—on this point. His testimony is as follows:

"Question by Plaintiff's Attorney. How long have you been acquainted with Milly McPherson, daughter of John McPherson, resident of Marion county? Answer. In the spring of the year 1806, John McPherson lived on my farm, Milly McPherson, his daughter was then living with him, and I believe, was about seventeen years of age. Question, by same. Do you or not, believe she was of sound mind? Answer.

At times I believe she was of ordinary soundness of mind. At other times I do not believe she was of sound mind. A short time previous to her leaving the neighborhood, she staid all night at my house, and was disposed to talk much; and said, she had much to disclose to Mrs. Lancaster, which was refused to be heard; and we supposed her mind then aberrating." According to this testimony Milly has been occasionally deranged since 1806—or about thirty years. But her father and brother say, she was not insane until the love scrape between her and Osburn in 1821. So that Mr. Lancaster makes her insane fifteen or sixteen years before she became so, according to the testimony of her relations! Such a contradiction is not calculated to strengthen the evidence. But what evidence does Mr. Lancaster furnish of her derangement? It is necessary to state the facts which evince mental aberration. It is worthy of remark, that though he has been acquainted with Milly *thirty* years, he specifies but *one occasion* when she appeared deranged. One would have supposed that in so long an acquaintance, many circumstances could have been detailed, proving beyond doubt, that she was not of sound mind. He mentions one night "a short time previous to her leaving the neighborhood." In what year this occurred, he does not state. It might have been 20, or only 5 years ago. But what facts are stated? Why, she "was disposed to talk much." If this is evidence of derangement, I fear, many who have always been considered sound, must now go to the hospital. One of Mr. Elder's witnesses thought she was deranged, because she was *not* disposed to talk much. Sarah Mc-

Pherson, her sister-in-law, was asked why she thought her deranged? She said, "She was silent—seemed to be studying." Now since most persons are disposed to talk or to be silent, it would be easy to prove them insane!

He gives another evidence of derangement: she said, "she had much to disclose to Mrs. L. which was refused to be heard." If this occurrence was after she left the Nunnery, she probably had something to disclose; and if Mr. L. had heard it, he would have been better qualified to judge of the state of her mind; but nothing could be heard against the priest—no matter how great an outrage he may have committed upon a helpless female. And is this all the evidence Mr. L. could give, after an acquaintance of 30 years? Is this any evidence at all? Indeed, it was given up by Mr. Elder's counsel, and was not read.

Let us now examine the testimony produced in court to prove her insane. And the first witness is her father. Instead of that tender concern which a father should feel for an injured daughter, he appears as a witness against her. Such are the bitter fruits of Popery. I give his own words. "After she had been there (at the Nunnery) some time, a negro man came from the Nunnery with her. I think, she called him Jake. They stopped at the gate. Her clothes were thrown in the corner of the fence—her mother told her to take her clothes in the house. She or some one else took them into the lumber room, and she took a black *shawl* or handkerchief, and carried it about the yard on a cornstalk. She told me, some of my neighbors had communication with the devil. In the night she was distressed—ran in and jumped behind her

mother. One day when witness was brushing the chimney to get the soot out, Milly was cross to her mother; and he discovered they were on cross questions. He told her, he had given so much to bring her from Union, and he would give twice as much to take her back. She put her hand on her head and cried, O Lord! O Lord! O Lord! and ran into the woods. Witness looked after and watched her, and told his wife, Milly is gone. She said, what business had she (Milly) to be such a fool." This last affair took place, as Wm. McPherson says, (for the old man could not tell) immediately after she came from Union county, which must have been about 15 years ago. It is likely enough, her father struck or threatened to strike her with his brush; for we have evidence from Mr. Elder's witnesses that he did threaten her with violence. But the testimony of the old man, his son and daughter-in-law, is so palpably contradictory as to be perfectly worthless, only to show the true character of Popery. Her father was asked, whether Milly told him the cause of her leaving the Nunnery? He positively asserted, that "she did not state to him the reason why she had left the Nunnery—he did not ask her. The letter (which she brought from the Nunnery) stated that she was sick. "Afterwards, however, he said," She told me she wanted to tell me something—wanted two witnesses. I sent for my son Billy, and my grandson Mattingly. She said, they dealt with the devil at the Monastery." Whether she thought that Duparque dealt with the devil, or whether the Nuns did, the old man did not say; but it is likely she had the same opinion of both, since she told Mrs. Ray, she thought the Nun-

nery "the gate to hell." However, here the poor old man flatly contradicted his former assertion, and admitted that his daughter did tell him her reasons for quitting the Nunnery. And so important were the disclosures she was about to make, that the old man went and got *two witnesses*, though not the witnesses that she desired. And when all came together about this serious matter, they shut the door, as the old man said, "to keep two negroes from hearing Milly." His son William says, "I was sent for, when she came home from the Monastery, to *hear what she had to say was the reason she left*—and she wanted two witnesses." Defendants counsel asked, "Who came for you? Answer. Father wanted me and Mattingly for witnesses." Sarah McPherson says, "Her father came for my husband, and said, Milly was concerned in some way; and said, if he could get two witnesses, she would tell him. I went along," &c. Well, and why did she leave the Nunnery? The old man at first said, she brought a letter that said she was sick. But Miss Phillips, the nun from Calvary, said "*this (sickness) was not the cause;*" and Mr. Elder had informed us that she was dismissed, "because she was not such as they could consistently keep." Of course sickness was not the difficulty. But the old man thought of another reason—"They dealt with the devil at the Monastery"—a tolerably good reason for leaving, one would suppose. William McPherson, who was sent for as a witness to hear her disclosures, gives quite a different reason. "She said, there was idolatry among some of them at the Nunnery—she must worship idols, or come away. No doubt, she was in the right, if she made such an objection. But Sarah

McPherson, who went along to hear, gives yet another and different reason. She said, some of the scholars were witches, and she was bewitched." Here are *five* different reasons for leaving the Nunnery, 1. "She was not such as they could consistently keep." 2. She was sick. 3. They dealt with the devil. 4. They were idolaters. 5. The scholars were witches, and she was bewitched." And the old gentleman and his son and daughter-in-law plainly contradicted each other. Indeed, we have also a *sixth* reasons for her leaving. Sarah McPherson said, "I asked her why she came from Calvary? She said she got insulted because she wanted to be a teacher, and they would not let her." Here is certainly a *sufficient number* of reasons to have influenced even a *sane* woman!

But we very much suspect, we have not got the true reason yet. Milly said she left, because of Duparque's lewdness. Did she give this reason to her father and the witnesses? Sally McPherson says "she said nothing about Duparque." So says William McPherson. Let us compare this with the testimony of Mrs. Elizabeth Riggs, a very respectable lady, and at the time a near neighbor of McPherson's. She says, "Sally McPherson, wife of William McPherson, one of the old man's sons, told me, that Milly did in her presence and that of her husband, and of her father and mother, state that it was owing to the improper conduct of Duparque, before alluded to (attempt to seduce her) that she had left the Nunnery. Sally McPherson stated, that she ought to be whipped until she confessed herself a liar. The old man replied, "No—I never knew Milly to tell a lie." Sally then replied to the old

man, "if you are afraid her mother is not," &c. I adduce this testimony to show, that Milly did, notwithstanding the denial of the witnesses, tell them that Duparque's misconduct caused her to leave the Nunnery. And Sally McPherson admits that she wished to have her confined and whipped. "I told her, she had acted the fool. Her father said he did not know what to do with her. I told him, I would confine her—I told some one, if she was a child of mine, I would have whipped her". This is manifest confirmation of the testimony of Mrs. Riggs. So we discover, despite of all the evasions and contradictions, that Milly did tell her father and relations of Duparque's misconduct towards her; and instead of acting the part of friends toward her, they became her bitter enemies, and attempted violence upon her. And now they, in the true spirit of Popery, come into court to prove her insane and shield the priest! Of what value is such testimony?

Is it not remarkable, if Milly was so perfectly deranged as to be carrying a shawl about the yard on a corn stalk, and if she had been, as they say, deranged not less than ~~ten years~~, that her father thought it necessary to collect witnesses to hear her reasons for leaving the Nunnery? Yes, and they shut the door on her, as the old man reluctantly admitted. Why did they do so? He says, it was to keep the negroes from hearing her. Yet, she was perfectly insane!!!

The testimony of Sarah McPherson, even if it were not so contradictory, is worth but little; for she admitted that she was not friendly to Milly. She said, "I did not set any great store to her. I had nothing against her—I liked her

well enough till she came from Calvary. And why did she dislike her? She gave two reasons. 1. "I had some dealings with her, while she was at Calvary—she did not want to pay me—disputed about the price of bacon, potatoes and flour." She trades with a poor deranged sister-in-law, who while at the charitable establishment at Calvary, had to furnish her own provisions; and she quarrels with her about the price of her food! 2. "She had agreed to teach my children, before she went to the Nunnery; but I found she would not do it when she came back." Milly, we are told, was perfectly deranged. Yet her sister-in-law quarrels with her because she is not disposed to teach her children! It is not common, I believe, for insane persons to teach. Such, however, was Mr. Elder's principal testimony.

Their conduct would not have appeared quite so cruel, had they not been the near relations of that poor unfortunate woman. It was their duty to have been friends to her, and to have protected her from insult. It is said, that in countries where the inquisition was established, when any member of a family was taken by that horrid tribunal, the family dared not say one word, or make an enquiry concerning the individual taken. I could not but be reminded of that fact by the conduct of Miss McPherson's relations. She was compelled to leave home or suffer violence at their hands; and when she disappeared, no search was made for her; but they quietly and carelessly concluded that she was dead. And when others turned public attention to so strange an occurrence, they were the principal witnesses against her! What a comment upon the spirit of Popery. Unlike the blessed Gospel, it turns

the hearts of the fathers *from* the children, and gives the clergy almost unlimited power over the virtue and lives of their followers.

Let us examine the other witnesses. Miss Jenny Mattingly comes next. She says, "The first time I saw her, after she came home, she was sitting on the floor very serious—fetched loud bilches and blowed, and said, "Go from whence you came." I asked her, aunt Milly, what is the matter? She said, they say I have devils in me, and I want to blow them out. At another time I went to my grand-father's house—was told she was lying in the room on the bed—went to her—asked what was the matter. She said, I am dying—I am speechless—I want the doctor. I said, if you are dying, you had better have the priest. Milly said, 'I don't know 'twould do any good to bring the priest—I am speechless. I wanted her to go home with me. She said, she could not; for she was dying. I left her—went home, in a few minutes after I got home, she came, bare-headed, with her hair browsed. The moment she came in, she said she was dying and was speechless—wanted me to go for Mr. Ray, and tell him to bring ink and paper." This is a specimen of Miss Mattingly's proof of her insanity. It is very remarkable that these marvellous facts told by her, some of which occurred at her grand-father's, were known to none of the other members of the family. Not one of them pretended ever to have heard of them. This is strange!

Mrs. Carico, a Roman Catholic, said, "Milly lived with me seven months in the year 1831—was to work one week for herself, and one week for me. She did not work much—would sweep

a circle on the floor—sit down in it—take her Dictionary, laugh and read it. I then thought her deranged. She spun a little sometimes—she said, she could not make money with witness, and could not therefore stay. She said, she was going to Mr. Russel's to teach a school." She said, "she saw Milly McP. when she returned the last time from Calvary. She passed by her house on Sunday, accompanied by a black man. I went to her father's the same evening, to ask the reason of her coming back. She said, she had to undergo hard labor at Calvary, and could not bear it." Mrs. Carico, it appears, felt anxious to know the reason why this poor deranged woman had not stayed at the Nunnery, and she went to her father's to enquire of her! A distracted woman's *reason* for leaving the Nunnery! Unfortunately for this testimony Mrs. Carico asserted, that "the last time she (Milly) was there (at her house) was in 1832, in the fall." Now all admit, that she disappeared in 1831, and has not since been heard of!

Mrs. Doyle, a Roman Catholic, said, Mrs. Whitehead told her, "that Milly had been there, and was in as crazy a fit as ever Peggy (her sister) was." But Mrs. Whitehead declares that she had never heard an intimation of her insanity, until after her difficulty with Duparque. Besides, Mrs. Doyle says, this was "in the fall of 1832;" whereas I have already proved that she disappeared in the fall of 1831. She also says, "Mrs. Carico was there, but paid no attention!" Such testimony is not likely to satisfy the candid.

Mrs. Ann Johnson, a Roman Catholic, swore, "that Milly was at her house three or four weeks in the fall of 1831. Benedict Austin applied to

me to take her as long as she and witness should be pleased. She came by herself. Milly said, she could stand and talk to a person 50, 100 or 1000 miles off, or in England—could make them hear, and could hear them talk. She was so weak minded, she would knit a little, and then unravel it. She undertook to make a coarse garment, but could not sew a straight seam. She would sew a little and rip it out—she went to meeting once at Cambron's—I went with her. She behaved queer at church—*scrouched* about from place to place, sorter deranged." Here, it seems, Milly had gotten rid of the witches and devils, and was so idiotic, that she could neither knit nor sew, and "*scrouched*" about in church! She concludes too, that she can work a miracle quite as great as Duparque himself would venture on—she can talk to people even in England! Now there are some unaccountable things about this testimony. In the first place, Mr. Mitchel, not a professor of religion, stated, "that he was living at Benedict Austin's about 1831. Milly McPherson was then attending to Mrs. Austin's work, and waiting on Mrs. Austin, who was sick. She cooked for the family and the hands—was steady about business; not talkative. I took her to be sensible; saw no derangement. I was there a week. Mrs. Austin was sick; and Milly attended to the children." How wonderfully Milly was changed in going to Mr. Johnson's! But this is not all. Mr. Berry, Mr. Johnson's son-in-law, said, "He lived in Washington Co., in 1831, at Matthew Johnson's, about one week, while Milly McPherson was there. She was employed mostly in spinning. She wove some—he recollects, a dress for herself. While there, she seemed

to have good sense—not overly smart, but not deranged. She appeared to have sense enough. She did not talk much. He heard nothing of her saying, that she could make people hear her talk, 50 or 1000 miles off, and hear them talk. The family said, she was a still person—slow about work, but did it tolerably well.” Can any one believe, that if such evidences of insanity had been given, this man would have heard nothing of it. If she could not knit or sew; how did she weave?

We will now examine the testimony of John Robards. He said, “He did not know Milly McPherson. He saw a woman who called herself Milly McP. at his house, five or six years ago—did not know whence she came, or where she was going. She staid at his house a day and two nights, or two days and one night. He had but little conversation with her. Once as he was about leaving his house to go to his mill or warehouse, she followed him to the end of his passage, and said to witness—the Sheriff and a parcel of men were after her to take her—wished him to go to Bardstown to see the Bishop, and get him to stop them. Witness said, he would. About a half an hour afterwards he returned to the house—told her he had seen the Bishop, and he had stopped the sheriff—does not recollect what she said, if any thing, in reply—she seemed satisfied. Witness had no more conversation with her, that he knows of. He believes her not to have been in her right mind—she talked more with witness’ wife than with him, and was more in her company. She walked the room of a night.” That Milly should fear violence, is not strange, when she was threatened by her near-

est relations, nor is it wonderful that she should desire the protection of the Bishop. It is surely no evidence of insanity, that she believed Mr. Robards, when he told her he had seen the Bishop; but there is no evidence that he did believe it. Nor would it have been surprising, if, after being maltreated by her friends, insulted by her priest, and cast off by her church, she should have been bewildered and deranged. Wo to that unfortunate woman, whose relations are Papists, and who shall feel compelled to resist the insults of a priest!

But Mrs. Robards, with whom she had more conversation, and who had far better opportunities of judging of the state of her mind, says, "She was distressed, eat but little, walked about in her room at night, talked sensibly. Her recollection was bad about some things. She said her family had treated her cruelly. I thought her distressed. She assisted me in cutting clothes for the negroes—did it pretty well, on the whole. I think she was distressed, not deranged." My readers will not fail to remark, that though Milly could neither knit nor sew at Johnson's; she could cut out clothes very well when she got to Robards'! She was not troubled with devils or witches, and said nothing about talking to people in England!

I have now presented all the principal evidence adduced by Mr. Elder, to prove Milly McPherson insane; and, if I mistake not, the candid reader, without hearing an opposing evidence, would greatly doubt whether this was not an affair gotten up after her mysterious disappearance. I will now prove satisfactorily, as I think, from Mr. Elder's own testimony, that she

was not deranged. I have already shown, that Mr. Lancaster makes her insane at least *fifteen* years before her friends say she became so. According to their account of it, she lost her reason about the year 1821. But Miss Spinks, a Nun, and one of Mr. Elder's witnesses, said, "that she went to school with Milly McPherson in Union Co., at St. Vincent's Nunnery, *fourteen* years ago." Of course this was in the year 1823. But the marriage contract between her and Osburn, which is said to have occasioned her derangement, is dated July, 1821. Then Miss Spinks went to school with her *two* years after she became deranged! and she does not pretend to have heard that her mind was not sound. This looks badly.

Again. It was in the fall of 1831 that Milly left the Nunnery at Calvary. Of course she had been deranged *ten* years. Is it not passing strange, that no one of the witnesses stated a single fact proving or pretending to prove her insanity during that period, except that related by her father and brother immediately after her return from Union? Even Miss Mattingly, who related so minutely her conduct after she came from Calvary, could mention no circumstance of the kind previous to that time. Mrs. Carico did say, that she lived with her in 1831, before going to Calvary; and she thought her deranged because she sat on the floor and read her Dictionary! It might be interesting to know how she was employed all that time. We find her, after her return from Union, painting flowers for her friends. Miss Mattingly says, "Milly delighted in painting—had painted flowers for her, soon after she came back from Union—the first time and also

the second. Flowers tolerably well painted." This does not look like insanity.

Next, we find her at Loretto. Miss Mattingly says, "She went to Loretto first after coming from Union Co. and staid about twelve months." Miss Philips, a Nun, said, "She was acquainted with Milly McPherson at Loretto—she was at Loretto eight, nine, or ten months—was an inmate of the Nunnery; *became a Nun after I left Loretto.*" Milly, we are told, was perfectly insane; but yet she could so far deceive the managers of the establishment, that she remained twelve months, and gave such satisfaction that she was admitted to take the veil! And why did she leave the Nunnery? Her brother says, "She got sick and came home." And have we any proof of her derangement while at Loretto? Miss Myers, a Nun, said, "She was acquainted with her at Loretto nine or ten years ago—she was habited as a Nun. I had not much conversation with her." Defendant asked, whether she was deranged, while there? Answer. "I once conversed with her—met her in the passage in the day time. She came from her room crying. I asked what was the matter. She said, a ball of fire had rolled up to her bed." This is all the evidence of derangement which Loretto could give, after she had stayed there twelve months, and been received as a Nun! Did not bishop Chabrat, who had charge of that Nunnery, hear her confessions? How happened it that no derangement was detected?

We next find Milly going to Union Co. as a witness in a civil suit. Miss Mattingly says, she staid at Loretto twelve months "*before she went to Union Co. as a witness.*" John McPherson

says, "she went down once as a witness in a slander case." Now unless I very much mistake, it is not common to admit deranged persons as witnesses in Court. But as she had deceived the priest and Nuns at Loretto; so, it would seem, she deceived the Court, and was believed to be entirely sane!

After this we next find Milly in the Nunnery of Calvary, where she staid, Miss Mattingly thinks, "six months." Miss Philips, the Nun, says, "*eight months*." Well, did she exhibit any derangement there? No—Miss Philips says, "When Milly came to the Nunnery the first time, I believe the mother was well satisfied." The priest Duparque heard her confessions, and discovered no insanity. Miss Philips says, "She came to Calvary to school;" yet her teachers discovered no derangement. For a period of twenty months, therefore, she lived in two Nunneries, and kept her derangement entirely concealed!!!

We are not informed why she left Calvary the first time; but we, after this, find her employed in teaching school. Miss Mattingly says, "All the time between going to Calvary the first and second time was not more than eighteen months—*She taught school six months of that time in the neighborhood*." Was she deranged while she was teaching? We hear nothing of the kind—not a word from any who sent their children to her.

Finally, in the fall of 1831, Milly returns to Calvary; and though the mother did not wish to take her, as Miss Philips says, because she was "an old girl, and not very healthy;" Duparque, who was before acquainted with her, told her, she must take her and keep her as the Nuns. Miss

McPherson was a strict Papist—and of course, had been in the habit of confessing to the priest. During her stay (eight months) at Calvary, she must have confessed to Duparque. He, therefore, was well acquainted with her; and he proved that he did not consider her insane, by receiving her a second time into his Nunnery. The reason of her leaving it yet remains a secret, unless it was, as she declared, the misconduct of Duparque. These facts, proved by Mr. Elder's witnesses, prove most clearly, that this unfortunate Nun could not have been deranged.

But we are not yet through with this contradictory testimony. In order to account for the mysterious disappearance of the Nun, Mr. Elder sent to Indiana, and took several depositions to prove that she had been teaching school there, since she disappeared from her father's neighborhood. How far he succeeded in this point, I shall hereafter examine. But admitting, for the present, that the woman spoken of in these depositions was the real Milly McPherson, the lost Nun; was she deranged? No—she had no sooner crossed the Ohio, than she recovered from her insanity with which she had been afflicted for fifteen or sixteen, or perhaps thirty years, and commences teaching school! The following is the testimony of Sarah Greathouse, of Indiana, one of Mr. Elder's witnesses.

“Question by Defendant's Attorney. Did she appear to you like a crazy or deranged woman? Answer. No—she did not. Was she a steady and attentive woman to her school? Answer. Yes—I believe she was.” Jonathan Greathouse testified as follows: Question. What was the character of Milly McPherson, while in your

neighborhood? Answer. I believe her to be a prudent, well-behaved woman. Question. Was she a woman of good sense? Only moderately so." Margaret Dufree testifies as follows: "Question. Had you any knowledge of her being deranged? Answer. No." Mary Ann Great-house, a little girl, discovered *once* something like derangement. And, reader, what do you think it was? Why, she started one day to go to a neighbor's house, and took the wrong direction! This is all. Now suppose this woman to be Milly McPherson, Mr. Elder has clearly proved that she was not insane, and has thus contradicted the testimony of all his principal witnesses in Kentucky. Suppose we had no farther testimony to prove the sanity of the Nun; is not Mr. Elder's testimony abundantly sufficient to prove it?

But we have some farther evidence from his witnesses, which confirms part of the testimony of one of ours. Mrs. Elizabeth Riggs gave the following testimony: "Sally McPherson, wife of William McPherson one of the old man's son's, told me, that Milly did in her presence; and that if her husband, and of her father and mother, state that it was owing to the improper conduct of Priest Duparque before alluded to (attempt to seduce her) that she had left the Nunnery. Sally McPherson stated, that she ought to be whipped until she would confess herself a liar. The old man replied, no—I never knew Milly to tell a lie. Sally then replied to the old man, 'If you are afraid, her mother is not.' Milly then stated, she would never retract what she had said; and she would die before she would confess herself a liar, and would pour it down

upon the priests and Nuns, like hard claps of thunder; and then remarked, that "I reckon you intend to kill me;" and then she jumped out at the door and made her escape from them." These facts Mrs. Riggs, a respectable lady, who is not a member of any church, declares on oath were made to her by Sally McPherson. Now I beg my readers to observe the following confirmation of it. Sally McPherson at first said, "I never stated to any one, she (Milly) ought to be whipped;" but afterwards she said, "I told some one, if she was a child of mine, I would have whipped her." Ignatius Medley, a Roman Catholic, and one of Duparque's witnesses, said, "The old man (McPherson) said, he had heard of the charge made against Duparque, and talked about whipping her (Milly) for telling lies. Witness advised him against it." Here, then, we have evidence from themselves, that they talked of whipping Milly. My readers will keep in mind, that she had been entirely deranged for at least ten years; and yet her father and her sister-in-law wish to whip her, suffering as they pretended she was, under that most dreadful affliction, the loss of her reason!!! Surely Satan himself cannot be more cruel. Are these the tender mercies of Popery? The fact is, they did not believe her insane; and therefore, true to the spirit of their religion, they wished to punish and abuse her for daring to say one word against the immaculate priest. Mr. Medley himself, who is a neighbor of McPherson's and must have heard of her insanity, if it had existed, said, "I always held an opinion of Milly, that she was a girl of good common sense—never heard of her derangement before this report."

Let us now examine the testimony introduced by the Defendant. It is scarcely necessary to say, that when an individual, however humble in life, is afflicted with the loss of reason, such a misfortune inevitably becomes notorious to neighbors, and is the subject of common remark. It is impossible that any individual in such a situation should live in a neighborhood for years, and be in habits of intercourse with neighbors, and yet nothing be heard of the circumstance. Is it possible for the most prejudiced to believe, that Milly McP. was insane for ten years, and yet her intimate acquaintances who live almost in sight of her father's house, knew nothing of it? And let it be remarked, that not one of McPherson's neighbors, not one of the acquaintances of Milly, *except Roman Catholics*, believed her deranged! Mrs. Nancy Ray, said, "She believed, and was of the opinion, that she was a girl of good common sense, and was considered and believed to have more sense in the neighborhood, and to be better behaved, than any of the old man McPherson's family. Question. Did you ever hear in the neighborhood, or from any of her relations, that she was of unsound mind, until after the difficulty with Plaintiff, and after she had stated the facts alluded to in this deposition? Answer. I never did hear any intimation of this sort, until afterwards. She taught a school in the neighborhood for some short time." Lloyd Ray believed her perfectly sane. True, when he saw her at Mr. Whitehead's, he doubted whether her mind was perfectly right. He was then in her company less than an hour; and he was induced to doubt by some superstitious notions she entertained. "She expressed some

notions I did not understand, relative to a priest." Rev. Mr. Whitehead, who had doubtless paid more attention to the opinions of Papists, than Mr. Ray, and who had had more conversation with Milly, told him, she was not deranged. Mr. Ray was about to state this opinion of Mr. W. to the jury; but Plaintiff objected. Mr. Ray was afterwards convinced that he had been mistaken. "He saw Milly at witness' house two or three times afterwards. I conversed with her only on one subject—heard her converse with my family—saw nothing in her indicating derangement. She talked rationally; and I then became convinced that my first impressions, when I saw her at Mr. W's., as to her mind, were not right. I think, she was of sound mind, and knew what she was about." Now I ask, which was most likely to be correct, the opinion formed after a few moments conversation, or that formed after seeing her and hearing her converse several times? The attempt made by the Plaintiff to invalidate Mr. Ray's testimony by introducing several persons who professed to have had conversation with him on the subject, proved ineffectual. For all the witnesses agreed, and it is well known, that the character of Ray is unimpeachable. However, let us examine this testimony. Ignatius Medley says, Ray told him, "he did not swear her, because the family were simple." Well, it seems hard that Milly should atone for the simplicity of her relations; but Ray, it seems, did not tell Medley that Milly was simple. And if the family were so simple, they should not have been brought up as witnesses against her. Dr. Smith of Springfield, a Roman Catholic, was sent for for the same purpose. He

said, he went to see Ray in Springfield, to enquire concerning the reports of Milly. "I then understood Mr. Ray in that conversation to assign as the reason why he did not swear Milly, when she applied to him for a warrant, as I understood—that he did not consider her capable of making an affidavit, because of a want of capacity." This testimony will not do. Milly never did apply for a warrant; and of course Mr. Ray never did so state to Dr. S. And if he misunderstood Mr. Ray in this particular, or has forgotten; he may have committed as great a mistake concerning other points. Mr. Hamilton, a Roman Catholic, was introduced; but his testimony strengthened Ray's, if it could be strengthened; stated, that "Ray said, the Catholics blamed him, but he was not more to blame than others—that he had heard, she had been in two Nunneries; and if she had deceived them twice, they ought to forgive us, if she deceived us once." But did Ray say, she had in fact deceived us? No, for Hamilton also said, "when he (Ray) spoke to witness, he thought it ought to be investigated—that they ought to answer for it. It is hard that a poor woman should be taken off in this way." The only other witness to invalidate Ray's testimony is a young man, a Papist, whose name is Caleb Mattingly. He said, Ray told him, "she was a poor silly girl." I am willing this shall go for what it is worth. It is useless for men to attempt to invalidate the testimony of such a man as Esquire Ray by such flimsy stuff. Ray had lived for many years in the immediate neighborhood of John McPherson; and Milly had often been in his house; and yet he had never heard that she had been deranged since 1821!

Mrs. Fanny Whitehead said, "She was a woman of ordinary good mind. I was well acquainted with her, and never heard it stated by any person, that she was deranged, until she disappeared from the neighborhood." William McPherson did say, that he went to Mrs. Whitehead's, and "she told me, Milly would go as crazy as Peggy—she said that Milly did not talk plain talk. She told me to be careful about Milly—you know how it was with Peggy." The question now is, which shall we rather believe, William McPherson, the brother of Milly, a Papist, and who with his wife and father gave such contradictory testimony; or Mrs. Whitehead, an aged Baptist lady, whose character is above reproach, and who had no possible interest to serve by false testimony? I leave my readers to decide. Mrs. Fogle said, "her character was that of a good, truthful, industrious girl, of *common sense, tolerable good reason.*" Plaintiff asked, "Was she not in a strange way? Answer. No, but she was distressed—she talked rationally." George Whitehead was at his father's when she returned from the Nunnery. He said, "she appeared to be in her usual mind." Plaintiff asked, "When you saw her at her father's, was her mind as strong as when you had seen her before? Answer. Her mind was about the same. I heard nothing about her being crazy." Defendant asked, "Did you ever hear of her being charged with being crazy? Answer. Never before she was missing." Stephen Riggs, a neighbor of her father, said, "I believe her to be a virtuous woman, and of *sound mind.* Such was her general character in the neighborhood. I never heard any thing to the contrary, until

after this fuss with Duparque, and until after she disappeared from the neighborhood, which was in the fall of 1831, as I believe." Elizabeth Riggs, said, "I never heard any thing said against her, or her character or *mind*, until after she left the Nunnery at Calvary." The testimony of Catharine Riggs is substantially the same. Such is the testimony of her neighbors and familiar acquaintances to the sanity of Milly McPherson. Is it not abundantly satisfactory?

Dr. W. W. Wood, of Lebanon, said, "He saw Milly McPherson in the fall of 1831, a few days after leaving Calvary, at Mathew Carico's—heard her converse—saw no signs of derangement. She behaved well, spoke sensibly and rationally. He conversed with Milly McPherson when he saw her at Carico's, and gave her medicine. He was at that time attending upon Carico's family, and saw her several times." Mrs. Carico said, "She came to my house with her hair hanging down like a crazy person. She staid but a little while." But Dr. Wood, who was practicing in the family, saw her several times; and he thinks, she had nothing of the appearance of a crazy woman. Dr. W. is a gentleman whose veracity none will call in question. He is not a professor of religion.

Rev. John Wathen, the priest, was asked, "Did Milly appear to be deranged, when you saw her? Answer. I saw nothing extraordinary in her—she looked like other women." Of course he saw no insanity. Mrs. Wathen saw her at Esquire Ray's after she left Calvary—"heard her converse on various subjects at Mr. Ray's. She conversed intelligently." Several Nuns were introduced from Loretto and Calvary:

but no one of them ventured to say that Milly was deranged.

It was said that insanity was a family failing, because two of the family are not of sound mind. But if this fact is sufficient to prove Milly insane; it is certainly sufficient to prove the members of the family who were witnesses, incompetent to testify.

Let us now see what the testimony of Mr. Elder requires us to believe.

1. Mr. Lancaster makes her insane at times from 1806—her father, brother and sister-in-law, from 1821—a difference of *fifteen* years. Who is right?

2. The testimony read in Court proved her insane, as just remarked, from 1821; but Miss Spinks, a Nun from Loretto, said, she went to school with Milly in Union Co. at St. Vincent's Nunnery, *fourteen* years ago. That was, of course, in 1823—two years after she lost her reason! Is it common to send deranged girls to school? But Miss Spinks did not pretend that she was deranged.

3. Miss Spinks was at school with Milly in Union Co., she says, "*fourteen* years ago;" but Miss Jenny Mattingly says, "She came back from Union the first time about the love scrape with Horatio Osburn, *fifteen* years since." And the same witness says, "She went to Loretto first after coming from Union Co. and staid about twelve months." Then her brother William says, "she got sick and came home." After this, "she went to Union as a witness." Then *fourteen* years ago she was at Loretto. But suppose her to have been in Union, it will be recollected that she was perfectly deranged when she came from Union

the first time. Of course, when Miss Spinks saw her, she was deranged. But though in school with Milly, she heard nothing of it!

4. She had been deranged since 1821; and yet her near neighbors, living almost within sight of her father's, and frequently meeting with her, had heard nothing of it. Mr. Medley, a Romanist and a neighbor, had not heard it. The priest knew nothing of it—else she could not have become a Nun. No testimony was given concerning her derangement during almost the whole of that period!

5. Notwithstanding her derangement, she became a Nun at Loretto; staid there twelve months, and staid in Calvary eight months; and her derangement was not discovered! She taught school in her father's neighborhood six months, and went to Union as a witness—no derangement discovered by priests, teachers, patrons or the Court!!!

6. "She was not such a one as they could consistently keep," says Mr. Elder; and yet the only charge against her was, that "she was an old girl, not very healthy!"

7. She left Calvary in her right mind; but by the time she rode home, a few miles, she was perfectly mad—no sense at all!—so simple that Mrs. Carico would not talk to her!

8. Though Mrs. Carico knew she had been for some time insane, she went immediately to her father's to enquire her *reason* for leaving the Nunnery! And though her father had known she was deranged since the memorable "love scrape" of 1821; yet he went in search of *two witnesses* to hear her disclosures about the Nunnery!

9. When she came home she brought a letter that said, she was sick; and yet Miss Phillips, a Nun, who saw her come, and saw her leave, says she was not sick! And her father says, she did not tell him the reason she left—he did not ask her. Yet he says, he did go for two witnesses to hear her disclosures, and they shut the door to keep the negroes from hearing!

10. She said, they dealt with the Devil at the Monastery, says the old man. She said, they were idolaters, says William. She said, they were witches and she was bewitched, says Sally McPherson. She said, she was offended because they would not let her teach, says the same witness!

11. Sally McP. told Mr. Riggs, that Milly brought charges against Duparque; and she wished to have her whipped for it. Sally says, she did not say so; and yet she did tell some one, if Milly was a child of hers, she would whip her! The old man threatened to whip her; but Mr. Medley advised him against it. Still she was deranged!!!

12. She is awfully bewitched, and runs about with browsed hair, while among Papists; but gets perfectly cured, when she goes amongst others! She is deranged at Carico's; yet Dr. Wood converses with her and gives her medicine, and sees nothing of derangement!

13. About home she talks only of witches and devils at the Nunnery; but when she gets to Mathew Johnson's, she forgets all about witches, and becomes such an idiot, that she can neither knit nor sew—can spin a little! Still she could work a miracle greater than Duparque would attempt—she can talk to people in England!

Yet Mr. Berry was at the house and heard nothing of all this—recollects her weaving a dress!

14. At Austin's she could attend to the business of the family; but at Johnson's, a few miles off, could not sew or knit. Yet, at Robard's she could cut out the negroes' clothes, and do it pretty well!

15. But to cap the climax, as soon as she crosses the Ohio, devils and witches leave her, and she recovers her senses entirely, and begins to teach school !!!

If any one can swallow such testimony, he need not stagger at Gulliver's travels.

WHERE IS MILLY McPHERSON?

The testimony thus far examined, has proved, I think, to the satisfaction of the candid, the three following points: 1st. That Milly McPherson left the Nunnery, charged Duparque with attempted seduction, suddenly and mysteriously disappeared, was supposed to be dead, and that these facts were commonly reported and believed in the neighborhood. 2d. That she had ever borne a good character for virtue and truth. 3d. That at the time of making the charges against Duparque, she was of sound mind. And if these facts are proved; I leave the candid reader to determine whether I have

established all that I ever asserted, and how nearly I have proved the fact of Duparque's guilt. In forming a decision, consider the following facts.

1st. That Duparque had charge of the Nunnery at Calvary; and he, an unmarried man, was living amongst a parcel of unmarried females, who were most solemnly bound to confess to him from time to time all their sins, even the most secret.

2nd. That Milly McPherson was a Roman Catholic—born and reared in the church of Rome—taught from infancy to venerate a priest, as the vicegerent of Christ. She had been accustomed all her life to bow down at his feet in humble confession and to receive his absolution, as coming from Christ. Was it likely that she would, notwithstanding these early and strong prejudices, without any cause, accuse the priest?

3d. Her parents, brothers, sisters and relations were all Papists, who would of course warmly resent such an outrage upon so sacred a character as that of the priest? What had she to expect from making such a charge against him, but the enmity of her relations and the anathemas of the church? Yet it would seem, she, after having maintained a blameless character till forty years of age, disregarded every feeling of early prejudice, of piety and of interest, and recklessly attacked the moral character of her priest! Is this probable? I had almost said, is it possible? Whether, therefore, she can be found or not, the evidence against Duparque is exceedingly strong—so strong that NINE of the jury have declared in a recent publication, "that under all the circumstances, but for the

instructions of the court, we would have been compelled to find a verdict for the Defendant."

But the mysterious disappearance of the Nun has had great weight in convincing the public that there is iniquity about this matter. From the time she left John Robard's, we hear nothing more of her. If she had been deranged, she would have excited the more attention. But near six years have elapsed since she disappeared, and more than one year since, I published an account of it in the Protestant; and the news has gone throughout the country, far and near; but no one yet can answer the often repeated question—Where is Milly McPherson?

But Mr. Elder has attempted to prove, that she has been in Indiana, since her disappearance. Let us see how far he has succeeded. Miss Spinks, one of the Nuns of Loretto, stated, that she went to school with Milly McPherson in Union Co. at St. Vincent's Nunnery, fourteen years ago—that she saw her about three years ago in Indiana, at Mathena's, near Amsterdam—did not converse with her, but knew her. She was at preaching—remained at Mathena's two or three weeks. It was at a Methodist meeting, in the day time. I saw her on the first Sunday in June, 1835. I expect she saw me at preaching, but did not speak to me, nor I to her." There are a few about this testimony difficulties that need explanation.

1. Fourteen years ago, as I have already proved, Milly was in Loretto and not in Union. Besides, fourteen years ago she was, as Mr. Elder attempted to prove, deranged. 2. Her dates do not agree together. She saw Milly in Indiana, as she repeatedly declared, on the first Sun-

day in June, 1835. She then stayed with her brother one, two, or three months. Then she was at Bethlehem one or two months. Then she went to Gethsemane and staid seven months. Then she went to Loretto, and will have been there two years in August. These are her dates. Let us examine them. If we say, *one month* at her brother's, *one* at Bethlehem, *seven* at Gethsemane, and *twenty-two* at Loretto, we have *thirty-one months*. But it had been just *two years*, or *twenty-four months*, since June, 1835, to the time of the trial. This will not do. But if we take the other time mentioned by her, viz: *three years*, her dates make it only *thirty-one*, or at most, *thirty-four months*. It is impossible to reconcile this testimony. 3. She had not seen Milly for twelve years, at which time she herself was thirteen years old. It may well be doubted, therefore, whether she would have known Milly.

4. But she says, she did not speak to her. It is scarcely probable, if she had known her as an old acquaintance at school, that she would have passed her without speaking. 5. She says, she told Rev. Mr. Able, a year ago, that she had seen Milly at Mathena's. Yet Mr. Elder sent to Rockport, Ia., to prove that Milly had been there, but did not go to Mathena's, where Miss Spinks had seen her, which was not so far! How did this happen? If Mr. Elder had believed that Miss Spinks had seen her at Mathena's would he not have sent to Mathena's to procure the desired evidence? There is something very suspicious about this testimony.

But there are some other witnesses from Rockport, Ia., who testify that a woman calling herself Milly McPherson, taught school in that neigh-

borhood about April, 1836. It is proper, however, to remark, that no one of those witnesses was acquainted with Milly McPherson in Kentucky. Of course, the only way in which they can identify her, is by describing her personal appearance and other circumstances. It is proper further to say, that there are very many persons of the name of McPherson in different parts of our country. Let us now see how far these witnesses identify her.

First. As to her personal appearance. It is admitted that the name of the woman in Indiana, or the name by which she chose to be known, was Milly McPherson.

It is also admitted, that her size and supposed age correspond with those of Milly. Her *complexion* does not correspond. All the witnesses in Indiana describe her as having a *dark complexion*; but her particular acquaintances in Kentucky say, she was *fair*. Mrs. Ray said, she had "a fair skin, a little freckled." Mrs. Whitehead said, "she was a fair skin woman, black or dark eyes, and black hair." Wm. McPherson, her brother, one of Mr. Elder's witnesses, said, she had "*fair skin*, black eyes, black hair." Her father said, she was fair. But Mr. Elder discovered that his own witnesses were going against him. The matter was immediately rectified. Several Nuns and others were introduced—all of whom were pretty confident that her complexion was dark. Wm. Wayne, one of Defendant's witnesses, said, "that Milly had a tolerable fair skin—much fairer than Miss Mattingly, the witness." Mrs. Fogle said, "she had a white skin, rather pale, some freckles, black eyes and black hair." Many were not a little amused to see Mrs. Sally McPherson introduced to correct

the mistake her husband had made in reference to the complexion of his sister. She thought, he did not know her complexion as well as she—that he had not been much in her company! But there are greater difficulties in the Indiana testimony, than this.

She told Jonathan Greathouse, that she was born and partly educated in Maryland—"that her father moved to Kentucky and settled near the Rolling Fork, before she was quite grown; at which place she remained till she finished her education." She told Margaret Dufree, "She was born in Maryland, near the Potomac River; that she lived in Montgomery, Kentucky, with her sister, before she came to this state—that she received her education in Maryland—that her father and mother were dead, and that they died in Maryland." She was asked by Defendant's counsel, "Did she not tell you, that she had no relations in Kentucky but the sister with whom she lived, after her father's death? Answer. I never heard her speak of any other but her sister." She told Sarah Greathouse, "she came from *about* Bardstown," she believes near the Rolling Fork—that she finished her education about Bardstown. She told Mary Ann Greathouse, "that she had lived about Bardstown, and got her education there also." These statements are sufficiently contradictory; but none of them are true of Milly McPherson. For,

1st. Her father and mother did not die in Maryland. 2d. She did not get her education there. 3d. She never did live about Bardstown, or get her education there. She lived near Lebanon, and her brother says, "she got the principal part of her education at the Nun-

nery in Union." 4th. She never did live in Montgomery, Ky., with a sister.

But there was one circumstance by which Mr. Elder expected to identify Milly. The woman in Indiana told some of the witnesses, she had sent to Louisville for a paint box, and paid five dollars for it; and John McPherson brought a paint box into Court, which he and his family said, belonged to Milly. Unfortunately for this testimony, the woman did not say, she *had left the box at her father's*. On the contrary, since she was teaching painting, she of course had her paint with her.

But the woman in Indiana was not known to the witnesses as a Roman Catholic; nor did she intimate that she had ever been in a Nunnery. And the witnesses agree that she seldom spoke of her parents—that she was reluctant to say any thing concerning them. Now one of three things is true, viz:

1. The woman in Indiana was not the true Milly McPherson, but another woman. 2. Or a woman was sent there by way of anticipation to personate Milly, and acted her part badly. 3. Or it was Milly. The second supposition is favored by the fact, that that woman, after teaching a short time, disappeared from that region, and since then cannot be found. Inquiry and scarch have been made for her, without discovering what has become of her. Besides, Mr. Elder has said, "When I shall need her, she shall appear, or her absence be satisfactorily accounted for."

But suppose it to be the true Milly McPherson; then three important facts are established:

1st. She was of sound mind and of good moral character. So the witnesses in Indiana declare.

2d. She was very anxious to avoid being know. The witnesses state, that she seldom spoke of her parents, and was unwilling to be questioned on that subject. Mrs. Sarah Greathouse said, "I did not hear her say any thing about her father's house. Question. Did she seem free to discourse about her father and mother? Answer. She did not. I never heard her mention their names, only as above stated." The following is Mary Ann Greathouse's testimony on this point: Question. Did she seem free to discourse about her father and mother, and why she had left them? Answer. No sir." Margaret Dufree testifies as follows: "Question. Did she not manifest considerable unwillingness to be questioned about her connections, and why she had left them? Answer. She did—I never asked her many questions; for she did not like to be questioned."

Now it is natural to enquire, why this unwillingness to give information of her past history? Why did she conceal the fact that she was a Roman Catholic, and had been a nun? If she was deranged, when she made the charges against Duparque, why did she not return to her friends and the church, after recovering her reason? Why has she never written to her parents or relations? Her conduct can be accounted for only on the supposition that she knew her charges to be true, and feared she might be pursued and injured. Rather than confess that she had slandered Duparque, she determined to forsake his church, and become during life an exile from her father's house. What better evidence could she give, that she had told the truth and nothing but the truth? If,

then, we admit that Mr. Elder has identified Milly, the evidence is decidedly against Duparque.

3. That Milly McPherson, after she reached Indiana, and had regained her senses, still made the same charges against Duparque. Miss Ann Spinks, the Nun, testified, that "she heard a story about the conduct of Mr. Duparque. I heard it a week or two after the meeting at which I saw Milly in Indiana; and and I heard it from Mrs. Mathena, when last at her house." Now if the testimony of Miss Spinks is to be relied on, Milly McPherson made the same charge against Duparque in Indiana, that she had made in Kentucky. And let it be remarked, Miss Spinks did not pretend to have heard from Mrs. Mathena, at whose house she represents Milly as having staid two or three weeks, that she betrayed any symptoms of derangement. So that, according to their own testimony, the priests have completely failed to account for her charges against Duparque, by proving her insane! Now, it will be recollected, that I proved, and they did not deny, that Milly McPherson's character for veracity was good. Thus did they make one part of their testimony murder the other. But I am yet unable to confide in any part of the testimony of Miss Spinks. It is likely enough that the same woman was at Mrs. Mathena's, who passed at Rockport as Milly McPherson; but that Milly McP. from Kentucky, was at either place, remains to be proved. I have good reason to doubt that Miss Spinks ever heard of Duparque's treatment of Milly from Mrs. Mathena. In either case, however, the evidence is against Duparque.

I have now examined the testimony on both sides concerning this strange occurrence; and I

fearlessly challenge even the most prejudiced to point to the fact that I have published, and which I have failed completely to establish. Was not the circumstance mysterious; and has Mr. Elder, according to promise, removed the mystery?

But I had additional evidence to prove that Duparque was a licentious character. And doubtless Mr. Elder was aware of this; for it is a remarkable fact, that he made no attempt to prove Duparque's general character good. It is true, that the law considers every man innocent, until he is proved guilty; but we did not suppose that Mr. Elder would allow his brother priest to stand before court with only that character which the law gives equally to every class of men, in preference to attempting to prove for him a better character by those who knew him. We did not attack his *general character*, simply because we knew many of his friends would swear that it was good, and we would not be allowed to invalidate their testimony by adducing *particular facts*. But if Mr. E. had attempted to prove his general character, we then would have proved the contrary by the introduction of such facts.

We labored to ascertain from Mr. Elder's witnesses, something in relation to Duparque's difficulties with the nuns in Lebanon. That they were very serious, we were confident; for zealous Romanists, who have taken the veil for life, would not for a trifle forsake the cloister and return to the world, as one or more of the nuns did; nor would the father of one of them, a Romanist, have manifested so much excitement against him for nothing. No information, however, could be obtained from the witnesses.

Miss Hamilton, a nun, was questioned on this point. She said, "Miss Spalding left the Nunnery before Duparque left Kentucky. She was the mother and principal teacher in the Nunnery in Lebanon. Question by Defendant. Did she not leave it because she was dissatisfied with the conduct of Duparque towards her? Answer. She was not satisfied when she left. He was not satisfied with her course. *There might have been many other reasons.*" Joseph Spalding, uncle of Miss Spalding, was asked, what induced her to leave the nunnery, whether it was not in consequence of Duparque's conduct towards her? He answered, "that he did not know *of his own knowledge.*" Duparque's friends were well aware that strong suspicions existed in the public mind, concerning the difficulty between Duparque and the Nuns. One would have supposed that Mr. Elder, who was so very anxious to vindicate the character of his brother priest and of Nunneries, would have embraced this opportunity to remove the mystery that hangs around that part of Duparque's conduct, especially when urged to do so by repeated questions. But the Nun and the uncle of Miss Spalding seemed very ignorant on the subject; and the public are left to conjecture the cause of a difficulty which caused much excitement at the time, and resulted in the entire abandonment of that institution. The unavoidable inference is, that the existing *suspensions* do less injury than the *truth* would do, if known. Such are the methods by which Mr. Elder sought to "place the accused in that eminence which his virtues had secured him in public estimation."

We proved by Daniel Everhart, a gentleman of high standing and not a member of any church, the following facts:—"That he was well acquainted with Duparque—knew him well—that in the month of July, 1831, he was in company with his father-in-law, Mr. Vaughn, who is now dead, who was also acquainted with Duparque, the plaintiff. They were riding by Calvary, about three o'clock in the afternoon; and when they had approached near a thicket that stood inside of the fence, to the right hand, his attention was called by Mr. Vaughn to the Plaintiff Duparque, whom he saw just emerging out of the thicket, in a position to see witness and Vaughn. He pulled out of his pocket a book and placed it in a position as though he was reading. When witness first saw him, (Plaintiff,) he was about 20, 30, may be 40, steps from me, and walked parallel with the course witness had come, but in a different direction from that in which witness was going. Vaughn remarked—"Let us ride on; and if we don't see a woman on the other side, I will get down and examine the thicket." They rode on, increasing their speed a little; and when they got to the corner of the fence, (the thicket coming up to the fence,) they turned down the lane, instead of pursuing the course they had intended to go. Having rode about one hundred or one hundred and fifty yards, so as to clear the thicket, and see on the other side opposite to where they had seen Duparque come out, they saw a woman, habited as a Nun, walking from the thicket, about one hundred yards from witness, about fifty or sixty yards from the edge of the thicket, walking in a usual gait, at an angle of about thirty-five degrees from the Nunnery. She was between

three and four hundred yards from the Nunnery. The thicket was thickly set with undergrowth—sufficiently so to make it a safe place of concealment. The woman was going rather towards the Nunnery, bearing to the right, at about the angle aforesaid. Duparque knew us, but did not speak.” Mr. Everhart drew a diagram representing the thicket, and the respective position of the parties, which I am not prepared to exhibit. Three Roman Catholic gentlemen were introduced, who stated that the enclosure, containing the thicket, had been used as a pasture, and that there was a small path running through it. The thicket, as Mr. Everhart stated, “at the place where he saw Duparque, was not very wide, thirty or forty yards.” I leave others to guess, if they can, why the Nun was at the thicket at that time of day, and how it happened that she and Duparque emerged from it at opposite sides, at the same time. She was not going directly to the Nunnery, but bearing to the right. Doubtless she and he reached the Nunnery from opposite directions. That he should pull out a book, when he saw the men, as if very devotional, was natural enough. It is to be presumed, Mr. Vaughn had seen similar occurrences before; and hence his suspicions were so quickly excited. It is proper to remark, that neither Mr. Everhart, nor his father-in-law was a professor of religion. One would suppose, that a man, concerning whom such things could be proved, should have been cautious about coming into court. Perhaps Mr. Elder was not aware that such circumstances existed in relation to his friend, or his zeal for the suit must have abated.

I had other evidence, as Mr. Elder knew, proving the criminality of Duparque; but he thought proper to let his friend, though a superintendant of two Nunneries, in which were taught two female schools, stand simply upon his *legal* character. That he was afraid of this point is manifest from another circumstance: At the September term of court, Mr. Elder's counsel filed an *amended declaration*, in which they sued me also for *oral* slander—that I had on a certain occasion, in my church, not only charged Duparque as in the publications on which the suit was founded, but had said, that he was “a debauched man.” Now I had never on any occasion, made such remarks; but I determined not to deny, but to prove them true. When they discovered this, they readily withdrew that part of the declaration. Why did they do so? Plainly because the way would be open for the admission of testimony which they desired to exclude! Was this by way of showing how much they desired to know the *truth*?

In view of the whole evidence, I ask what are we to think of priests and Nunneries? Duparque's character seems to have been about as good as the most of his brethren. At least they were willing to risk a law-suit in which the reputation of their establishments was staked upon his character. His nunneries, in which female schools were taught, were as free from suspicion as others; and those who patronize them, were far from suspecting them of immorality.

Under the circumstances may we not adopt the principle, *ex uno disce omnes*—from one learn the true character of all? The facts elicited by this suit, clearly prove what I have repeatedly

declared—that while Nunneries present the strongest temptation to vice, such are the facilities of concealment, that it is very difficult to detect it. But for this suit, the origin of which was, so far as human agency was concerned, perfectly accidental, the public might never have discovered the existence of such immorality and cruelty. And I assure the reader, that if a strict legal investigation were had concerning other Nunneries in Kentucky, and if persons who know facts would testify, the result would not probably be more to their credit. I am able to prove, were it necessary, that in one instance at least, a young lady who was a pupil in a Nunnery in Kentucky, was seduced while there. The fact is, it is impossible that Nunneries can exist, under their present arrangements, without the frequent occurrence of immorality; and when such conduct takes place, there is a powerful temptation to cruelty on the part of the priest. It is natural that he should feel unwilling to see a Nun return to the world toward whom he had acted improperly, lest perchance she should divulge the secret.

I have now presented the *legal* evidence in this case, for the consideration of the candid; and I cheerfully leave them to form their own opinion. The suit has cost much trouble as well as money; but I rejoice that it occurred, because of the good that has resulted and must yet result from it. I shall long remember with peculiar pleasure the interest which many friends have taken in my conflicts, and their faithful friendship even when their temporal interests might have induced them to pursue a dif-

ferent course. Towards Roman Catholics, I have no unkind feelings. I firmly believe that they are deceived, and that their deceivers are becoming the deceivers of others. And however I may desire their personal friendship, a sense of duty compels me to the course I am pursuing, even at the risk of losing it.

APPENDIX.

FURTHER EVIDENCE.

It will be recollected that Rev. John Wathen, a Roman priest, Mrs. Doyle, and William McPherson, Romanists, made statements in court, calculated to invalidate the testimony of Mrs. Whitehead. Mr. Wathen said, that when he was conversing with Milly McPherson, at St. Charles' church, she called up Mrs. Whitehead, who stated to him, that she had never heard Milly say any thing against Duparque. Mrs. Doyle stated, that she was at Mrs. Whitehead's house in the fall of 1832, and that Mrs. W. told her, Milly had been there in as crazy a fit as ever Peggy (her sister) was. Wm. McPherson said, he went to Mrs. Whitehead's soon after Milly had been there, and Mrs. W. told him, she had been there in a crazy fit. I have already given my reasons for discrediting this testimony. But as Mrs. W., in consequence of ill health, was not able to attend court, and had no opportunity to reply to these statements, I have, since writing the preceeding part of this volume, obtained her affidavit, which I now present to the reader.

State of Kentucky, }

Marion County. }

This day, Fanny Whitehead made oath before me, a justice of the peace for the county afore-

young ladies, I regard it as my duty to publish the letters, that parents may know their true character, especially since I have been charged with slandering them, when I have represented them as unworthy of confidence. The original letters are in my hands. For the present, I shall not publish the names of the writers, having no desire to increase their trouble in their prisons.

The first letter was written to Mr. Picot, when he was sent to Vincennes, in 1831, to succeed priest Champomair. Before I saw this letter, I had received one from a gentleman in Mississippi, dated February 27, 1837, informing me of certain facts relative to the Nunnery at Vincennes. The following is an extract of the letter:—

“I wish to put you in possession of a fact, which may answer as another example for “Old Elder” to establish the purity of Roman Catholic priests and nunneries. Several years ago a Roman Catholic priest, by the name of *Shampomair*, was stationed at Vincennes, Indiana; and by his influence a company of four or five Nuns were brought (if I mistake not) from Nazareth, Kentucky, to that place; where they soon became, as usual, school teachers. At one time they had the most flourishing female school in the state—many young ladies were sent to them from a distance. But owing to a single circumstance, it was at once almost totally broken up—all prudent parents took their children away.

“The priest, as we all know, had the supervision of the establishment; and as a matter of course, as is the custom with all priests, he had the privilege of visiting the Nuns when he pleased

and this you know he was often under the necessity of doing to hear their confessions.

“But this singular sociability between unmarried persons, nearly proved fatal to the cause of Catholicism in Vincennes.” * * *

The writer proceeds to state, that on account of certain facts, which, true or false, were believed, the priest and some of the Nuns thought it prudent to leave, or were removed. On receiving the letter, written by the Nun, I had no doubt it referred to the same occurrences, and that it fully confirmed the correctness of the statements of the gentleman from Mississippi. The letter is dated Nazareth, June 19, 1831, and is as follows:—

“*Rev. Mr. Picot*: In compliance with your desire to hear from us, when we should have reached our journey’s end, I will now endeavor to satisfy your request. It is true I have felt, ere this, some little remorse for not writing sooner; but as I was somewhat strange, though in my own country, and felt a little unsettled, I thought better to defer it to a later day. We arrived here on Saturday evening after we left Vincennes; having a pretty pleasant journey, except from Louisville—the road was very bad. *Rev’d. Mr. Reynolds* was here when we arrived; he received us with kindness, and expressed great satisfaction at seeing me once more at home.

“I did not see *F. David* until the next Tuesday after we got home. I went then to speak to him. He told me he had received my letters in due time, but that I had not opened any secret to him whatever—that he knew these things long before, and that he was not at all astonished

at any thing that had happened, from the experience of former years. I do not mention these things to excuse my own faults; neither have I any reason to regret the manifestations I then made, though at the time so repugnant to my feelings. But on the contrary, I would evidently have thought it a duty in me if I had supposed either the Bishop or F. David ignorant of them. Then let me entreat you, as the friend of virtue, not to let your mind be prejudiced by what is past, with regard to the little community now under your pastoral care. If some have had the misfortune to be implicated by them, all have not, to my certain knowledge; and I know that tattlers are never wanting in Indiana; more than elsewhere; and if you have the misfortune to listen to all the tales that may be brought you against sisters of charity, I fear your troubles are not yet at an end.

“But I hope your charity will be sufficient to support those whose little defects may be visible, instead of exposing them to public remark, as has been unfortunately too often the case;—but I do hope and pray, and have every reason to believe, that these times and trials are past forever.

“I trust you will pardon me these few remarks. They were not designed as a slur by any means, for you well know what has taken place in the congregation within these few years past, where the reputation of both parties has greatly diminished.” * * * *

It appears from this letter, that the Nun, whilst at Vincennes, had made some disclosures to Bishop David concerning certain practices in the Nunnery; and it would seem that the pre-

siding priest was implicated—else, why were complaints made to the Bishop, and not to him? But Bishop David, she says, was not at all surprised—“he knew these things long before; and he was not at all astonished at any thing that had happened, from the experience of former years.” He had had sufficient acquaintance with Nunneries for years past, to expect such evils to exist in them! Hence, though perfectly aware of their existence at Vincennes, he had made no effort to remove them.

What the precise nature of the disclosures were, she does not state; but the relating of them to the Bishop was very “*repugnant to her feelings.*” And indeed it is most probable that she was also implicated; for she says, “I do not mention these things *to excuse my own faults.*” Some of the facts, whatever they were, had, it appears, become public to the great discredit of “both parties.” This evidence comes from a source which renders its truth indubitable.

The next letter I shall present to the reader is dated at *St. Catherine's, August 28, 1825.* It is addressed to Rev. Mr. Champomair, then of Vincennes, by a Nun, who seems to have sustained some strange relations to the Rev. gentleman. The letter is as follows:—

“*Mon tres cher Pere:* I had the mortification of understanding from S. Harriet's that you had never received a line from me yet, which astonished me much at first; but when I reflected on the insignificance of my letter, I thought it rather a providential miscarriage. However, it has deprived me of the great satisfaction of received a few lines *de mon bon pere*, which is no small subject of regret for me. Do not think

my silence the effect of indifference for your person, or that the old proverb is now verified in me, that out of sight out of mind; or that my affections are now entirely drawn another way. No, *mon pere*: believe me not to be so versatile. You know my heart in your regard too well to think thus of me. You know it cost me much to part with a father of whom I was never weary of serving, and with whom I was more than willing to spend my days. And would I not have been a very ungrateful child had I hesitated a moment to alleviate, as far as in me lie, the distresses of a father that exhausted himself for me. I am not insensible of your multiplied favours, *mon tres cher pere*; and if I have not wherewith to reward your beneficence, God, who is the liberal rewarder of all good deeds, will satisfy you over and above. I know the only thing you require of me is, a grateful remembrance of your repeated favours; and be assured, *mon tres cher pere*, that no distance whatever—no change will ever cause me to let your past favours sink in oblivion. Ah! could I, fain would I be under the shadow of thy paternal care. But this is not the will of our dear and sovereign Lord. I have been a very great sinner—the most ungrateful of children—and here is the place that I am to satisfy for past misdemeanors. I find this place best calculated to humble a proud soul as I am. But, Oh! am I sure that I will profit by being on the throne of suffering? I fear very much the contrary. I am not that magnanimous soul that only lives to suffer. I am discouraged at every little difficulty.

All that I have had to encounter as yet ap-

peared to me as something too enormous for me. You know my weakness, dear Father. Pray much for me, that I may discharge every duty in the manner God requires.

Mon tres cher pere! When will you gratify my ardent desire of beholding your face. Oh! do come and see your sacred dog—if only to spend a few hours with her. Let me know when you will come, and I will try and have something pretty prepared for you. It was my only thought when I left you, if ever I had the means, to get my much esteemed father a nice coat, and send him, and so it is yet; but I fear you will be impatient waiting its arrival. At present our school is trifling—but little prospect of its being better. I am glad to hear that the Sisters have a plenty to do. At least it will free them from many temptations.

S. Bib joins me in love to you and ma mere. I have done my best to get her to write; but all in vain. She thinks the task too difficult; and I believe it would be greater than her health or strength. She has neither.

Adieu, *mon tres cher pere!* Pray much for your poor sacred dog, and favour her with a few lines; and rest assured you will never be forgotten by her.

With sincere affection,

Your unworthy child,

* * * *

“When I remember we are apart,

It's with a sad and heavy heart;—

And what makes this separation more severe,

A word from you I ne'er can hear.”

Comment is perhaps unnecessary upon the peculiarly affectionate style of this epistle. She

is particular to assure the priest that, though out of sight, he is not out of her mind—that her affections have not been drawn *another way*. It cost her much pain to part with one with whom she would have delighted to spend her days. Indeed, before closing, she becomes quite poetic.

“When I remember we are apart,” &c. But the degrading language she employs concerning herself is a most disgusting comment on the spirit of Nunneries. “O do come,” says the poor creature, “and see your *sacred dog*—pray much for *your poor sacred dog*.” We are accustomed to say, that in the heathen lands females are the *slaves* of men, and I have occasionally represented Nuns as the *slaves* of the priests; but I never ventured to call them their *dogs*! It was left for Popery to complete the degradation of the female sex, a work which, it would seem, Paganism had but *commenced*. I am not able, perhaps, to understand the precise import of the expression “sacred dog,” as exhibiting the relation of a Nun to her priest. It is an expression to which American ears are unaccustomed. Could any man but a Roman priest endure to have a woman thus crouching at his feet as a *dog*?

If Americans wish to have their daughters become the *sacred dogs* of Roman priests, let them send them to Nunneries. I know of no other schools in which such lessons are taught. Our daughters to be taught by the priests’ *sacred dogs*!!!

The next letter was written by the same Nun to the priest, after her return to his Nunnery. It is dated September 22, 1829, and is as follows:—

“Mon pere: As I felt anxious to see you paid, after waiting so long with us, I did all in my power to make the collection; but not succeeding in that, I have finally come to the conclusion of borrowing it, and have met with a friend that was disposed in my favour. It is perhaps the last that I shall ever have the happiness of presenting you with. Since you have found out the unknown blessing of my being removed from this place, I shall not give way to excessive grief on the occasion, but will do all in my power to procure you that favour again; and if you do not obtain it, it shall not be because I am wanting in my exertions to effect it. I am very far from wishing to stay with a confessor that avails himself of every provocation, real or imaginary, to express his aversion to my person, and his regret for my coming back. If I stay, it will be through compulsion; for I shall never feel happy with one in whom I can neither see the trait of friend, father nor protector. Then, perhaps, you will find that you were mistaken twice. If I wished the appellation of *wife, sweetheart* or *lovely dear*, as you scornfully told me I did, I certainly would take some means to gain them. As christians, we could have friendship without these extremes. Though I am resigned to be all alone and forlorn, my fate to bemoan, with many a heavy groan, to ever been born. He who made me, knows what is for my good; and as He permits it, He is also pleased that I should bend my neck to receive the humiliation with cheerfulness.

But I must confess we do not always do as we would that others do to us. Had I told you what has been said by more than forty persons about

you, as I have heard myself, though it was empty words, your feelings would have been more than mortified; and for that reason kept it to myself. A proof of my being more cautious in wounding you, than you were in wounding me.

Nevertheless, I am, for a short time,

Yours, with respect,

* * * *

N. B. I cannot help making one remark upon what you so often wish to remind us of, viz. that if you find us to be an incumbrance to you, why do you not send them where they will not have it in their power to incommode you? And if what we do for you and the church must be considered as a mere nought, why did you have your glazing done by the Sisters last summer, if it saved you nothing? You were certain it would save you at least \$100. And if you had to buy the soap and pay for the washing your church things, you would find that it would more than amount to the salary of four at the rate they wash such things in this town—50 cents per doz. But this shall not trouble me, if men try to make these appear as nothing. It is known to God, who will distribute to every one as he has merited.”

The poor creature had now obtained her heart's desire, and found herself once more “under the shadow of his paternal care;” but alas, how changed was her *tres cher pere*—her dear father. He now takes every opportunity to express his aversion to *her person*, and reproaches her for her attachment, as desiring the appellation of *wife, sweetheart, or lovely dear!* He had probably found other *sacred dogs*, and she was cast off. She was now perfectly wretched, and resolved not to remain in that

Nunnery, unless *compelled*. This proves that compulsion may be employed against those unhappy creatures, even in this country. She is now all alone and forlorn, bemoaning her unhappy fate, and vainly wishing she had never been born.

It appears that the priest had obtained from them a *tolerable* amount of labor; and he was disposed to have them think it a *privilege* to be his slaves, as well as his *sacred dogs*. Such is the purity, the liberty, and the happiness of Nunneries!

The following letter, addressed by another Nun to the same priest, affords another example of the *virtue* and *elevation of character* to be found in Nunneries.

Mon tres cher Pere, si j'ose me servir de cette expression.

Yes, I can, I am sure; for though I have not acted towards you the part of a grateful child, you have for me, I am persuaded, the bowels of the most tender father. I cannot express to you how great are the contending emotions which fill my breast. On one side, my heart is plunged in the most profound grief, considering that if in any point of conduct towards us, you have deviated from what was strictly becoming, it was entirely my fault, and that after all I have done what will cause you to be blamed as the one guilty; and on the other, it is filled with an unspeakable satisfaction, to find you so meek and humble and resigned to the consequences, be they what they may. If the same tenor of mind accompany you to the knee of your Bishop, I trust in God, the thing will die between you and come to the ears of no other. Pardon me,

my father, pardon me—I have not taken this step through malice, nor the remotest desire of giving you trouble. No, No—God, in whose presence I am, knows that I speak the truth; and could it be, that I should alone pass for the most impious and spare you the least censure, I would willingly do it. Your conduct fills me with amazement. How is it possible that you can tolerate my vile presence! How can you forbear kicking me out of your house! Your kindness on one side and my ingratitude on the other, break my heart. Though I am perfectly willing to terminate my exile in this place, yet if it will be more to your liking never to see the wretch, by whom you are so treated, ask for my removal; it will disgrace me, but I am disposed to be degraded in the mind of all mankind. Assured, yes well assured, that you have nothing on your heart against me, yet I cannot forbear imploring your pardon again and again.

* *

This Nun appears to be in great tribulation, because she had so divulged the conduct of the priest toward her, that the Bishop had heard of it. The gentleman had “deviated from what was *strictly becoming*” in his treatment of her; but the poor degraded creature is willing that all the blame shall attach to her. She is amazed at the *pious* spirit with which he bears his difficulty, and still more astonished that he does not *kick her out of his house!!!* She is now perfectly at his disposal. She is willing still to remain where she is; but if he does not wish to see her, he has only to ask for her removal; and however disgraceful it may be, she is ready to go. Such is the *purity* of Nunneries and such

the *elevation* of female character in them! Such are those who propose to educate our daughters!

I presume that every unprejudiced mind, after examining the evidence I have adduced, will be perfectly satisfied that the celibacy of the Roman clergy and the establishment of Nunneries produce the evils we would naturally expect. Is there a Christian, a philanthropist, or a patriot who, after looking at their true character, can conscientiously lend his assistance to the multiplication of such establishments?—Establishments which, instead of elevating the female sex to that standard in society which properly belongs to them, makes them the “*sacred dogs*” of Roman priests, crouching at their feet, and thankful that they are not kicked out of their houses!!! Are these the institutions in which our daughters are to receive their training? No—had the people of this country been acquainted with the true character of priests and Nuns, they would have been the last persons to whom the education of their daughters would have been committed. And there can be no doubt, that the disclosures recently made concerning them, will induce the intelligent community generally to withdraw their patronage from Nunneries.

PROSELYTING IN ROMAN SCHOOLS.

In a preceding part of this volume, I promised to give two instances in which Roman priests contrary to their promises repeatedly and publicly made, did receive into their church two small boys, without the knowledge and contrary to the wishes of their parents. The name of one of these boys was James Noland. He was the adopted son of Mrs. Minis, now dead, who was an exemplary member of the Baptist church, and very decidedly opposed to Popery. She sent her adopted son to St. Mary's College, near Lebanon. After he had remained there, perhaps twelve months, she ascertained, to her surprise and grief, that her son had been actually received into the Roman church. She, likewise, ascertained, that although funds had been left with the Superior, his clothes and his person had been shamefully neglected. She immediately removed him from the College, and placed him in a school at that time under my charge, where he remained till she could send him to South Hanover, a Presbyterian College. This fact I published in the seventh number of the *Western Protestant*: President Elder, in a letter to me, which is contained in the preceding part of this volume, declared his belief that what I had published was "substantially false." In the following number of the *Protestant*, I gave the names, which had been omitted in the first statement. And in the ninth number, I published another similar fact, as follows:—

"Dr. Henry Riley, with whom we are intimately acquainted, a gentleman whose veracity

none who know him will ever question, makes the following statement concerning himself. When a boy, he was sent to Georgetown College. This College, like other Roman institutions, professes not to proselyte. Dr. Riley says, "Previous to my leaving home, my mother gave me a small Bible, with the hope that I would make a good use of it. But her hopes were all in vain—for on reaching the College our trunks were subjected to a rigid inspection, and every thing removed beyond our control, except such books or things as they, in their wisdom, saw fit to intrust us with. Several of my books I never afterwards saw—what became of them is better known to others than to me. But it may be said, the works were of a demoralizing character. They were such as a solicitous parent had given me, and one was what God had given to a ruined world for its salvation. I occasionally saw one of those books in the hands of a novice, and though I recognized it as mine, I dared not whisper that it was. Should this fall into the hands of any now at the College, and should they find stowed away in some dark dusty corner, a small gilt-edged, morocco-bound, diamond type Bible, with the subscriber's name in it, their predecessors shall receive my forgiveness for having shut out the light from my own mind for the time being, if they will place it for perusal in the hands of any deluded Protestant child now in the College."

Having removed the word of God out of his reach, these blind guides so succeeded in their object as to induce this boy to join the church; and he was for years a bigotted Papist, and for a time, designed preparing for the priesthood.

If in ordinary cases **Romanists** are more cautious in their operations than in these two instances; it is very certain that they often are equally successful.

To these facts, President Elder, in his *Handbill*, made the following reply:—

“To affect our institutions, which seems to be a main object with Mr. Rice, he tells you that Catholics inculcate their peculiar tenets, notwithstanding fair pledges to the contrary. Of this general conclusion he gives the evidence of two cases—the one of a James Noland; the other of a Dr. Henry Riley. Logically, the cases prove no general principle, if they were true. What to say of Dr. Riley, I know not; but I have sent for information. Of James Noland Mr. Rice tells us, that his mother was a *Baptist*: but she was a *Catholic*, whose dying request was to Mrs. Minis, as she told me, to take that child and raise him a Catholic; and Mr. A. Lowry, her son, so instructed the gentlemen at St. Mary’s, when he left the boy there.

In other circumstances of that case, Mr. Rice has plainly misled his readers. Mrs. Minis, in assigning to me her reasons for not sending back the youth to St. Mary’s, mentioned no other than her displeasure in witnessing how much his instructors had neglected his *personal* comforts—she certainly said nothing of his religious training. I imagine that she preserved all her former respect for his dying mother’s request.

Having in the mean time received a letter from the President of Georgetown College, he published in the close of the Handbill the following postscript:—

"P. S. Since I wrote the above appeal, I have received a letter from the President of Georgetown College, in answer to my inquiries concerning "Dr. Henry Riley's" case. It turns out to be very different from what the Western Protestant made it; which shows how true is the old adage—"one story is true till another is told." Here are extracts from President Mulledy's letter.

'Henry, whilst here, became a convert—he was apparently very pious; but I have since learned from some who were then his companions, that he was a consummate hypocrite, and very immoral.

As to his books being taken from him—that is all nonsense. It has never been the custom of this College to take the Bible from Protestant students, and there are now 30 or 40 Protestant students in the College, most of whom have their Bible. It may be that Henry Riley, in the fervor of his conversion, gave up his Protestant Bible, and took a Catholic one. He was certainly not compelled to it.'

The W. Protestant makes the Doctor say, that he studied to be a priest. *This* President Mulledy flatly denies in these words: "I never knew he was designed for priestly orders—this must be a fabrication of his own." Which is the more evident, as the Dr. did not remain at the College longer than a few months.

Thus it appears that even Mr. Rice's individual and isolated cases are 'substantially false,' as I suspected, and if true, they would prove nothing.

I dislike to name individuals; but if Mr. Rice

drags them before the public, I must inquire about them, and relate what I hear.

G. A. M. ELDER.

BARDSTOWN, KY. *July 2, 1836.*

To these remarks of Mr. Elder, I published the following reply in the Western Protestant extra.

“We have said that Romanists, though they profess not to influence the religious principles of Protestant children, in fact do it. This we have proved, by a letter written by bishop Flaget, by the assertion of the Annals De Propaganda, and by two examples in which they have received Protestant children into the church without the knowledge or consent of their parents. How does Mr. Elder dispose of these? The first is the case of James Noland, adopted son of Mrs. Minis. Mr. Elder admits that he was received into the church; but he justifies the course pursued, by saying, that his mother was a Catholic; that her dying request was to Mrs. Minis, as she told him, to take that child and raise him a Catholic; and that Mr. A. Lowry, her son, so instructed the gentlemen at St. Mary’s. Now we are authorized to say, that there is not a word of truth in all this. Mr. Lowry positively denies ever having given such instructions. Mrs. Minis, as he states, and as she informed others in Bardstown, never saw James’ mother. She took him, an orphan, from the Asylum in Natchez, simply because she was pleased with his countenance, and probably thought that he resembled a son she had lost. It is impossible, therefore, that she or Mr. Lowry could have made any such statement. Indeed

it is most unlikely that a Protestant lady—one who assuredly has no predilections for Popery—would take a child under a promise to raise him a Papist. Would any one believe me if I were to affirm that a certain Catholic lady had promised to raise a child a Presbyterian?

Mrs. Minis told us and her friends in Bardtown, as we are ready to prove, that she removed him from that institution, because he had been taken into the church, not at his voluntary request, but by the directions of his teachers, without her knowledge and contrary to her wishes. True, she also expressed her displeasure 'in witnessing how much his instructors had neglected his *personal comforts*.' And where is James Noland now? Is Mrs. Minis raising him a Catholic according to his mother's dying request? He is at South Hanover, a *Presbyterian* College—a fact affording decisive evidence that no such request was ever made. If we believe Mr. Elder, we must suppose that she is now violating a most solemn promise made to a dying mother! How does Mr. Elder now look?—The second example was that of Dr. Henry Riley. Mr. Elder does not venture to deny that his parents were Protestants; and he is informed by the President, that 'Henry, whilst here, became a convert—he was apparently very pious.' It is then fairly admitted, that he, a *boy*, was received into the church without the consent of his parents. But the President has since learned from some of his companions, 'that he was a consummate hypocrite and very immoral.' It is of no consequence whether he was or was not a hypocrite; the fact is proved that the clergy of that College, though pledged

not to influence his religious principles, did make a convert of him and received him into the church. The President, however, denies that his Bible was taken from him. We prefer to believe Dr. Riley's statement, because we know that the gentlemen of the College have in this instance violated their promise, and now they have a motive to do a similar thing again; and because we have more than once learned similar facts from others. But it is of little moment, whether they took his Bible in order to his conversion, or first deluded him and then took it.

Mr. Elder says, 'The Western Protestant makes the Doctor say, that he studied to be a priest. *This* President Mulledy flatly denies.' The Western Protestant makes him say no such thing, as any one can see by consulting our 9th No. which contains all we have said of him. We said, that 'he was for years a bigotted Papist, and for a time, *designed* preparing for the priesthood.' Is this saying, that he *did* study to be a priest? Mr. Elder says, he was at College only 'a few months.' This, if true, only proves that Papists make converts in their schools faster than we had supposed.

Here are two examples, showing how much confidence can be placed in those pledges so frequently made by Papists. But Mr. Elder says, 'If true, they would prove nothing.' That is, if it is true that Papists, in their treatment of children confided to their care, violate their solemn pledges, it proves nothing!!"

Accompanying these remarks was the following certificate from Mr. A. J. Lowry, to whom Mr. Elder had appealed:—

BARDSTOWN, KY. *July 6th, 1836.*

Rev. N. L. RICE:

In answer to your inquiry respecting my having requested the President or Superior of St. Mary's Seminary, to educate James Noland a Catholic, or that it was the dying request of his mother that he should be raised a Catholic, I can say, that I never made any such request of the Superior; nor did I ever hear from any source that it was his mother's dying request to have him educated a Catholic. He was taken by my mother from the Orphan Asylum at Natchez—his parents having both died with the yellow fever, a year or two previous.

Yours respectfully,

A. J. LOWRY.

Mr. Elder now found himself in an awkward predicament. President Mulledy's letter confirmed what I had stated concerning Henry Riley, and Mr. Lowry's certificate flatly contradicted what he had said of James Noland. Anxious to extricate himself from his difficulties, he soon after this published a Pamphlet, in which he made the following statements, accompanied with certificates:—

"FELLOW CITIZENS:

You have seen my handbill and Mr. Rice's Extra. You perceive we are yet at issue on the case of James Noland. You are aware that Mr. Rice has stated, and frequently insisted that at our schools we profess not to meddle with the religion of our pupils; and yet we violate our pledges. In proof whereof he adduced the baptism of James Noland, at St. Mary's Seminary; an event which he says was contrary to the *wish and expectation* of his parents.

I denied this to be the fact; first because I well know that things of this kind are not done in Catholic schools: secondly, because I had evidence that this special case was not a *violation* of our general principles.

But as some of my friends were not a little astonished to find my testimony set aside by Mr. Lowry's certificate, and felt afraid that I had acted unadvisedly, you will please now to hear my evidence. Here is the certificate of Mr. Minnis; which, you will see, unfolds the sentiments of Mrs. Minnis, now deceased:

‘I do hereby certify, that when we sent James Noland to St. Mary's Seminary, Mrs. Minnis had no other expectation than that he should be raised a Catholic; and, let me add, it was my expectation, and my *wish*. C. B. MINNIS.

To the same effect the following:—

‘Having been called on to state what I know respecting James Noland, when placed at St. Mary's Seminary—I am authorised to say that Mrs. Maher did instruct the Rev. Geo. A. M. Elder to have him brought up in the Catholic faith.
PHILIP MAHER.’

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE, August 13th, 1836.

REV. SIR: Having been requested by you to give some explanation relative to James Noland, formerly a student in this Institution, I willingly send you the following matter-of-fact statement:

About three years ago, James Noland was brought to this College. The President being absent at that time, it devolved upon me to receive any information which Mr. A. Lowry, the gentleman who presented the boy, might think

proper to give. His communication to me left on my mind the strongest conviction—1st, that J. Noland was born of Catholic parents—2d. that he was not baptized; and that we were directed, or at least authorized to baptize him. In consequence of this conviction, I informed the President, on his return, that the boy was to be instructed and prepared for baptism. Accordingly he attended the usual preparatory catechism, and was baptized in due time. It is now three years since his admission in this Institution, and nearly two since his departure: and yet, during that time, no reproach or observation has been addressed to us, by the persons who act as his guardians, as if their intention had been acted against or misunderstood.

I am, Rev. Sir, respectfully yours,

TH. E. LEGOUAIS.

To the Rev. G. ELDER.

Whether Mr. Lowry actually conveyed such a notion, or not, it is certain the Rev. Mr. Legouais received such an impression. But it seems to me most probable that Mr. Lowry really conveyed the sentiment, being a liberal man and a friend to our institutions, but has since forgotten his conversation. Neither of these gentlemen is capable of falsehood.

Can any one now doubt whether we felt authorized to instruct and baptize James Noland? Mr. Minnis tells me they did not know, but they had supposed Noland's parents to have been Catholics; and that, for that reason, he and his wife had ever inclined to raise him to that faith; which naturally led me to think that it was his dying mother's request. Let me tell Mr. Rice that

he did not know half so well as we do, the persons whom he has ventured to drag before the public; and that as often as he brings up cases of this kind, he must be foiled, because he is laboring against truth. And let him know, that I challenge him to prove a single instance of our violating our pledges to Protestant parents.

In relation to Mr. Maher's certificate, allow me to inform you that he gives it for his wife, who is the daughter of Mrs. Minnis; who is well known for her filial piety and therefore cannot be suspected with having advised me contrary to her mother's *wish*.

The public will also please to remember, once for all, that my ascribing the conversation of Mrs. Maher to her mother, does not at all effect the question at issue between me and Mr. Rice: to wit, whether the gentlemen of St. Mary's acted *advisedly* in the case of James Noland. I have proved that they did. But I must add, as another conclusive evidence of the same, that the same James Noland has already been ordered to St. Joseph's College with another ward of Mr. Minnis. Poor evidence indeed of any violence done to his *wish* in the case! And you may rest assured, fellow-citizens, that in every case which it may please Mr. Rice to bring forward, he must fail; for we are faithful to our pledges."

In the fifteenth number of the Protestant, we gave the following exposure of Mr. Elder's assertions, to which he has never ventured a reply:—

"We shall, first, examine what Mr. Elder has to say of James Noland. He says, 'some of my friends were not a little astonished to find my testimony set aside by Mr. Lowry's certificate.'

Perhaps they will be still more astonished to find it now set aside by Mr. Elder himself, and by Mr. Minis, who certifies for him. In his late handbill we find the following declaration: 'Of James Noland Mr. Rice tells us, that his mother was a *Baptist*; but she was a *Catholic*, whose dying request was to Mrs. Minnis, *as she told me*, to take that child and raise him a Catholic.'—The whole of this positive assertion Mr. Elder is now compelled to admit to be untrue. He confesses that Mrs. Minis told him no such a thing; but he now says, that he ascribed the conversation of Mrs. Maher to her mother.' Well, did Mrs. Maher tell him that Noland's mother was a Catholic? She did not; for Mr. Minnis says, '*that they did not know*, but had *supposed* Noland's parents to have been Catholics.' How could Mrs. Maher tell him what she *did* not know? What now becomes of the tale about his mother's dying request to Mrs. Minis? Why it is all a *fiction* of Mr. Elder's. It is not pretended that Mrs. Minnis ever saw Noland's mother. The difficulty, then, is not that Mr. Elder 'ascribed the conversation of Mrs. Maher to her mother;' but that he positively asserted, that Mrs. Minnis told him what he now confesses that *no one ever told him!* A gentleman caught in such a predicament, should, one would think, be very modest about charging others with falsehood. We would certainly be cautious in committing the education of youth to a man, who could in so short a time fabricate such a tale as this. If it is *forgetfulness* in Mr. Elder, his memory is too frail to have so important a charge: he should retire.

But let us examine his certificates. The first is that of Mr. Minnis, at which his friends are much surprised. It is as follows:—

‘I do hereby certify, that when we sent James Noland to St. Mary’s Seminary, Mrs. Minnis had no other expectation than that he should be raised a Catholic; and, let me add, it was my expectation and my *wish*. G. B. MINNIS.’

Well, does Mr. Minnis say that Mrs. Minnis *directed* that the boy should be baptized? No. Does he say that he, or any one else gave such directions? No—but he says, ‘Mrs. Minnis had no other expectations than that he should be raised a Catholic’—and it was *his wish*. That Mr. Minnis, being a Roman Catholic, should wish James Noland raised in that faith, is not surprising; but Mrs. Minnis, who, as Mr. Elder well knows, had the strongest aversion to Popery, took him from an asylum at Natchez; and he was under her control. This Mr. Elder knew, and therefore in his handbill he professed to have baptised James by *her* direction. But that Mrs. Minnis was disappointed, grieved, and much displeased at the conduct of the Faculty of St. Mary’s in baptizing, or at all influencing him in his religious principles, and that this was her principal reason for removing him, is proved beyond the possibility of a doubt, by the following certificate. It is furnished by individuals whose high standing is known, and with whom Mrs. Minnis was very intimate; and they could not have been mistaken, as she repeatedly conversed with them on the subject.

BARDSTOWN, *August 18th*, 1836.

Rev. N. L. RICE,

SIR: In answer to your inquiries, we can state that we have *repeatedly* heard Mrs. Minnis speak on the subject of James Noland being taken into the Catholic church at St. Mary's Seminary; and she always stated, it was done *without her knowledge, and against her wish*; and that it was the principal reason that she took him from that institution, although she had another objection, that of his personal comfort.

CATHERINE BURKE,
BARBARA HYNES,
RUTH V. BROWN.

In addition to what the certificate contains, we are authorized to say, that Mrs. Minnis, in conversation with Mr. Elder, did express great dissatisfaction at the reception of James into the church. Could Mr. Elder have forgotten this?

The next certificate produced by Mr. Elder, is that of Mr. Maher for Mrs. Maher. It is as follows:—

‘Having been called on to state what I know respecting James Noland, when placed at St. Mary's Seminary—I am authorised to say that Mrs. Maher did instruct the Rev. Geo. A. M. Elder to have him brought up in the Catholic faith.

PHILIP MAHER.”

Does this certificate say, that Mrs. Minnis either directed or wished James baptized? If Mrs. Maher had known that her mother wished it, doubtless she would have said so. But Mrs. Maher, her daughter, directed Mr. Elder.—Does he mean to say, that James was under her

control? Surely not. Did he, then, feel authorised to take so important a step on such grounds? This makes the matter worse; for Mrs. Maher is herself a Roman Catholic, who, to the grief of her mother, was brought under that influence at Nazareth, one of the institutions that professes not to influence the religious principles of the pupils. They grieve the heart of a pious mother by misleading one child; and then, by the direction of that one, convert another! This is doing things *systematically*. Mrs. Minnis, in common with many others, often expressed her deep regret that she had ever patronized a Roman school.

The only other certificate is that of Th. E. Legouais. It is as follows:

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE, *Aug. 13th, 1836.*

REV. SIR:

Having been requested by you to give some explanations relative to James Noland, formerly a student in this institution, I willingly send you the following matter-of-fact statement.

About three years ago, James Noland was brought to this College. The President being absent at that time, it devolved upon me to receive any information which Mr. A. Lowry, the gentleman who presented the boy, might think proper to give. His communication to me left on my mind the strongest conviction—1st, that J. Noland was born of Catholic parents—2d, that he was not baptized, and that we were directed, or at least authorized to baptize him. In consequence of this conviction, I informed the President, on his return, that the boy was to be instructed and prepared for bap-

tism. Accordingly he attended the usual preparatory catechism, and was baptized in due time. It is now three years since his admission in this institution, and nearly two since his departure: and yet, during that time no reproach or observation has been addressed to us, by the persons who act as his guardians, as if their intention had been acted against or misunderstood. I am, Rev. Sir, respectfully yours,

TH. E. LEGOUAIS.

To the Rev. G. ELDER.

There are a few things relating to this certificate, which are certainly remarkable.

1. It is given by a *Jesuit* professor of St. Mary's College—the very man who, more than any other, is implicated in this affair. The very man who stands charged with the crime, is brought in as a witness! Will Mr. Elder allow a similar proceeding in the famous suit he has brought? Is this man a *disinterested* witness? His own character, the credit of his institution, and the interests of his church, are concerned.

2. This certificate flatly contradicts the positive declaration of Mr. A. J. Lowry, who asserts that he never gave such directions concerning James. Mr. Lowry is a man whose character is known to be above reproach; he is not a member of any church, and has no possible interest in making the statement he has made, unless it be true. Whose testimony should we believe? In any court of justice that of Mr. Lowry would be taken, and the other rejected. The following is Mr. Lowry's certificate:—

BARDSTOWN, KY. *July 6th, 1836.*

REV. N. L. RICE.

In answer to your inquiry respecting my having requested the President or Superior of St. Mary's Seminary, to educate James Noland a Catholic, or that it was the dying request of his mother that he should be raised a Catholic, I can say, that I never made any such request of the Superior; nor did I ever hear from any source that it was his mother's dying request to have him educated a Catholic. He was taken by my mother from the Orphan Asylum, at Natchez—his parents having both died with the yellow fever, a year or two previous.

Yours respectfully,

A. J. LOWRY.

3. This Mr. Legouais the other day proposed to Mr. Lowry the following Jesuitical trick: Mr. Lowry had certified that he gave the Superior no directions to baptize James. This is all true, said the Jesuit; but you can now certify, that though you did not so direct the *Superior*, who was from home, you did direct *me* to tell him! We give the substance, not the words. Can we put confidence in such a man? This is Jesuitism to the life?

4. Mr. Minnis' statement proves the certificate false. Mr. Legouais says, the communication of Mr. Lowry 'left on my mind the strongest conviction—1st That J. Noland was born of Catholic parents; 2d That he was not baptized,' &c. Mr. Minnis states, that it is not known whether his parents were or were not Roman Catholics. How, then, could Mr. Lowry have told Legouais that they were? But even supposing it probable

that they were Romanists; it is not yet known whether he was, or was not, baptized. How could Mr. Lowry have told him that he was not baptized? The Jesuit, therefore, testifies that Mr. Lowry told him what he did not know, and what, it is confessed, is not yet known! Does Mr. Elder expect sensible men to believe such a certificate?

5. Mr. Elder asserted as positively that Mrs. Minnis told him that James' mother was a Catholic, and that her dying request was that he should be raised a Catholic, as Mr. Legouais asserts that Mr. Lowry told him. Mr. Elder now confesses that this assertion was utterly unfounded and untrue. What evidence have we, that this Jesuit has a better memory, or better morals, than Mr. Elder?

Mr. Elder manifestly saw the difficulty in which he and his friend are involved, and feared they would not be believed; for in his Appendix he says, 'He (the candid reader) will, then, in the case of the Rev. Mr. Legouais, Mr. Lowry, and myself, conclude that what each of us has stated, is the candid declaration of what we *remember*.' Mr. Elder certainly did not *remember* what he stated; for he admits, that neither Mrs. Minnis, nor any one else, ever made the statement to him. It is curious for men to *remember* what never happened! Mr. Legouais is in the same predicament. But Mr. Elder is determined to frighten us into a belief at least of his *integrity*. He says, "I do not hesitate to say, that whoever doubts the *integrity* of any of us, is a malignant man." The public cannot be trusted to form their own opinion. Mr. Elder publishes beforehand his condemnation of the man who

does not think as he directs. "He that is first in his cause, *seemeth* just; but his neighbor cometh and *searcheth* him." Prov. 18: 17.

In addition to the evidence already given, the admitted fact that James Noland was removed from St. Mary's by Mrs. Minnis, as soon as she learned that he had been baptized, and placed in South Hanover, a *Presbyterian* College, where he has ever since remained, proves decidedly that Mrs. Minis was unwilling to have him raised a Papist. But Mr. Elder asserts, as "conclusive evidence" in his favor, "that James Noland has already been ordered to St. Joseph's College." Already! That is, according to the statement of Legouais, nearly *two years* after leaving St. Mary's! Why was he not ordered to St. Joseph's College immediately after leaving St. Mary's! Was he sent to South Hanover to be raised a Catholic? Was he committed to the instruction of that "trained band of ruthless revilers," as Mr. Elder in his characteristic *good humor*, calls Presbyterians, to learn to be a Papist? Already! Does he mean, that James Noland has been ordered to St. Joseph's so soon after Mrs. Minis' death? He was not ordered to St. Joseph's *during her life*! But she has scarcely been a *month* in her grave, when President Elder boasts that her son is "*already* ordered to St. Joseph's College!" Disgraceful boast!

We now cheerfully leave this whole matter to the decision of a candid public. We shall not prescribe to them what opinion they shall form, or threaten to pronounce them "*militant*," if they do not decide in this or that particular way. We have no fears on the subject.

I have published these two examples of proselyting in Roman schools, not because they are singular, but because they were *denied* and then *proved*. Such violations of their pledges more frequently occur, if I mistake not, in their female schools. And were I to seek for them, I could state and prove many similar facts. Let those parents who desire to preserve pure the moral and religious principles of their children, never place them in Roman schools, male or female.

*Entered, according to the Act of Congress, in the
year 1837,*

BY REV. N. L. RICE,

*In the Clerk's office, for the District Court of
Kentucky.*

[illegible]

b8906385560

b89063855696a

89063855696



B89063855696A