

THE LORD'S DAY—

OR MAN'S?

BV 130

.S7

MISSION : { DR. SUNDERLAND.
DR. CROFFUT.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Chap.

BV 130

Shelf

.S7

PRESENTED BY

W. a. Croffut

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

“AND THE LORD SPAKE UNTO MOSES SAYING, * * * WHOSOEVER DOETH ANY WORK IN THE SABBATH DAY, HE SHALL SURELY BE PUT TO DEATH.”—*Exodus xxxi, 15.*

“ONE MAN ESTEEMETH ONE DAY ABOVE ANOTHER; ANOTHER ESTEEMETH EVERY DAY ALIKE. LET EVERY MAN BE FULLY PERSUADED IN HIS OWN MIND.”—*Paul.*

“EVERY YEAR, EVEN AS I SPEAK, RELIGIOUS MEN ARE PUT IN JAIL IN KENTUCKY, VIRGINIA, AND THE CAROLINAS FOR KEEPING SATURDAY INSTEAD OF SUNDAY.”—*Rev. Mr. Hickox, Baptist.*

THE LORD'S DAY— OR MAN'S?

A PUBLIC DISCUSSION

BETWEEN

BYRON SUNDERLAND, D. D.

AND

W. A. CROFFUT, PH. D.

AT WASHINGTON, D. C., AS REPORTED IN THE WASHINGTON
DAILY POST FROM JANUARY 27 TO
APRIL 17, 1896.

(WITH SUNDRY RECENT POEMS.)

TRUTH SEEKER COMPANY,
28 LAFAYETTE PLACE, NEW YORK.

1897

11

W

WRITINGS OF W. A. CROFFUT.

HISTORY OF CONNECTICUT DURING THE REBELLION. 891 pages; plates 58. Price \$5. Ledyard Bill, New York, Publisher, 1869.

HELPING HAND FOR AMERICAN HOMES. Introduction by Horace Greeley. 821 pages; 117 illustrations. Price \$4. Wilstach & Co., Cincinnati, Publishers, 1870.

BOURBON BALLADS; HUMOROUS POLITICAL SONGS. 100 pages. N. Y. Tribune, 1881. Second edition. 10 cents. 15196

DESERET, OR A SAINT'S AFFLICTIONS. An opera. Music by Dudley Buck. First produced in Brooklyn, N. Y., 1880.

A MIDSUMMER LARK (verse). Henry Holt & Co., Publishers, 1883. (Leisure Hour Series, No. 150.) Pp. 270. Price \$1.25.

THE VANDERBILTS AND THE STORY OF THEIR FORTUNE. Belford, Clarke & Co., Publishers. Pp. 325. Price \$1.50.

THE PROPHECY, AND OTHER POEMS. Lovell Bros., New York, publishers. 180 pages. Price 50 cents.

THE LORD'S DAY—OR MAN'S? The Truth Seeker, New York, Publisher. 152 pages. Price 25 cents.

WASHINGTON, D. C.
GIBSON BROS., PRINTERS AND BOOKBINDERS.
1897.



ag-17-44-M

A WORD EXPLANATORY.

It was in the first months of 1896 that Dr. Byron Sunderland and I became mixed up in this amicable discussion. We were old friends and on receiving his challenge I recalled how gallantly he had fought for freedom to think and to speak when his pro-slavery church sought to muzzle him during the early days of the rebellion. How this verbal duel began and ended is made obvious in the following pages—the letters of Dr. Sunderland and my own here reprinted verbatim from the Washington Daily Post. It is pleasant to add that our cordial friendship suffered no interruption throughout an exchange of views which disclosed antipodal differences, and that the discussion served to reveal very attractively Dr. Sunderland's manly honesty and gentle and genial tolerance.

A debate which is chiefly contentious and disputatious seldom serves to illuminate a subject or to change an opinion, but it seems to me that the cause of truth may often be promoted by a friendly discussion in which the parties, while sincerely seeking to impress upon the reader what they believe to be the facts in the case, treat each other with mutual consideration and respect. It

may be added that no man is qualified to discuss any question unless his conclusions are in such a fluid state that he is willing to change them in accordance with evidence and to adopt new conclusions without flinching. As Dr. Sunderland says in letter No. X, "Wherever the truth leads, there every true man will follow." A corollary of this proposition is that to attain the highest results no belief should be held to be sacred and no tradition should be considered equal to testimony. In seeking correct conclusions, we should profit by the injunction of Thomas Jefferson :

"You must lay aside all prejudice on both sides, and neither believe nor reject anything because any other person rejected or believed it. Your own reason is the oracle, and you are answerable not for the rightness, but for the uprightness of its decision."

In utter confidence, therefore, I send this booklet forth, indifferent as to whether Dr. Sunderland or I be deemed to have the better of this particular argument, but hoping that thought will be so stimulated that justice will at last prevail, when no citizen shall be required to worship or to pay the expenses of others' worship, and when every day of the week shall be solemnly dedicated to the service of man.

W. A. CROFFUT.

WASHINGTON, D. C.,
140 B st., N. E.

INTRODUCTION BY COLONEL INGERSOLL.

This discussion about the sacredness of Sunday will certainly do good. The readers will find that Christians have no evidence even tending to show that the first day of the week was ever sanctified by any pretended Jewish god, or by Christ or any of his apostles. They will find that the Rev. Dr. Sunderland relies on quibbles, inferences, dodges, evasions, subterfuges, and assertions—that he has been driven to the pit and pushed in, and that he lost not only his cause, but his candor. They will also find that Dr. Croffut has stated his case with clearness, and defended his statements with facts, so that it is impossible for any sensible man to read this discussion without seeing and admitting that the Rev. Dr. Sunderland was overmatched and overwhelmed.

But I must admit that the reverend gentleman was honest. Nothing but sincerity could place such implicit reliance on absurdity. How is it possible for a space of time to be holy? Can time be moral or immoral? Can it be vicious or virtuous? Can one hour, or one day, be better than another? Can we divide the days into sacred and profane? Christians tell us that Jehovah made the seventh day sacred, because on that day he rested from his labor. According to them he had worked for six days, during which he created the universe. This resting of Jehovah is the first reason given in the Bible for the sacredness of the seventh day.

Is this a good reason? We now know that Jehovah did not create the world in six days. Even Christians admit this, and say that the word "days" should have been translated "periods"—unmeasured spaces of time. If Jehovah rested on the seventh "period," how did that affect the seventh day? Undoubtedly the writer of Genesis believed that Jehovah commenced work on Monday morning, did his best for six days, and then took a rest; and he thought that men ought to follow the example set by God. Christians now admit that the writer of Genesis was mistaken about the six days, but still insist on the sacredness of the seventh day.

We now know that Jehovah did not create the world—that he had nothing to do with it, and that he did not rest on the seventh day or the seventh "period." We now know that matter, substance, is eternal—that it never was created and that it can never be destroyed. This being so, the first reason given for the sacredness of the Sabbath—of the seventh day—is left without any foundation. It makes no difference what men have said—what they believe—what has been written—about the sacredness of the seventh day; the first reason given is absurd and idiotic.

But there is another reason given in the Bible. The Sabbath is declared to be holy because on that day Jehovah delivered the children of Israel from the Egyptians. Is this a good reason? In the first place, is it true that the Hebrews were delivered from Egyptian bondage?

According to the Bible the Jews were in Egypt at least two hundred and fifteen years—that is to say, for about seven generations. The Jews and Egyptians lived to-

gether—slaves and masters—for all this time. It is certain that they talked to each other; and if they did, the Jews must have learned something of the language of the Egyptians, and the Egyptians must have known something of Hebrew. In this way, new words would have been added to the language of each people. But we are now assured by the best Hebrew scholars that no Egyptian word, or word of Egyptian origin, is found in Hebrew. So, it is claimed by philologists that no Hebrew words have been found in Egyptian records. This being so, it is absolutely certain that the Hebrews were never slaves in Egypt, and that the whole story of the bondage and deliverance is a pure myth.

The second reason for the sacredness of the seventh day has no foundation in fact.

The truth is that the Jews got their idea of the Sabbath from the Babylonians, as well as the stories of Creation—Adam and Eve—the forbidden fruit—the expulsion from Eden, and the Flood,—all these things came from Babylon. In my judgment, the Pentateuch was written, or at least put into form, after the Captivity,—and many superstitions that they had learned from the Babylonians were added. The Jews were, undoubtedly, impressed with the grandeur and power of their conquerors—with their education and wealth—and adopted many of their myths and legends. Unless we believe in the Babylonian gods, we have no divine sanction for the seventh day. We are compelled to rely on reason and to decide the question without supernatural aid.

In the New Testament no great regard is expressed for the seventh day. A man asked Christ what he should do to inherit eternal life, and Christ told him to obey the

commandments. The man asked him, which? Christ told him the ones he must obey, but said not a word about keeping the Sabbath. On several occasions Christ scandalized the pious Jews by violating the sacred day.

But if it can be established that the Old Testament is inspired, and that the seventh day was sanctified by Jehovah, how is it that Christians pay no regard to the seventh day? By what authority has the first day of the week been substituted for the seventh? God did not rest on the first day. That is the day he began to work. Neither is it pretended that God delivered the Jews from the Egyptians on the first day—that was on the seventh, according to the Bible.

When was the change made? There is no evidence, so far as I know, that Christ or his early disciples changed the day from the seventh to the first. The day seems to have been designated by Constantine. He named the first day, because that day was, and had been for many ages, sacred to the Sun. It was a Pagan holy-day, and for that reason was adopted by the Christians.

As a matter of fact, Christianity borrowed everything it has. It borrowed the biography of Christ—all its dogmas and all its ceremonies and symbols. There is nothing original in "our religion."

Nothing can be more idiotic than the belief that Sunday is sacred, and that labor is profane. Nothing can be more idiotic than the belief that pleasure is sinful.

Work is worship, labor is prayer, and happiness is the answer. Looking sad, feeling mournful, folding the hands of idleness, sitting in the shadow, thinking about death, listening to orthodox sermons—to descriptions of

the eternal prison—is an insane way of spending one-seventh of our lives. Every sensible man should do what he can to destroy the Sunday-superstition—to take the “sacred” day from the myth called God and give it back to the people.

All Christians who are trying to get God and his oldest son into the Constitution—who are trying to keep the Sabbath sacred by law, trying to prevent the running of boats and cars on Sunday, trying to abolish bloomers and bicycles, picnics and excursions—all these Christians are the enemies of liberty. They are egotistical and ignorant, superstitious and malignant, narrow, shriveled, tyrannical, impudent, and pious. They have no conception of human rights. They regard the universe as an absolute monarchy. God, their God, is the King. They are his agents and the people are slaves. These agents are overbearing, meddlesome, meek, and malicious. They are never as happy as when writing rules and making laws for their neighbors. To see a man in jail for having worked on Sunday fills them with holy joy. They think that their God has been vindicated and the devil rebuked. If they could close the mouths of unbelievers, burn the books of real philosophers, and stop the intellectual progress of mankind their faces would become as much too short as they are now too long.

Death to superstition!

Down with bigotry!

R. G. INGERSOLL.

FOR A STRICTER SUNDAY.

On December 9, 1895, the Churchman's League of Washington, D. C., consisting of orthodox ministers, met in Willard Hall to formulate legislation for a stricter religious observance of Sunday in the District of Columbia; Rev. Dr. Elliott, Episcopalian, presided, and speeches in favor of the movement were made by Rev. W. H. Brooks, Dr. Mackay-Smith, Mr. Charles Lyman, Rev. Dr. Domer, Judge Kimball, Rev. Dr. Radcliff, Rev. W. P. Young, and Rev. G. F. Williams. A committee was appointed to draft a bill punishing Sabbath-breaking, and to urge its passage by Congress.

(From the Washington Post, Jan. 27, 1896.)

AGAINST A STRICTER SUNDAY.

The Washington Secular League, at its assembly room, yesterday afternoon, passed the following resolution, introduced by Mr. D. Webster Groh:

Whereas Hon. Elijah A. Morse has introduced, as proposed legislation for the District of Columbia, a bill avowedly "to protect the first day of the week;" and

Whereas days, unlike persons and property, can neither be kidnapped, starved, injured, robbed, oppressed, nor demolished, and have neither health, wealth, nor morals to protect; and

Whereas "the Lord's day, set apart by general consent in accordance with Divine appointment as a day of rest and worship," if there be any such day so set apart, must necessarily be a religious day; and

Whereas the toiling masses of the United States feel

that more holidays rather than holy days would promote the general welfare ; and

Whereas the constitutional injunction, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion," strictly forbids legislation enjoining religious observances: therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secular League of Washington, and the subscribers hereto, most solemnly protest against the passage of House bill No. 167 as violative of the fundamental law, destructive of personal liberty, subversive of the rights of the people, and tending to transform our republic into a theocracy.

[While this discussion of Sunday observance was proceeding, *i. e.*, on March 11, 1896, a public hearing was had before the Judiciary Committee of thirteen members of the House of Representatives (Hon. Mr. Ray, of New York, chairman) of the proposed joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States, by inserting in the first lines of the preamble the words, "acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all power and authority in civil government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the ruler of nations, and His revealed will as of supreme authority in civil affairs." In favor of it were heard Rev. H. H. George, Rev. W. H. Hubbard, Rev. W. J. Coleman, Rev. H. A. Vale, Rev. J. R. Cole, Rev. David M'Allister, and Rev. Dr. Stockton ; and against it Samuel P. Putnam, F. B. Woodbury, Rev. A. H. Lewis, Rev. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Rev. Mr. Abraham, Gen. Wm. Birney, and W. A. Croffut. The opponents of the amendment occupied an hour and the advocates of it two and a half hours. The speeches were reported verbatim and published in a Congressional document of forty-two royal octavo pages. The Judiciary Committee unanimously decided against the amendment.]

DR. SUNDERLAND REPLIES TO THE SECULAR LEAGUE.

EDITOR POST: Referring to the resolutions of the Washington Secular League, printed in your issue of this morning, may I have a word through your columns with those gentlemen, not in the spirit of controversy, but as members of society, who wish in every way practicable to promote the welfare of their fellow-men?

Let me put a case to them. Suppose a man sincerely believes that God's command to "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy" is binding on himself and on society, and that if the command is obeyed a great good will result to the community, should he not desire to see that good accomplished and avail himself of every lawful means to secure its accomplishment? And if the "Christian Sabbath" can be protected in any measure by a law of Congress, what is the objection to it? Let us see.

1. It is described as "the first day of the week" and also as "Sunday." These are the terms in common use to distinguish it from the Saturday or Jewish Sabbath, but the Scripture title is "the Sabbath," which signifies rest or rest-day—and is now always the seventh day of the week and not the first day.

2. Time is an abstraction with nothing about it to protect. Why, then, are Independence, Labor, and other days legalized by law?

3. The Lord's day must necessarily be a religious day, therefore legislation concerning it is unconstitutional.

Answer—The Constitution explicitly recognizes it under the term “Sunday,” as a *dies non*, or a day not to be reckoned among the secular days of the week when ordinary business may be performed. Can legislation for that which the Constitution explicitly recognizes be regarded unconstitutional?

4. The toiling masses need more holidays and less holy days. Answer—So they thought in the French Revolution, and they cut off three-tenths of the yearly Sabbaths. But it did not last long. They found that God is wiser than man. The Sabbath is the only national holy day, while there are already several holidays, and there is a difference of opinion about what the toiling masses need—not what they may chance to want, but what they must have for their highest good.

5. The Constitution strictly forbids legislation enjoining religious observances. This is denied. It is a false construction of the language of the Constitution, which only forbids establishing by law “a union of church and state”—taking that phrase in its historic sense—nor did the authors of the Constitution so regard it, as is seen from all the state papers and legislation of that period. The position now taken by the Secular League is a clear departure from the construction of the fathers of the republic, and from their practice under the provisions of the Constitution.

6. To denounce proper legislation for the protection of the Sabbath “as violative of the fundamental law, destructive of personal liberty, subversive of the rights of the people, and tending to transform our republic into a theocracy” is virtually to condemn the opinion and work of the great men who formulated and founded

our republican government and institutions. They held to no such doctrine. It is the afterthought of those who reject Christianity as the basis of our national stability and prosperity. It is an abandonment of all religious conviction and all sense of responsibility to the God of nations.

If our people are ready for this they will, of course, succeed in transferring the character of our government and laws from a religious to an irreligious basis, and then history will repeat itself, adding another instance to the warnings of the past.

7. "The District needs no special laws for any special days." Let us, then, abolish the legislation for the existing holidays and take the nation into atheism *simon pure*, but, as Bobby Burns has admonished us,

An atheist's laugh's a poor exchange
For Deity offended.

B. SUNDERLAND.

DR. CROFFUT REPLIES TO DR. SUNDERLAND.

EDITOR POST: As a member of the Secular League I voted for the resolutions of remonstrance against the establishment of a Puritan Sunday in Washington, and am interested in the protest against those resolutions uttered by my friend, Dr. Byron Sunderland, in your paper. In the manifestation of your usual liberality and impartiality, give me a little space for a reply:

1. The Doctor thinks everybody ought to be compelled to "keep" Sunday—that is, to abstain from work and play on the first day of the week—because the

Bible says, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." And then he goes on to explain that "the Sabbath" is not Sunday at all! He says that Sunday is "the first day of the week," and that "the Sabbath * * * is now always the seventh day of the week and not the first day." In other words, the Doctor thinks that man ought to keep holy the first day of each week, because he has been solemnly commanded to keep holy the seventh day of each week. And then, forgetting the distinction which he has just carefully made, he immediately goes on to say that "the Sabbath is the only national holy day." Is there any respectful way to deal with such utter carelessness in the use of language?

2. Who authorized the substitution of Sunday for Saturday? The Bible did not. Who did? Nobody knows. All that we know is that Constantine, the bloody-handed propagandist of Christianity, having three months before deliberately murdered his sister and his son, presided over the great Christian Council of Nice, and there promulgated the edict making holy "the Venerable day of the Sun." The next important event in the history of Sunday is that Henry VIII, after divorcing two of his wives and killing two more, declared himself the head of the Protestant Church, and put forth a royal command that the English race should always thereafter keep Sunday as a holy day.

3. The holy day has had a hard gauntlet to run. Jesus was denounced as a Sabbath-breaker. Paul refused to insist on the Sabbath being kept. Justin Martyr said, "There is no need of a Sabbath since Jesus Christ." The most distinguished founders of the Christian Church—Ireneus, Clement, Origen, Tertullian—

opposed its observance. Luther repudiated it as a holy day. William Penn said: "To call any day of the week a Christian Sabbath is not Christian, but Jewish. Give me one scripture for it, and I will give you two against it." When John Knox visited Calvin on Sunday afternoon he found him with some companions rolling tenpins. The observance of Sunday was opposed by John Milton, Baxter, Paley, Jeremy Taylor, and Archbishop Whately.

Then what right has Dr. Sunderland or Congress to impose religious observances, either positive or negative, on people who favor and have ordained perfect freedom of thought on the subject of religion and whose Constitution explicitly commands that "Congress shall make no law concerning the establishment of religion"?

W. A. CROFFUT.

DR. SUNDERLAND'S REJOINDER.

EDITOR POST: Now as to my friend Croffut:

1. He is a sterling joker, witty and wise, and I do think he might have spared me on the tenpins of Calvin, since we have enough to cope with in his "five points." Friend Croffut is a poet and a master of language in things he comprehends, but he is evidently not up in the modern literature of the Sabbath question. He regales us with some very old chestnuts that have long been masticated to staleness, and which I pass over as irrelevant to the present issue.

2. He plays, as many do, a logomachy on the words "Sunday," "Sabbath," "first day of the week," "seventh

day of the week," etc., and then soberly asks, "Is there any respectful way to deal with such utter carelessness in the use of language?" I frankly answer him, I know of none, remembering, all the while, that it is his "carelessness" and not mine. I have read his poems with deep interest, and I know he would not deliberately hurt my feelings, as I certainly would not his, but he is evidently not aware of vital distinctions which the student of the Sabbath question from a Bible standpoint must recognize. Through this inadvertence he represents me as saying that "Sunday is the first day of the week and that the Sabbath is now always the seventh day of the week and not the first day, and that it is the only national holy day." Of course, he garbles what I did say, leaving out the explanatory clauses of my statement, and so makes a caricature. We make a distinction between the Jewish week and the Christian week, and when I said "the Sabbath is now always the seventh day of the week and not the first day," I had reference to the Christian week and not the Jewish.

3. My friend Croffut asks, "what right we have to impose religious observances, either positive or negative, on people who favor and have obtained perfect freedom of thought on the subject of religion." I answer, the same right that these same people exercised when they formulated their Sabbath and Sunday laws—the right of a majority to establish a rest day for man and beast by law. Nor did they construe this as an imposition of religious observance on anybody. I answer again, the right which the Government had to suppress polygamy in Mormondom—the right which State and municipal authorities have to close the saloons on Sunday—mean-

ing by that the Christian Sabbath. Perfect freedom of religious thought is one thing ; protecting a day of rest and prayer is quite another.

B. SUNDERLAND.

CROFFUT REPLIES TO SUNDERLAND.

EDITOR *Post*: In his reply to some remarks of mine which the *Post* kindly published, my eloquent friend, Rev. Dr. Sunderland, has fully marshaled the reasons which move him to favor a law to compel everybody to keep, as a day of rest and worship Sunday, which he courageously calls "the seventh day of the Christian week." I cannot better show proper appreciation of the kindly things which he says of me, and of the strength of the reasons which he adduces to support his position, than by resting my plea for keeping Sunday as a secular holiday on the argument which he makes against it.

W. A. CROFFUT.

OTHERS TAKE A HAND.

At this date, February 5, several others came into the discussion : on the side of less liberty, Rev. Dr. Elliott, Rev. Mr. Crafts, and Dr. Butler ; and against greater restriction, Mr. J. H. West, Mr. D. Webster Groh, Mr. W. E. H. Smart, Mr. F. B. Woodbury, Mr. Samuel P. Putnam, President of the American Secular Union, and Major Maurice Pechin, President of the Secular League. From Mr. West's letter may be quoted the following vigorous paragraph :

“ Dr. Sunderland says that he still has the horrors of the French Revolution on his mind. That is really too bad; it is scarcely to be expected that, with such a nightmare disturbing him, he can ever gain courage to look at the horrors that produced that revolution, chief among which was that infamous union of church and state for which he seems to be contending. Who sows the wind shall reap the whirlwind.

“ It was once the fashion in England and in Europe generally, among monarchists and clergymen, to point to the French Revolution as a ‘warning’ against republicanism in politics and rationalism in religion, but this old scarecrow has been generally kept in the cellar since truer histories of that revolt against despotism were written. That revolution was, indeed, a warning that despotic kingly and clerical rule cannot produce a nation fit for republicanism or rationalism. The most fanatical leaders of that revolt (I do not question their virtue, character, or sincerity) were educated by clergymen. Marat was of a Calvinist family, and it was Robespierre, trained by priests, who exclaimed: ‘If God did not exist, we should have to invent him.’ It was Robespierre, too, who presided at the Fête de l’Etre Suprême, in 1794, when, in the name of the republic, the existence of a God was proclaimed. If this is the awful warning to which the Doctor alludes, let him pass it along to those of his clerical brethren who, in this country, are seeking to imitate Robespierre.”

(Monday, February 15.)

SUNDAY LAWS NOW IN FORCE.

EDITOR POST: The *Post* has been very liberal to give so much of its valuable space to a consideration of the Sunday question, and I would not re-enter the discus-

sion except with the hope of ending it, or, at any rate, of shortening it. The parties to the discussion seem to me to misunderstand each other—the cause of many controversies. The Rev. Dr. Sunderland seems to think that the Secular League wants to abolish all Sunday observance, and some of his critics appear to imagine that he wishes to persecute them. Both parties are certainly mistaken. The gentle-minded pastor of the First Church would not wantonly violate anybody's rights, and the Secular League clings to Sunday for rest and renovation quite as tenaciously as he.

What is the cause of the difference, then ?

Obviously all this bother has been created by an attempt to induce Congress to pass a bill to define and regulate the Sunday conduct of the people of the District of Columbia, that bill reading as following :

A bill to protect the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest and worship in the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That on the first day of the week, known as the Lord's Day, set apart by general consent in accordance with divine appointment as a day of rest and worship, it shall be unlawful to perform any labor, except works of necessity and mercy and work by those who religiously observe Saturday, if performed in such a way as not to involve or disturb others ; also to open places of business or traffic, except in the case of drug stores for the dispensing of medicines ; also to make contracts or transact other commercial business ; also to engage in noisy amusements or amusements for gain, or entertainments for which admittance fees are charged ; also to perform any court service, except in connection with arrests of criminals and service of process to prevent fraud.

Sec. 2. That the penalty for violating any provision of this act shall be a fine of not less than ten dollars for the first offense ; for second or subsequent offenses, a fine not exceeding fifty dollars and imprisonment for not less than ten nor more than thirty days, and one year's forfeiture of license, if any is held by the offender or his employer.

Sec. 3. That this act shall take effect upon its passage.

To this it has been objected (reasonably, it seems to me) that—

1. The first day of the week is not (generally) "known as the Lord's day." It is known as Sunday. In the ten thousand calendars and almanacs printed this year, many of them ecclesiastical, it is probably not "known as the Lord's day" on a single one. Sunday is its legal name. Sunday is its popular name. Dr. Sunderland himself calls it "Sunday" a thousand times where he calls it "the Lord's day" once.

2. It is not and never was set apart "by divine appointment." The Bible thus set apart Saturday as a day of rest ; but Sunday was especially dedicated to labor, for it seems to have been the day when God first began to work, and on that single day He created the heavens and the earth.

3. It is far from expedient to commit to police courts the question what are "works of necessity and mercy," and who "religiously" observe Saturday. Does Dr. Sunderland believe it would promote justice? The men who work hardest on Sunday are the ministers ; yet not only is their work to be permitted and encouraged, but the labor of livery-stable keepers, car conductors, brakemen, carriage drivers, and engine stokers in the power-

houses is to be called "a work of necessity," because they carry people to church. There is in this bill no definition of "necessity" or "mercy," and the police justice would be left to define both. In other words, he would have to be a legislator, as well as judge, and make the law which he would be called on to enforce. What is "necessity"? Is the Sunday-morning milkman a necessity? Is the Sunday-morning newsboy a necessity? Are cooling drinks a necessity—soda, at the drug stores, for instance? Are ice-cream restaurants a necessity? Is it necessary for a man to drive his family or his neighbors into the suburbs on Sunday afternoons, as most men who can afford it now do? Are steam railroads a necessity? Are telegraphs a necessity? Is it necessary to take a Sunday spin on the bicycle? Does not Dr. Sunderland see that so vague a law would necessarily be a foolish and iniquitous law—that it would assume as many forms as there are police justices, or perhaps policemen?

4. The end of section 2 is a vicious provision, that any employer—a livery-stable keeper, for instance—shall forfeit his valuable license if one of his men, during his absence (at church, maybe) lets a buggy for a drive into the country. This is certainly monstrous.

But suppose Dr. Sunderland really thinks that this bill is wisely drawn, and that such a law is needed? My sufficient reply is that such a law is already on our statute books, and this should put an end to the discussion. A law much severer than this, yet not too severe to be enforced, exists at this moment unrepealed among the laws which govern the District of Columbia, and its purpose is "to protect the Sabbath." That law is not too

familiar, perhaps, for you to quote it here once more. It is to be found in the laws of the province of Maryland, compiled by Kilty, passed during the September session of the Assembly, 1723, chapter xvi of those acts. When the District was organized these laws were adopted to thenceforward govern the people of Washington until repealed by Congress. Here is the section of chapter xvi :

And be it enacted that no person whatsoever shall work or do any bodily labor on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, and that no person, having children, servants, or slaves shall command or wittingly or willingly suffer any of them to do any manner of work or labor on the Lord's day (works of necessity and charity always excepted), nor shall suffer or permit any children, servants, or slaves to profane the Lord's day by gaming, fishing, fowling, hunting, or unlawful pastimes or recreations ; and that every person transgressing this act, and being thereof convicted by the oath of one sufficient witness or confession of the party before a single magistrate, shall forfeit two hundred pounds of tobacco, to be levied and applied as aforesaid.

This law, I repeat, is a part of the statutes of Maryland which were vitalized and made a part of our laws when the District of Columbia was organized, and it can be enforced now, by any judge wishing to enforce it, as well as it could ever be. I beg to call Dr. Sunderland's attention to the fact that 200 pounds of tobacco are worth much more than \$10, and that this superior penalty should be more likely to exact obedience.

It is also worth while to notice that, while the proposed new law says that Sunday is "known as the Lord's day," this old law, still in force, says that the Lord's day

is "commonly called Sunday." Brother Sunderland will doubtless insist that this old law is obsolete. I admit that it has not been enforced much lately, but that is distinctly the fault of those who insist that just such a law is sadly needed. Why has it fallen into disuse if it is really required for the peace of the community? It has, I believe, never been declared not in force, and it is a part of a code of laws, some of which, enacted by the same Assembly the same year, are enforced every week in Washington. While this stringent law is on our statute books unrepealed, I do not expect any sober-minded man to insist upon the passage of another law whose provisions are included within it. Dr. Sunderland, I am sure, will not enlist in any such puerile effort.

This old chapter xvi of the statutes has still further value, for it contains another section making it quite unnecessary to put God and Jesus Christ into the Constitution. I quote the explicit provision from Kilty:

Be it enacted by the right honorable, the Lord Proprietor, by and with the advice and consent of his lordship's Governor, and the upper and lower Houses of Assembly, and the authority of the same:

That if any person shall hereafter, within this province, wittingly, maliciously, and advisedly, by writing or speaking, blaspheme or curse God, or deny our Saviour, Jesus Christ, to be the Son of God, or shall deny the Holy Trinity, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or the Godhead of any of the Three Persons, or the unity of the Godhead, or shall utter any profane words concerning the Holy Trinity, or any of the Persons thereof, and shall be thereof convicted by verdict or confession, shall for the first offense be bored through the tongue and fined twenty pounds sterling to the Lord Proprietor, to be applied to the use of the County where the offense

shall be committed, to be levied on the offender's body, goods, and chattels, lands or tenements, and in case the said fine cannot be levied, the offender to suffer six months' imprisonment without bail or mainprise; and that for the second offense, the offender being thereof convict as aforesaid, shall be stigmatized by burning on the forehead with the letter B, and fined forty pounds sterling to the Lord Proprietor, to be applied and levied as aforesaid, and in case the same cannot be levied, the offender shall suffer twelve months' imprisonment, without bail or mainprise; and that for the third offense, the offender being convict, as aforesaid, shall suffer death without benefit of the clergy.

This old law is still unrepealed, still operative, so far as I know—that is, having the power of enforcement. It seems to have gone asleep of late years, encouraged thereto by the somnolence of the church, and is suffering from atrophy, like the tail of a rabbit. But a proper show of zeal would renew its usefulness. If it were to be enforced, obviously all of our estimable friends of the Unitarian Church would be going about with holes bored through their tongues and the letter "B" branded on their foreheads, if, indeed, they had not committed three times the doleful offense for which John Calvin and his friends burned Servetus and, in committing it, joined the great army of martyrs.

Now, Dr. Sunderland is sincere and candid, and he speaks without reserve; will he kindly tell us what he wants of another law, which is in spirit and purpose exactly like a law already among the statutes by which we are governed, and as accessible to the public courts as the law against drunkenness and fast driving, if there is anybody who wants to enforce it?

W. A. CROFFUT.

(Wednesday, February 24.)

DR. SUNDERLAND EXAMINES THE CONCLUSIONS OF DR. CROFFUT.

EDITOR POST: I welcome the article of Dr. Croffut in your issue of recent date, stamped as it is with its evident candor and sincerity. First of all, I wish him to know that I had never seen the bill now before Congress, and knew nothing of its provisions, till I read them as embodied in his article.

He has very fairly stated his objections to the bill becoming a law, as follows:

1. A wrong designation of the day.
2. It was never set apart by divine appointment.
3. The ambiguity of the qualifying phrase, "work of necessity and mercy," and of the word "religiously."
4. The severity of the penalty.
5. Sufficient law already exists.

In his comments on the bill Dr. Croffut, by his frequent reference to me, would seem to be under the impression that I may be the father of the bill, or at least have known the manner of its preparation and presentation in Congress. I can assure him I know nothing of the circumstances, or who drew the bill, or who presented it in Congress, or what provisions it contained. The resolutions of the Secular League were the first notice of it that I saw, and I have all along been discussing the subject on general principles, and not at all with reference to this particular bill. So I am as free to criticise it as Dr. Croffut himself.

1. I agree with him in his first objection, but differ

probably as to the proper designation of the day. I would have the title read :

A bill to protect the Sabbath, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest and worship in the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted, &c., That on the Sabbath, or Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, divinely designated as a day of rest and worship, &c.

2. I differ with him as to the Bible authority of the day. He says, "it never was set apart by divine appointment." I would change this phraseology, and say it was divinely designated as the Sabbath—and that is, for all practical purposes, equivalent to affirming its divine appointment. Dr. Croffut holds, if I understand him, that there is no Bible authority for treating the day as a Sabbath. I hold just the opposite view—that there is Bible authority for so treating it. On this point I doubt not we differ honestly, but still we differ, and differ widely.

He says, "the Bible thus set apart Saturday as a day of rest, but Sunday was especially dedicated to labor, for it seems to have been the day when God first began to work, and on that single day He created the heavens and the earth." Here is the whole matter in a nutshell. This is the *pons asinorum* of all anti-Sabbatarianism. It is the merest assumption—there is not a vestige of proof in the whole Bible that the creation week and the Jewish week are identical. I challenge any one to show from the Scriptures that the Sabbath mentioned in Ex. xvi. 23 is the calendar successor of that mentioned in Gen. ii. 2, 3. Where in the Bible is it said that God set apart Saturday as a day of rest? Or where in the Bible is it said that God began his work on Sunday? Challenges

to produce Bible texts for this or that are easy. Let the Secularists and Second Adventists produce a text from the Bible identifying the Jewish with the creation week.

Resort is had to Ex. xx. 8–11 for the sake of identification, but there is not a syllable of it which intimates or implies that the Sabbath of Ex. xvi. 23 is the calendar successor of that in Gen. ii. 2–3. It is simply *exempli gratia*, signifying that as God's week was seven days, so ours must be—that as He worked six days, so must we—that as He rested the seventh day of His week, so must we rest the seventh day of our week—that as He sanctified the seventh day of His week, so we must sanctify the seventh day of our week. But not a word is said nor a hint given as to the calendar succession—and no man can prove it from the Bible. Hence it is mere assumption to say God began His work on Sunday, and Saturday was set apart as a Sabbath. It may have been so, or it may not, and it is no consequence either way. And that is the reason for the silence of the Bible in reference to it. All that we find in the Bible on this subject shows the permanence of the Sabbatic institution as designed for all dispensations and generations; but there is no calendar succession of weeks from the creation down to Christ's advent shown anywhere in the Scriptures. Hence there is no proof that the creation Sabbath, the Jewish Sabbath, and the Christian Sabbath are identical.

3. The ambiguity and vagueness of the qualifying terms, "religious," and "necessity," and "mercy." Dr. Croffut takes exception here and specifies a great variety of personal acts, each of which must be judged upon its

own premises. He deems it inexpedient to commit this judgment to police courts. But it must rest somewhere, and if there is not sufficient safeguard for the protection of the accused, I would add the privilege of jury and the right of appeal. This is all that can be done for any individual rights in any case under our system of government.

Besides, if I understand him, Dr. Croffut assents to the existing law, or, at least, does not call for its repeal, and the existing law retains the clause objected to, in these words: "works of necessity and charity always excepted." If he assents to this in the old law, why should he object to it in the new?

Again, he claims that in the pending bill "there is no definition of the phrase 'necessity or mercy,' that the magistrate would be left to define both; this would make him both legislator and judge; compel him to make as well as administer the law." If this is sound reasoning, it is just as applicable to the existing law, which I understand Dr. Croffut to accept. Why make "fish of one and fowl of the other"?

4. Dr. Croffut objects to the severity of the penalty, and I agree with him. I think the suspension of license should be left to the discretion of the court, and not made mandatory.

5. Dr. Croffut objects to the pending bill on the ground that a severer law already exists. I do not see why, from his standpoint, he should be content with a severer law when it is proposed to put in its place a milder one. It is true the 200 pounds of tobacco is a strong inducement for retaining the old law, but as it is in some other respects somewhat out of date, "a back

number, as it were," not quite up to our changed conditions and appliances of civilization, I would be willing to forego the tobacco for the sake of a milder law, more clearly suited to the demands of the age and the various interests of our complex society. I think this old law should be repealed and a new law be substituted for it.

6. Dr. Croffut has unearthed an old colonial law of Maryland promulgated under the auspices of the papal church and bearing strong features of resemblance to the acts of the Inquisition of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, which forms the text of a brief sermon ending with the burying of Servetus by Calvin and his friends. It is sufficient here to say that, by the papal authorities of Vienna, Servetus had already been condemned to suffer death by fire. Escaping doom at Vienna by the aid of friends, he confronted Calvin at Geneva, and in the course of the proceedings he demanded that Calvin should be imprisoned and tried, the prosecution to continue until he or Calvin should be sentenced to suffer death or some other punishment. It was life for life between the two. In the end Servetus was condemned and burned. With Calvin it was self-preservation, and not a voice in Europe was raised against him for his part in the tragedy till more than half a century afterward. I call my friend's attention to this little bit of history. It was the spirit of those times fostered by the policy of Rome. We now live in a Bible age and note distinctions better fitted to our needs.

But of this old Maryland law for the punishment of heretics I have but one opinion. It surely does not now reflect the Christian sentiment of the world, and whatever may have been its uses in times past, it is no longer

fit to stand in American legislation. My friend Croffut asks me if I want another law in addition to those already existing, and I frankly tell him yes; not only for the reasons already given, but for the additional reason that I wish the two laws he has recited wiped out from the statute books, as they are already obsolete *sub silentio*, by "the silent practice of the courts."

Permit me to add that I have not been made aware of any effort among the churches of Washington to give the slightest support to the movement in Congress; and the only article I have seen in favor of a Sunday law was in *The Post* recently by Mr. Fitzgerald, a very sensible article, and he a member of an alien church. If our moral and Christian people take no more interest in the matter than they are evincing now, it will not be surprising if the opponents of Sabbath legislation in Congress, who are very much alive on the subject, do not carry the day and succeed in preventing any Congressional action. I have often been astonished at the apparent apathy of our ministers and churches whenever any question of this kind is before the public.

B. SUNDERLAND.

A CHALLENGE FROM DR. SUNDERLAND.

By this time the discussion had assumed formidable proportions. Some scores of letters on both sides of the question were banked up on the table of the managing editor of *The Post*, Mr. Scott C. Bone, and for them he could find no room. To escape from the dilemma and at the same time to give adequate hearing

on a question that excited lively interest, he permitted a continuance of the discussion under conditions outlined in the editorial columns of *The Post* as follows :

(From the *Washington Daily Post*, Feb. 19, 1896.)

The Post yesterday gave space to another communication on "The Sunday Question," from Rev. Byron Sunderland, D. D., of the First Presbyterian Church, in reply to the article from the pen of Dr. W. A. Croffut, printed some days ago.

Dr. Sunderland has sent to *The Post* the following challenge :

"I should like an opportunity to reply to all the articles which my communications have brought out, but cannot ask for the space required to do so, as you have already extended to me large courtesy. If, however, you will admit the discussion to your columns, with the risk of a protracted siege, I have this proposal to make : I will meet any one of the anti-Sabbatarians, who desires to champion their cause in a discussion of the Sunday question, to his heart's content. But it must be on condition that there is but one of their number, and not half a dozen, to reply to me, as has been the case heretofore.

"WASHINGTON, Feb. 22.

"B. SUNDERLAND."

The Post will give space to the discussion on the lines indicated by Dr. Sunderland. Dr. W. A. Croffut, the well-known writer, by special request, has agreed to take up the discussion on behalf of the Secular League. A condition of the discussion, in addition to the one named by Dr. Sunderland, is that each communication hereafter shall be limited to 700 words. The communications will appear in the issues of *The Post* of Monday, Wednesday, and Saturday, and as the discussion is now reopened, Dr. Croffut will next be heard from. The discussion will be confined to Dr. Sunderland and Dr. Croffut for the present.

(Wednesday, February 26.)

MRS. CROFFUT EXPRESSES ANXIETY.

EDITOR POST: The challenge given by Dr. Sunderland in this morning's issue of *The Post* to a reopening of the discussion of the Sunday law question, and its acceptance by Dr. Croffut, gives rise to serious apprehension in the minds of the friends of both, that the terms of exceeding amity and mutual respect which both the disputants express and truly feel for each other may suffer loss, as in the famous dispute upon a doctrinal point of church government described, in the novel of "Woodstock," by the masterly hand of Scott. Notwithstanding that the Rev. Nehemiah Holdenough and worthy Dr. Rochecliffe had recently revived a lifelong friendship, begun in early youth, and had reminisced with affection and great good will, no sooner had they entered the distressing field of controversy, in which both parties invariably claim victory, and refuse to acknowledge defeat, than they both became excited, and from "Nay, my dear brother," and "There I must needs differ," and "On this point I crave leave to think," the "flood-gates were opened and they showered on each other Greek and Hebrew texts, while their eyes kindled, their cheeks glowed, their hands became clenched," &c., and when finally separated by the interference of friends and forced to adjourn their dispute, "removed at the same time to a distance, and regarded each other with looks in which old friendship appeared to have totally given way to mutual animosity," longing each to renew a contest of which those who at first exhibited most interest

were at length aweary. Indeed, only the sentence of immediate execution was able to effect a reconciliation between these polemical divines. Is not this one of the lessons which it is the privilege of genius to convey?

MRS. W. A. CROFFUT.

I.

DR. CROFFUT SALUTES DR. SUNDERLAND.

EDITOR POST: I thank you for the public spirit which moves you to give very valuable space to a discussion of fundamental questions.

I congratulate Dr. Byron Sunderland on the enlightenment which induces him to quit the pulpit breastworks and speak with a chance of being answered. For sixty generations the church has put forth its creeds dogmatically, and the man or woman venturing to deny them has been denounced as a malefactor. Every clergyman has fancied he was having a dialogue, when he was merely enjoying a monologue, and he has entirely forgotten the fact that it takes at least two persons to carry on a conversation. The result has been an obvious enervation of the pulpit; and if Dr. Sunderland has not suffered from a method whose tendency is to emasculate the virility and hamstring the reason, it is because he has often had to contend in the face of opposition for what he believed to be just, and therefore has the courage to face the intelligent, impartial, and critical audience of a great newspaper.

1. Dr. Sunderland says that he is not the author or suggester of the bill "to protect the Lord's day" as a

day of worship in the District of Columbia. I congratulate him. But he immediately proceeds to defend all that seems most pernicious in the bill—that is, its violation of the religious liberty of the individual.

2. Dr. Sunderland says the Secular League is irreligious, and intimates that therefore its members have no “religious rights.” I remind the Doctor that the phrase “religious rights” always includes irreligious rights; that it means not rights in religion, but rights concerning religion.

3. Dr. Sunderland says Sunday “was divinely designated as the Sabbath,” and “there is Bible authority for so treating it.” Where? Will he kindly quote chapter and verse? He is now before an audience which holds every man’s *ipse dixit* suspended, and demands proof. I know of no Bible authority for it. I think there is no Bible authority for it, and wait for a reply. If the Doctor will turn to Schaff’s Religious Encyclopedia on his book shelf he will read of Sunday: “No regulations for its observance are laid down in the New Testament, nor, indeed, is its observance even enjoined.”

4. In my last I said that the Bible commanded rest on Saturday, “but Sunday was especially dedicated to labor, for it seems to have been the day when God first began to work, and on that single day He created the heavens and the earth.” Dr. Sunderland comments, “Here is the whole matter in a nutshell. This is the *pons asinorum* of all anti-Sabbatarianism. It is the merest assumption.” Since remarking that Sunday was dedicated by the Bible to labor, I find in the “Apology for the Christians,” by Justin Martyr, beheaded at Rome 165 A. D., the following: “The Christians regularly as-

sembled on Sunday, because it is the first day in which God changed darkness and matter and made the world."

But I care little about the origin of Sunday or of Sabbath. It is desirable that man should rest one day in seven—oftener, if he can—and the fact that the Bible does not anywhere designate Sunday as a holy day is not my chief contention. I refer it to the Jews and Second Adventists. Dr. Sunderland may ignore every point in the above four subdivisions if he will pay strict attention to the following:

5. In a government like ours, founded on civil rights and not on religious rites—on man's duty to his fellow and not on his relations to God—the state has no business to appoint a day of worship for any man, or say whether he shall worship at all. Ours is a democracy, not a theocracy. In colonial times, the laws of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Georgia, South Carolina, and Virginia compelled every person to go to church; in 1574 the kingdom appointed "searchers," whose business it was to hunt all over the parish and arrest persons who were "vaging abroad on the Lord's day." Three centuries have since passed. Laboring men will rest once a week, if they can, and "vage" if they wish to. Sunday must be kept a purely civil holiday, violating the rights of no man.

W. A. CROFFUT.

II.

DR. SUNDERLAND REPLIES.

EDITOR POST: Dr. Croffut is my brother man, and a very gifted man, too. I wish we could see alike in all

things. It would be very pleasant to me, indeed. It is not long since he invited me to take a trip to the Holy Land. I should love dearly to go with him if my circumstances would permit. But who would have thought that instead of this we should at this moment be laying our heads together in the columns of *The Post* to try and discover the real fact of a circumstance which occurred at Jerusalem some nineteen centuries ago.

1. His points are that, while I did not draw the bill, I am supporting a measure which violates the religious liberty of the individual.

2. That "religious rights" means "rights concerning religion."

3. He denies that there is Bible authority for keeping the day on which Christ rose from the dead as a Sabbath, and cites Schaff as authority. Yes, I am familiar with Dr. Schaff. He is not infallible.

4. He cites Justin Martyr, of the second century, whose opinion is no better than Dr. Croffut's or my own, as to the reason why the Christians kept the Christian Sabbath rather than the Jewish Sabbath, but Justin states the truth when he says they did so keep it. I might increase this testimony *ad libitum*. But enough for the present. It is conceded, then, that the first Christians kept the day we keep as the Sabbath, and this shows that a change of the day had already been made. So that in seeking Bible authority for it we need not go to Constantine and the acts of the fourth century.

5. He turns this whole question over to the Second Adventists, and I now give him and them chapter and

verse showing that the day we keep is divinely designated as "Sabbath," or "one of the Sabbaths," and not "first day of the week," as some English versions have it—Matthew xxviii. 1; Mark xvi. 2 and xvi. 9; Luke xxiv. 1; John xx. 1 and xx. 19; Acts xiii. 42 and xx. 7, and First Corinthians xvi. 2. In all these passages the day is designated as a "Sabbath," or "one of the Sabbaths." Dr. Schaff and all the rest of them have first to pervert and distort the natural meaning of the original Greek in which the text was written, by foisting upon it an English phrase, "the first day of the week," and after this torture of the Scriptures, they are able to say that "the observance of Sunday," meaning by that the Christian Sabbath, "is not even enjoined." What has that to do with the Sabbath, an observance of which "is enjoined"?

6. But I am happy to see that my good friend Dr. Croffut freely abandons all that part of the subject and clings only to the question of our rights under the Constitution—under this head he gives us information. He says, "the colonial laws of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Georgia, South Carolina, and Virginia compelled every person to go to church." I wish he would cite the very language of any such law. I know the rigors of those times were very severe, but I would like him to point out to me the precise language of any such law. It may be so, but let us hear the documents. I am reminded of our limit, and will stop here. The views of the fathers and founders of our republic, as well as the question of "religious rights," will come in subsequent articles.

My dear Mrs. Croffut's pointed article in *The Post*

this morning, calling to mind the genius of "the wizard of the North" in picturing the beauties of theological strife, is very timely. I hope we shall all profit by it.

B. SUNDERLAND.

III.

DR. CROFFUT REPLIES.

EDITOR POST: Dr. Sunderland speaks of Sunday as "the seventh day of the Christian week." Where does he get the authority for so designating it? In the Bible? No. I have examined twelve dictionaries—English, French, and German; Webster, Worcester, Walker, Johnson, Knowles, Perry, Smart, Bailey, Richardson, Adelung, Bescherelle, and Spiers. All but two call Sunday "the first day of the week." None of them calls it the seventh day of any week. Dr. Sunderland contends that the people of Washington should keep Sunday as a "day of worship" because it is the veritable seventh day, whose observance is enjoined in the Decalogue. Does a single one of his congregation regard it as a day of worship for that reason? Does he know of another clergyman who so regards it? If not, is it not necessary that he should publish a new dictionary at once?

In contending that our Sunday is the veritable Saturday which man is commanded in the Decalogue to "keep holy," Dr. Sunderland tries to be explicit. He says: "I now give chapter and verse showing that the day we keep is divinely designated as 'Sabbath,' or 'one of the Sabbaths,' and not 'first day of the week,' as some Eng-

lish versions have it—Matthew xxviii. 1; Mark xvi. 2 and xvi. 9; Luke xxiv. 1; John xx. 1 and xx. 19; Acts xiii. 42 and xx. 7, and First Corinthians xvi. 2.” I refer the reader to these texts. Dr. Sunderland claims that these are all mistranslations, and that “the first day of the week” should be the “first of the Sabbath.”

In this contention my friend is very lonesome. Not a version of the Bible that I have ever seen supports him. King James’s forty-seven scholars, Cranmer and Tyndale and their friends, and the learned Dr. Schaff and his associates, who recently made the Revised Edition, all translate differently from Dr. Sunderland. I care not which is right, for it is not of the least importance in this discussion. They must settle it among themselves. But it does seem a case of the eleven obstinate jurymen.

McClintock’s *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature* says: “The early laws of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Georgia, South Carolina, and Virginia compelled attendance at church.” The Doctor is referred to the statutes. To quote them were to waste space.

I am quite indifferent as to whether Jehovah changed His mind concerning the day on which He commanded His followers to worship Him. My contention is that ours is a civil and secular government, whose Constitution forbids its Congress to make any laws respecting religion; that legislators have no more right to embody in statutes the commands of God concerning worship or any religious rite than they have the commands of Baal, Jupiter, Isis, or Gitche Manito—even if it was perfectly clear what God intended to command; that Congress has no more right to prescribe the day or the duty of

“worship” than it has to set forth the duty of baptism, circumcision, or fasting on Friday. In this country, man may pray with his face to Jerusalem, Mecca, Rome, Salt Lake City, or the sky; or he may pray not at all, except by giving a sympathetic hand to his tired and struggling fellow-man. Under our Constitution the theist, the atheist, the pantheist, and the polytheist are equal in their rights.

Not only does the Constitution forbid Congress to make any laws respecting the establishment of religion, but George Washington, in signing the treaty with Tripoli, made it a part of the organic law that “the Government of the United States is not in any sense founded upon the Christian religion.” Fanatics have always been reviving this question. Simon Wolf calls my attention to the fact that sixty-six years ago Congress acted on voluminous petitions to stop the United States mails on Sunday. Johnson, of Kentucky, reported against the petitions. He said: “Our Government is not religious. * * * The Legislature is not a proper tribunal to determine what are the laws of God. * * * If a solemn act of legislation shall in one point define the law of God, it may, with equal propriety, proceed to define every part of divine revelation and enforce every religious obligation.”

In Ohio, contracts made on Sunday are valid and are enforced. Selah!

W. A. CROFFUT.

IV.

DR. SUNDERLAND REPLIES.

EDITOR POST: Galileo was most likely to be a little "lonesome," especially reciting "the seven penitential psalms" prescribed to him by his church. But he seems to have plenty of company with him in our day.

Of course, when my good friend, Dr. Croffut, took down his Greek Testament and read the texts I had cited, he naturally betook himself to a baker's dozen of dictionaries, all contradicting me as to the meaning of the Greek phrase in question. I would kindly advise him that I have examined a dozen dozen just such dictionaries and commentaries, including those named by him. Most of these dictionaries are mere repetitions of each other, like a flock of sheep running over a wall—the bell-wether starts out and the rest scamper after him—mostly going it blind. Now, I hope he will not laugh immoderately when in the most bland and child-like manner I venture to ask him this simple question: What is the testimony of a man worth whose practice invariably belies his opinion?

Per contra—Our Hexapla, embracing the six principal English versions, gives the versions of Tyndale (1534), the version of Cranmer (1539), and the Rheims version (1582), all of which exclude the phrase "first day of the week." The coterie of American and English scholars who lately undertook to revise the King James version left untouched several hundred passages, and the passages in question among them, because they would not agree on a proper correction.

The learned Lightfoot, one of the grandest scholars

of any age, has this to say: "The first day of the week is an ordinary Judaic phrase. They that are now so punctual to have these days so named and no otherwise mistook that for a purely evangelical phrase which is indeed a phrase purely Judaical," Strype's folio ed., 2 vols., London, 1684, vol. 1, p. 270. Frank Passow's Greek Lexicon is, I believe, the highest standard authority as to the meaning and usage of Greek words. It was edited by the following eminent German scholars: Dr. Valentine Christopher, Frederick Rost, Dr. Frederick Palm, Dr. Otto Kreussler, Prof. K. Keil, Director Ferdinand Peter, and Dr. G. E. Bensler. In the Leipsic edition, 1857, vol. 3, p. 1362, under the head of "Sabbaton" the various uses of the word are given, and among the rest the signification of "week." Then these gentlemen, with all the learned investigation of ages before their eyes, testify as follows: "This signification (of week) was adopted without any necessity in' the singular, Mark xvi. 9, Luke xviii. 12; in the plural, Matt. xxviii. 1, Mark xvi. 2."

The trouble with many of our learned writers is just that which seems to attend my good friend, Dr. Croffut—that is, they are satisfied with a very superficial investigation—*Sicco pede*. They have first erroneously retained the Jewish calendar, and then upon that theory they have started out to make the word "Sabbaton" mean "week." So one has followed another down to the present day. If, however, we find a man like Passow, who has taken pains to look thoroughly into the matter, we see him bringing out the truth.

Dr. Croffut asks whether my people know of my views on this question. I say they ought to; they have heard

me often enough. He wants to know likewise if any other clergyman in town agrees with me. I say frankly, I do not know. I never asked them. But I would suggest that out of the great circle of scholastics here in town—clergymen, university professors, librarians, lawyers, editors—he might put to any one of them this proposition:

If the literal, natural meaning of each word in the Greek phrase we are considering were retained, and if also the Greek grammatical construction were preserved, should it not read in English, “One of the Sabbaths”? I think it might be worth while to try this on—if Dr. Croffut has time to attend to it.

I have another favor to ask of my friend. I wish he would communicate in some way with McClintock’s Cyclopaedia, and get from it the exact text of any colonial law which “compelled people to go to church.” It must be a curiosity. I for one would like to see it.

I am afraid my limit is reached. I hope my good friend will be patient. He is very swift, I know, but I will try to follow him as to the question of “religious rights” under our Constitution, and as to what Congress may or may not do in limiting individual liberty for the general good. I will give attention to the treaty with Tripoli, and the other matters mentioned by my friend, so far as they seem to have any bearing on the issue between us.

B. SUNDERLAND.

DR. CROFFUT REPLIES.

EDITOR POST: Dr. Sunderland seems solicitous about the mint, anise, and cummin of this discussion—laboring to maintain non-essentials while ignoring or postponing essentials. The question before us is, ought statute laws to be passed enforcing the observance of Sunday as a religious holiday? Neither the fourth commandment nor the practice of the apostles has the slightest bearing on this question. Those are considerations for churches and Sunday-schools, not for legislatures.

The basal facts about the day which my friend calls “the Lord’s day” seem to be these: Egyptians, Arabians, Persians, and Hindoos measured time thousands of years ago by seven-day divisions. Those ancient pagans, the Sabeans, assembled together for feasting and enjoyment on new-moon days, full-moon days, and the intervening quarter-moon days, thus dividing the month into periods of seven days, and these were called “Saba days.”

It seems that this “Saba day” was kept by the pagans as a rest and amusement day for centuries, perhaps ages, before the Jewish nation existed or Abraham was born; that Jehovah, the tutelary and exclusive deity of the Jews, appointed the seventh day, and not the first day of the week, as the Sabbath; that Jesus habitually observed neither the seventh nor the first day as Sabbath, but that he showed to its scrupulous observance a studious disrespect, and violated it himself, according to the record, at least eleven times, and that this was

one of the causes of his execution; that the apostles "kept" Saturday, but considered any Sabbath of little consequence; that Sunday was not identified with "Sabbath" by the fathers till the fourth century; that it was a Roman Emperor and a Romish Pope, and not the Hebrews' God nor the Christians' Savior who initiated the sabbatical observance of Sunday.

All these facts I call non-essentials as concerning American legislation. Our only question is, ought statute laws to be passed here and now enforcing the religious observance of Sunday?

Such laws ought not to be passed.

Our Government is a civic compact.

It is founded not on opinions concerning the supernatural, but on man's right to govern himself in secular relations.

In handing down the decision of the Supreme Court of Ohio that a contract made on Sunday was valid, Judge Allen G. Thurman said: "Neither Christianity nor any other system of religion is part of the law of Ohio. The power to prescribe a day of rest is simply a municipal power and the injunction of a civil regulation. The General Assembly of Ohio is not a guardian of the sanctity of any day. If it may protect the first day of the week from desecration because it is the Christian Sabbath, it may protect the sixth day because it is the holy day of the Mohammedan, and the seventh day because it is the Sabbath of the Jew and the Seventh-Day Baptist."

About the time that my friend Sunderland was born, Congress was flooded with petitions to stop carrying the United States mails on "the Lord's day." These were

referred to a committee, of which the distinguished Richard M. Johnson was chairman. After a prolonged hearing the request was refused, and Col. Johnson made a report containing these words :

“Our Government is a civil and not a religious institution. * * * Should Congress adopt the sentiment [of the petitioners] it would establish the principle that the Legislature is a proper tribunal to determine what are the laws of God. * * * The Constitution has wisely withheld from our Government the power of defining what is the divine law. * * * Do not all men in this country enjoy all religious rights which martyrs and saints ever asked? * * * What other nations call religious toleration we call religious rights. They are not exercised in virtue of governmental indulgence, but as rights of which government cannot deprive any portion of its citizens, however small. Let the National Legislature once perform an act which involves the decision of a religious controversy, and it will have passed all legitimate bounds. If the principle is once established that religious observances shall be interwoven with legislative acts, we must pursue it to its ultimatum.”

The carrying and delivery of mails on Sunday was continued and tremendously enlarged. Congress adopted the report of the committee. The people elected its chairman Vice-President of the United States.

W. A. CROFFUT.

VI.

DR. SUNDERLAND REPLIES.

EDITOR POST: Oh, now, brother Croffut, where is that “colonial law” which you first spoke of? Having

shown beyond any reasonable refutation that the day we keep and which the first Christians kept is everywhere in the Scriptures designated as a "Sabbath," or "one of the Sabbaths," and that this is the only proper Bible name of it, I trust I may now dismiss once for all the unfounded allegation that we have no Bible authority for keeping it, and inasmuch as Dr. Croffut, who first introduced this topic, now thinks it is wholly immaterial to the real issue between us, I proceed to state his contention in his own words, namely: "Ours is a civil and secular government, whose Constitution forbids its Congress to make any law respecting religion—that legislators have no more right to embody in statutes the commands of God concerning worship or any religious rite than they have the commands of Baal."

Now, taking this statement just as it is, though not quite as accurate as it should be, I ask my friend in what respect the pending bill militates his contention. There is not a word in it which enjoins worship or any religious rite, and not the slightest intimation of any such thing. The requisitions of the bill deal wholly with the secularities of the people. The bill declares that it shall be unlawful on a certain day of the week to engage in certain kinds of secular occupation. Dr. Croffut has assented to leaving in force an existing law more severe than the bill in question, and yet opposes the enactment of this bill on the ground that it violates the religious liberty of the individual. It certainly no more violates individual religious liberty than the existing law to which he assents.

The tenor of the bill is to enjoin rest from labor. Labor is wasting; rest is recuperating. To impose rest

upon a man for the good of both body and mind is to promote the general welfare and happiness of the people, which was the very object in forming the Constitution; and to call rest "a religious observance" in the ecclesiastical sense is a misnomer in terms. Is it for men who have no religion to attempt in the teeth of the Constitution to deprive the people of their rest day upon the point that a Sunday law of this kind violates their individual religious liberty? Or that it imposes upon them "a religious observance"? All that it does or can impose upon them is that they shall cease from certain kinds of labor or secular occupation on one day in the week. A man must have a singular notion of "religion" if he means by it the liberty to have no religion. It is a solecism in terms.

My friend reminds me that the phrase "religious rights" always includes "irreligious rights"—that it "means not rights in religion but rights concerning religion." This is lucid to those that can see it, no doubt. How a man without religion can have any rights concerning religion is a problem to me. If he has any such rights, they must be concerning his neighbor's religion, for he has no religion himself. And what rights he has concerning his neighbor's religion the Constitution does not seem to define. I think we differ in our apprehension of the import of the Constitution itself. He claims that "Congress can make no law respecting religion," when the Constitution itself is a fundamental "law respecting religion." It explicitly protects "the free exercise of religion," and recognizes in terms the day we keep. What the Constitution forbids is an "establishment of religion" by law, legalizing a union of church and state—that is, an ecclesiastical

establishment supported by the state, such as prevails in Europe and as did prevail in some of the colonies prior to the Revolution. Making one day in seven a rest day for man and beast, does not go far toward building up such a state religion as that.

Now we come to the Tripoli treaty. George Washington had nothing to do with it. It was negotiated by Joel Barlow, sent to the Senate by John Adams, and proclaimed June 10, 1797.

Joel, our negotiator on that occasion, more diffuse and promiscuous than his ancient namesake, the prophet, wrote a monstrous tome of poetry called "The Columbiad." In the exuberance of his spirits he spread himself out as a broad-minded liberal, until, in fact, he became slightly too liberal, as is seen in the fact of his manipulation of the fourteenth article of the treaty. It was pretty cheeky for a man to say that "this government is in no sense founded on the Christian religion!" Consequently, that treaty could not stand with such a statement disgracing it. It was terminated by war, wiped from the statute book amid scenes of blood, and followed by another treaty, from which the obnoxious statement disappeared. My friend says, "the Government of the United States is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion, and that this is a part of the organic law." It was not so before 1797—it never has been from 1806 to the present time.

My time, I fear, is more than up. I pause here, to resume in my next some interesting points in my good friend's replies. "Selah" is an uncertain word—sometimes meaning "hallelujah," but more frequently a pause in the music. Ohio will be heard from in due time.

B. SUNDERLAND.

VII.

DR. CROFFUT REPLIES.

EDITOR POST: Hello! Hello—Dr. Sunderland! Are you there? This is the seventh time I have called you up on *The Post* 'phone. You are looking cheerful and hearty to-day. Eh? No, this is not Babcock, of the House committee. Richardson? No, no! This is Croffut. Oh, yes. Well. Sorry your last had to be put in type on Sunday. It fractured the Sabbath almost to pieces. Was it a work of mercy? Sorry to trouble me? Don't mention it, Doctor. It gives me pleasure to irradiate the gloom. For instance:

You remark, "How a man without religion can have any rights concerning religion is a problem to me." Why, just as a man without money can have rights concerning money; the right not to have bogus money passed on him. See?

You further say, Doctor: "If he has any such rights, they must be concerning his neighbor's religion, for he has no religion himself." Exactly, Doctor! You've hit the bull's eye. They *are* concerning his neighbor's religion; the right to reject it.

I am glad you want to go to Europe with my party this summer. They say you're a good traveller. I know you're an agreeable companion. When I get you a thousand miles from shore we will investigate these occult phenomena—with more than 700 words. But say, Doctor, I must drop back to the third person. In talking with a gentleman of your cloth, it seems less flippant and familiar and more ceremonious and proper.

Since I remarked that there were colonial laws compelling people to go to church, Dr. Sunderland has twice asked me to copy one, adding, "It must be a curiosity. I, for one, would like to see it." Gives me pleasure to oblige. Here is the Virginia law—Mercer's Abridgment, page 209:

If any Person of full Age shall be absent from Divine Service at his or her Parish Church or Chapel the Space of One Month (except such Protestant Dissenters as are excepted by the Act of Parliament made in the First Year of King William and Queen Mary) and shall not, when there, in a decent and orderly Manner, continue till the Service is ended; And, if any Person shall, on the Lord's Day, be present at any Disorderly Meeting, Gaming, or Tippling, or travel upon the Road, except to and from Church (Cases of Necessity and Charity excepted) or be found working in their Corn, Tobacco, or other Labour of their ordinary calling, other than is necessary for the sustenance of Man and Beast: Every such Person being lawfully convicted of such Default or Offence, by Confession, or otherwise, before one or more Justice or Justices of the County, within Two Months after such Default or Offence made or committed, shall forfeit and pay, Five Shillings, or Fifty Pounds of Tobacco, for every such Default or Offence; and on Refusal to make present Paiment, or give sufficient Caution for Paiment thereof, at the laying the next Parish Levy, shall, by order of such Justice or Justices, receive on the bare Back, Ten Lashes, well laid on.

"Curiosity." It is, indeed. Funny as thumb-screws. How it would have made John Calvin laugh! Its repeal was secured by that arrant and illustrious infidel, Thomas Jefferson.

This correspondence has done some good. The let-

ters of my friend Sunderland have convinced the advocates of a strict Sabbath observance that a law compelling it cannot be defended. So they have abandoned the bill which was before Congress when this discussion began and substituted a meeker one, whose theological purpose is less ostentatious. They have erased the "Sabbath," "the Lord's day," and the "divine appointment" for which Brother Sunderland has so spiritedly contended, and now merely insist that everybody shall rest on Sunday—everybody, that is, except those who must work in order to carry lazy folks to church. Under this "reformed" bill *The Post* cannot be sold on Sunday from the office or any news stand; ice-cream saloons and soda fountains may not mitigate the summer austerities; boys are forbidden to play a game of ball, though half a mile from any house; no excursion boat may visit Marshall Hall; no train may come in from Baltimore; nobody may take a buggy ride to Bladensburg or Glen Echo. A large number of meddling people from different parts of the country are here to urge the passage of this bill. The same people are advocating the amendment of the Constitution so as to declare God the source of all power, Jesus Christ the ruler of nations, and the Bible the supreme law of the land. If Brother Sunderland wants to know whether there are any objections to this, he should attend the hearing before the Judiciary Committee of the House this (Wednesday) morning at 10 o'clock.

W. A. CROFFUT.

VIII.

DR. SUNDERLAND REPLIES.

EDITOR POST: Now, dear Brother Croffut, that's a foul! Who has been and gone and told you that I ask *The Post* to do any Sunday work for me and so smash the Christian Sabbath? Do you think it's right to tell tales on your brother out of school—and when they are fibs, too—and only to think, to blurt them through the telephone, when you don't know but you may be exposing him to some sinister eaves-dropper, who may go out into the world and try to spoil his reputation? Oh, what a boy; what a boy, so frisky, so frisky! I only hope his morals may not suffer from his secular associations on Sunday.

So tickled! Half his article is telephone and the other half what he calls "mint, anise, and cumin." (I am glad to see he reads his Bible, at least semi-occasionally.) He has been over in Virginia and dug up some old church regulations for the discipline of church-members—not folks at large—but people who were under vows to attend their church, and he thinks that is the law for which I was inquiring. Why, if he wants to see the beauties of church discipline in full bloom in the olden time he should look at the earliest acts in Massachusetts. There everybody was a member of the church that was of sufficient age. There was no outside public but the babies. Of course, they compelled their members to live up to their vows or be punished. The same principle prevails in the church to-day, only the discipline consists in striking the delinquent from the roll

of membership. Every tyro in history ought to know these things. Jefferson was not "an arrant and illustrious infidel" in the modern sense. He, with many others, was opposed to the union of church and state as it then existed in Virginia, and they together succeeded in breaking it up, and after the adoption of the Constitution it was broken up everywhere throughout the Union. I have long been familiar with all those old colonial regulations, and for that very reason I have pressed it upon my friend to show me a colonial law which compelled people who were not members of the church to attend church. Such a law as that would be to me a "curiosity." Let him show it if he can. This is the third time I call upon him to do me the favor.

My friend is trying to make the impression that this is a purely theological contest in which Congress cannot meddle. If he can only get Congress to play the part of Gallio, he thinks he will be able to wipe out the Sabbath institution altogether. But to do this he will have to repeal the Sunday laws now existing in almost every State of the Union, the successive acts of Congress in favor of one rest day in seven, the multitude of court decisions, and a half dozen decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. The whole tenor of our municipal, State, and national legislation has been in favor of a Sunday rest from the beginning. It has proven an inestimable blessing to this country in every respect. How a man of my friend's intelligence and manly character can turn his back on the whole testimony of the past in favor of Sabbath observance passes my comprehension. At last, however, he clears up the tangled notion of "religious right."

We now understand that when a man without money claims the constitutional right to refuse money he is simply a fool. It is clear as mud. But what has that to do with legislation for a common rest day?

My friend suggests that I am overrunning my limit. He will remember it was to be at the risk of a "protracted siege." For my part, I have only just commenced the discussion. I want to review the action of Congress in 1830, the Ohio case, the "basal facts," and several other things introduced by my friend in this discussion, if space can be afforded.

B. SUNDERLAND.

IX.

DR. CROFFUT REPLIES.

EDITOR POST: 'Tis Sunday morning. I find myself engaged in the mutilation and divellication of Dr. Sunderland's "Sabbath," because my serial letter on the observance of this day must be put in type before 12 o'clock midnight for to-morrow's *Post*. Yet, as newspapers furnish a library to every family every morning, containing in the aggregate ten times as much reading matter as all the sermons in the land, and as enlightenment promotes peace, order, and morality, it strikes me that the Sunday type-setter, who makes the Monday morning paper possible, is about ten times as necessary as the carriage driver who takes the minister to church.

In my last I inferred that this discussion had done good, because the champions of the Sunday bill had withdrawn it from Congress and substituted one of milder

import, which omitted religious injunctions, but under which, as I said, "*The Post* cannot be sold on Sunday from the office or any newsstand ; ice-cream saloons and soda fountains may not mitigate the summer austerities ; boys are forbidden to play a game of ball, though half a mile from any house ; no excursion boat may visit Marshall Hall ; no train may come in from Baltimore ; nobody may take a buggy ride." Since that estimate was published the District Commissioners have discarded the new bill, and they say, "Strictly construed, it would prevent the hiring of bicycles or cabs, the delivery of milk, ice, mineral waters, or Sunday papers, work on Monday papers, the running of street cars or steamboats, the hiring of horses or vehicles, the sale of railroad tickets, and the use of telephones." They add this information to Congress : "Under the existing laws the first day of the week is recognized as a day of rest ; scenes of disorder on that day are almost unknown ; the sale of liquor does not prevail, and no city in the United States can show a better record, so far as the peaceful and orderly observance of Sunday is concerned." They therefore recommend that this bill do not pass.

It will be observed that this ungodly decision does not take theology into consideration. It says nothing about "Sabbath." It seems to regard ours as a civil government, and Sunday law as merely a municipal regulation devised to protect a holiday for rest and recreation, without any relation to its religious functions as "a day of worship." By one of those coincidences not uncommon, the authorities of the District, like the Congressional committee, have decided in favor of the position I have held and against the argument urged by Brother Sunderland.

The barbarous laws of the colonies concerning Sunday observance will not help us to decide what sort of Sunday we should have on the edge of the twentieth century; but I insist that the old Virginia law quoted in my last shall be accepted at its face value. It declared that "if any person of full age" shall be absent from his parish church a month, or shall leave before the service is ended, or travel on the road except to and from church, except in case of necessity, he shall be fined fifty pounds of tobacco or "receive on the bare back ten lashes well laid on." Dr. Sunderland thinks this refers to church-members only. If he will refer to the law and to the decisions of the court at that time, he will ascertain that he is mistaken, and that the law applied to everybody.

But to meet all of the Doctor's objections without putting him to the least trouble, I hereby quote another statute of that same colony of Virginia (Historical Collections Va., Henry Howe, p. 151):

Enacted, That the Lord's Day be kept Holy, and no Journeys be made on that Day, unless upon Necessity. And all Persons inhabiting in this Country having no lawful Excuse, shall every Sunday resort to the parish Church or Chapel, and there abide orderly during the common Prayer, Preaching, and Divine Service, upon penalty of being fined fifty pounds of tobacco by the County Court.

I trust this meets my collaborator's spiritual doubts. The ghost of John Calvin arises to remark that this is the kind of law he likes. He adds some uncomplimentary remarks about the "lukewarmness" of Brother Sunderland in seeming to object to statute laws which vigorously enforce with the lash the commands of God as amended by Constantine.

W. A. CROFFUT.

X.

DR. SUNDERLAND REPLIES.

EDITOR POST: I am glad Brother Croffut thinks this discussion has done good. When two men can debate an important matter of this kind in a friendly spirit, as I think we have thus far, I do not see why good should not come out of it. Wherever the truth leads, there every true man will follow.

The second rule cited by my friend is no better than the first as to the point I raised. Dr. Croffut had said that the colonial laws "compelled every person to go to church." I asked him for a specimen of this. He gave me a Virginia church regulation, which did not meet the case, for—

1. It exempts all who are not of full age.
2. It exempts all protestant dissenters.
3. It exempts all who are engaged in works of necessity and charity.

So he cites another regulation which compels only those who have "no lawful excuse." I do not yet see that he has made good his first statement that "every person was compelled to go to church." But it is, as he says, "non-essential," so let it drop.

In the Ohio case, decided in 1853, a contract dated June 17, 1848, was, in truth, executed and delivered on Sunday. The suit was appealed to the Supreme Court of the State under a statute forbidding ordinary labor on Sunday. The court decided that the Sunday contract was not ordinary labor, and therefore valid, because it did not violate the statute forbidding ordinary labor on

Sunday. Judge Thurman delivered a long and elaborate opinion of eighteen pages full of *obiter dicta* from beginning to end, mere private opinions which had nothing to do with the case before them. All that was said concerning the religious aspect of the case was foreign to the issue.*

The Sunday laws of Ohio, passed since that decision was rendered, are a full reply to what Judge Thurman said on that occasion. They are sections 3176, 3177, 4951, 5458, 7032, and 7033. Judge Thurman, in delivering his opinion, distinctly says: "It is not to be understood, however, that because the Sunday contract may be valid, therefore business may be transacted on that as on other days." He sought to distinguish between the word "business" and the word "labor." The law forbids Sunday labor, but the business of a Sunday contract, he says, is not labor; and yet "business" may not be transacted on Sunday as on other days. If any one can see any consistency in these statements, he can do more than I can. It is mere seed-picking.

Now, as to "the basal facts" of Sunday. My friend has developed a commendable proficiency in his acquaintance with ancient and modern pagan customs and manners, and seems to have obtained some smattering knowledge of the Scriptures. And though many of his statements are erroneous, this does not seem to detract from the merits of his diligence. Having stated what he calls "the basal facts of the Sabbath," many of which are no facts at all, and all of which he now repudiates as "non-

* For example, Judge Thurman said: "Neither Christianity nor any other system of religion is part of the law of Ohio." Yet that seems relevant.—W. A. C.

essential," he proceeds to what he terms the only question before us, and even here he mistakes the real issue, which is not religious observance, but shall this land and this District have one rest day for man and beast? I have taken no part in the proceedings now pending. I know nothing of what is being done in or out of Congress on this subject, save what I see in the papers. My aim is to present my own views. The next item will be the action of 1830.

B. SUNDERLAND.

XI.

DR. CROFFUT REPLIES.

EDITOR POST: In this desultory chat on "Sabbath-keeping," I desire to ask Dr. Sunderland to state what changes he wants in the manner in which Sunday is now observed in Washington. Will he give us a picture of his "Sabbath of divine appointment" which he wants enforced in this District by law?

I, too, would like to see some changes. I want to see the Corcoran Art Gallery open every Sunday.* I want to see the National Museum open every Sunday. I want to see the Monument elevator running every Sunday, and, above all, I want to see our superb Congressional Library open on Sunday, as soon as Mr. Spofford gets it into its new and sumptuous home. And I expect to see all these things. Now, if Dr. Sunderland please, we will have his notion of what Sunday laws we need.

* A few weeks later the Corcoran Art Gallery was opened on Sunday afternoon and has been thus open ever since.—W. A. C.

Ours is a civil and secular government. It has nothing whatever to do with religion, excepting to legitimize all views concerning the Unknowable, and to protect everybody in the expression of them. Let me briefly review :

1. The Constitution says nothing about God or Christianity.

2. Madison declared, "There is not a shadow of right in the general government to intermeddle with religion. The least interference would be a flagrant usurpation."

3. Thomas Jefferson wrote: "Young man, question with boldness even the existence of a God, for, if there be one, he must more approve the homage of reason than of blindfold fear."

4. Benjamin Franklin said: "I had been religiously educated as a Presbyterian, but some of the dogmas of that persuasion appeared to me unintelligible, and I early absented myself from the sect, Sunday being my studying day."*

* As the remainder of this utterance of Franklin seems apposite, I quote it here: "Though I seldom attended any public worship, I had still an opinion of its propriety and of its utility when rightly conducted, and I regularly paid my annual subscription for the support of the only Presbyterian minister or meeting we had in Philadelphia. He used to visit me sometimes as a friend and admonish me to attend his administrations, and I now and then prevailed on myself to do so, once for five Sundays successively. But his discourses were chiefly either polemical arguments or explications of the peculiar doctrines of one sect and were all to me very dry, uninteresting, and unedifying, since not a single moral principle was inculcated or enforced. At length he took for his text that verse of the fourth chapter to the Philippians, 'Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, honest, just, pure, lovely, or

5. George Washington secured the negotiation of the treaty with Tripoli, which contains, as part of our fundamental law, this declaration: "The government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion."

My friend Dr. Sunderland (I had a glimpse of him yesterday in the Senate gallery and he looked cheery and vivacious as ever, notwithstanding the fatigue and exposures of the campaign) makes a very serious mistake concerning this treaty. He says "George Washington had nothing to do with it," for it "was sent to the Senate by John Adams, and proclaimed June 10, 1797."

Let us see whether Washington had anything to do with it.

During his first administration Algerine pirates captured eleven of our ships, imprisoned the officers for ransom, and sold the sailors—a hundred—into slavery in Tripoli. Consternation prevailed in America. What did Washington do? He appointed his most intimate personal friend to be Plenipotentiary to Tripoli—David Humphreys, who had been on his staff during the Revolution, and a member of his family at Mount Vernon for four years thereafter. Humphreys went; met with un-

of good report, if there be any virtue or any praise, think on these things.' And I imagined that, in a sermon on such a text, we could not miss having some morality. But he confined himself to five points only, viz: 1, keeping holy the Sabbath day; 2, being diligent in reading the holy Scriptures; 3, attending duly the public worship; 4, partaking of the sacrament; 5, paying a due respect to God's ministers! These might all be good things, but as they were not the kind of good things that I expected from that text, I despaired of ever meeting with them from any other, was disgusted, and attended his preaching no more."

foreseen obstacles; reported difficulties; and a year later Washington turned to Joel Barlow—poet, scholar, linguist, philosopher, traveler, publicist, the wittiest and most eminent unemployed statesman of the day—the John James Ingalls of the Revolutionary period—and said to him: “David is in trouble. I appoint you Consul General to Tripoli. Go and help ransom our enslaved sailors.” Joel joined David. They bought the American citizens for a million dollars. They concluded on November 4, 1796, and signed January 4, 1797, a treaty bearing the declaration: “The government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion.” They sent home the sailors and carried home the treaty. Washington read it; approved it; thanked them for their high service. He retired from office and the treaty was actually proclaimed by his successor—the iron-clad old Presbyterian, John Adams.

In saying “Washington had nothing to do with it,” Brother Sunderland forgot that it is much more necessary to be careful when dealing with facts than when we are merely preaching.

What next? Why, the various religious sects of Washington applied to Congress for land to build their churches on. Congress refused it. They then applied for acts of incorporation. The government refused these. In expressing his disapproval of the scheme President Madison said: “Because the bill exceeds the rightful authority to which governments are limited by the essential distinction between civil and religious functions, and violates in particular the article in the

Constitution which says: 'Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion.'"*

Was the First Presbyterian Church of Washington one of the applicants?

W. A. CROFFUT.

XII.

DR. SUNDERLAND REPLIES.

EDITOR POST: I will attend to my friend's Saturday article in a future reply. I am not specially familiar with what was done in the Senate of 1829-'30 on the Sunday question, but action was taken in the House. At that time the mail system was in its childhood, compared with what it is to-day. I freely concede that Sabbath work of necessity or mercy may be done in that department. A law regulating the mail system then existed, and under the construction of the Post-office Department that law was complied with by holding the post-offices open at least one hour on Sunday, provided it did not interfere with the time of public worship. Mr. Johnson seems to have approved that state of things. Many of the best people of the country wished the mail service to enjoy a full day of rest on the Sabbath and sent to Congress earnest petitions to that effect. Counter petitions were also sent. All were referred to the House committee of which Mr. Johnson was chairman. In March, 1830, this committee presented a majority and

* Madison further says: "The Constitution gives no more authority to adopt a measure affecting the conscience of a single individual than one affecting a whole community."—W. A. C.

minority report, Mr. Johnson, with much irrelevant matter concerning its religious aspect, claiming that the existing law was sufficient. The next day Mr. McCreary presented the views of the minority, ably refuting the irrelevancies of Mr. Johnson. Both reports were referred to the Committee of the Whole, and 10,000 copies of each ordered to be printed. I can find nothing more that was done about it in the House, yet my friend, with characteristic inaccuracy, says: "Congress adopted the report of the committee." In this connection he takes pains to stigmatize the very best people in the country as "fanatics." I do not think he could strictly mean this as anything more than a "poetic license," to which he is fairly entitled, and in moments of poetic elevation he is liable to utter things for which he should hardly be held responsible in his sober senses.

My friend seems to have been dwelling with the muses several times during this discussion. His vivid contrast between the ministry of the press and the ministry of the pulpit one Sabbath morning; his levitation at the thought of having scattered all the hosts of "fanatics" from the sabbatic field, and gained a victory at every point, evince in the clearest manner the great departure which has been made from the views and convictions of the fathers and founders of the republic.

The first Congress made an appropriation for the importation of 20,000 copies of the Bible. What an outcry the Secular League would have raised in that day if there had been one! Oh, yes, we have made wonderful progress in the way of unrestricted liberty. What a disaster it will be to society when boys can't play games on Sunday, making the streets hideous with noise.

What a calamity to the world when on one day out of seven no youngster can get a buggy to take his girl out to Chevy Chase. What a collapse of freedom will come upon us when the plate printers are deprived of their Sunday dance, with whiskeys and beer in abundance. Why, Brother Croffut, just picture to yourself the awful dismay that will fill all hearts! It fairly drives me into dreamland. Imagine a monster form rising on the face of the earth. It is called the "Secular League." It is reinforced by Congressional committees, by District Commissioner, by Second Adventists, the deceivers of the world, by Seventh-Day Baptists, infatuated with exploded Jewish calendars; by thousands of printers' devils, by anti-Sabbatarians of every ilk, by Sunday excursionists, baseball teams, bicycle and buggy riders, ice-cream eaters, Judge Thurman's opinion, Johnson's defunct report, the defeat of the "fanatics," the disciples of Constantine, the guild of mitered pontiffs, the dozen rickety dictionaries, the New Testament revisers who did agree to substitute "bowl" for "vial" in the apocalypse, the wide circle of hoodlums still widening in the land, the lies about George Washington, the saloon-keepers, the club houses, and all the general riffraff of the country round. And in this dream I saw an "illumination" such as the human race never yet beheld. Before that gleam Christianity itself "paled its ineffectual fires." The church was consumed like flax, the flame died from the altar, and over the ashes of religion that monster form proclaimed "peace, order, and morality!" "I come," it said, "to turn a desert world into an eternal paradise. I am the genius of Utopia, the spirit of the vasty deep, the minister of an unknown power to bring

in the true millennium." And at that voice a man arose and shouted "Selah!" with a thundering shout, at which I awoke, and behold, it was a dream! See Monday police reports!

B. SUNDERLAND.

XIII.

DR. CROFFUT REPLIES.

EDITOR POST: Your miraculous Mergenthaler type-founder is so nearly inspired that it is almost infallible, but in my last letter it substituted "legislatize" for "legitimatize," and thereby made me indulge in neological nonsense.

When Col. Richard M. Johnson reported from his committee the bill to prohibit mail carrying on Sunday, recommending "that it do not pass," Congress concurred by not allowing it to pass. Of this I said: "Congress adopted the report of the committee." Dr. Sunderland declares, "nothing more was done about it in the House," and calls this my "characteristic inaccuracy." In both respects he is correct. Nothing more was done about it, and this kind of inaccuracy is characteristic of me. He has lived here so many years, and officiated so much as chaplain of the House, that he knows, of course, that the way in which Congress adopts an adverse report on a bill is by not passing the bill. Hence his compliment. I modestly hope that it is deserved, and that this is, as he says, a fair specimen of my accuracy.

My friend Sunderland complains that I "stigmatize the very best people of the country as 'fanatics.'" I

don't remember doing so; but I have no hesitation in stigmatizing fanatics—almost all fanatics—as being, as far as mere goodness goes, among the very best people of any country. Fanatics are dominated by an idea. They have sympathy without knowledge; imagination without judgment; moral sense without common sense. I beg that Dr. Sunderland will notice that it is not conscience that men need half as much as it is exact information, serious thoughtfulness, and an intelligent comprehension of the relation of things.

Dr. Sunderland says, “the first Congress made an appropriation for the importation of 20,000 copies of the Bible.” Will he kindly point out some official document in which that fact is definitely stated?

The last half of Dr. Sunderland's letter of Monday is alarming to the nervous. It is a terrible foreshadowing and hind-shadowing of calamities past, present, and to come. It sounds like the Lamentations of Jeremiah, crossed with the ninth chapter of Revelations. I beg the Doctor to be calm. There is no cause for distress, and no reason for ringing the fire bells yet. Americans are fit for self-government seven days in every week; the Twentieth Century is at our doors; some disorder will doubtless be mingled with our order, but, on the whole, our democratic republic is like the new-fangled locomotive which devours its own smoke, and we shall still, with progressive steps, move slowly forward in the enjoyment of liberty protected by law.

And now, lo! another clergyman reinforces Dr. Sunderland by an appeal for a new Sunday law to prevent “servile labor” in the District of Columbia. The use of this word “servile” is a very bad break; it indicates

that the writer has inadvertently copied some old law of slavery times. I guess it is not needed.

The Churchman's League holds that a new and explicit Sunday law is needed here because, although stores are not now open, some wicked person might take a notion to open them! Its representative says: "Should every store in the city of Washington be open to-morrow for the sale of articles, there is no law which could close any of them, except stores for the sale of liquor." Then, in the name of all that is reasonable, where is the need of any law? Does he want a law to close stores which are habitually shut?

And then, sure enough, he declares that there are seven Sunday laws in force in the District now, and that is the reason why he wants more. He has a vision of "hundreds of weary clerks and laborers surrendering their rest day to the selfishness of competing capitalists." And, therefore, forsooth, he would prevent them from taking a buggy ride on Sunday; he would prevent them from buying a glass of soda or a plate of ice cream; he would prevent them from playing innocent games in the city's spacious suburbs; he would forbid their buying a cigar; he would prohibit the sale of milk or ice or perishable fruit; he would prevent a railroad company from repairing its tracks so that they might ride; he would impose a fine of from \$5 to \$50 on "weary clerks and laborers" who take a cheap little excursion ten miles down the Potomac. Is this the best way to show consideration for laborers who are very weary and not very rich?

W. A. CROFFUT.

XIV.

DR. SUNDERLAND REPLIES.

EDITOR POST : Either Brother Croffut is in a deep hole or else I am. He said Washington signed the treaty ; I replied Washington had nothing to do with it. What does this pronoun "it" stand for ? I hope my friend has not taken leave of his grammar. It does not stand for Humphreys, nor Barlow, nor a dozen other things mentioned in his rather florid account. It stands simply for the signing the treaty. It was signed by Barlow, January 3, 1797, at Tripoli. It was sent to Humphreys at Lisbon, who indorsed it February 10, 1797, "subject to the approval of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate." It could not have left Lisbon for Philadelphia before that date—only twenty-two or twenty-three days remained of Washington's last term. Voyages from Lisbon to Philadelphia in those times usually consumed from forty to sixty days.

Now my friend amends his statement. He says, "They carried it home ; Washington read, approved it, and thanked them!" Whereas neither Humphreys nor Barlow left Europe at that time ; nor could the treaty by any ordinary course have arrived in time for President Washington to read and approve it. If my friend still insists that it did, he will please give chapter and verse. Let us have no loose preaching this time.

Yes, I know John Adams sent it to the Senate, and afterward proclaimed it ; but how much of a Presbyterian he was at the time, or what his opinion of Barlow was, I leave my friend to discover.

The treaty was ill-fated in all ways.

1. It bore a falsehood on its face.
2. It was made with a set of pirates, whose aim was plunder and extortion.
3. It was procured by the most humiliating and abject compliances.
4. It was a constant source of trouble and annoyance as long as it lasted.
5. It was finally terminated by sending United States war vessels to the Barbary coast and compelling the corsairs to make another treaty, from which the glaring falsehood was expunged. This was in 1805-'6, and I still believe that it is a perversion of truth and a blot on the memory of Washington for any man (except friend Croffut) to say that he indorsed so unchristian a statement as that.

Now as to the religious sects asking Congress for lots to build churches on and for incorporations. I have not examined the record and I find I cannot rely on my friend always to give me correct information. Possibly it was so. It matters little how it was. Our old church, as far back as 1795, was granted the use of the carpenter's shop to hold religious meetings in. The shop was erected for the convenience of the workmen on the White House. I suppose my friend would hold this to be "unconstitutional"—"a union of church and state"—"a violation of the civil compact." It only shows how far he has drifted from the original moorings of opinion. Later on it was worse still, for when the Capitol was sufficiently advanced our people had the use of the Supreme Court room, where they held their first communion service. And even so late as 1868 Congress gave our church an act of incorpora-

tion. I don't know what Brother Croffut will do about this, but I hope he is too generous a man to ask for the repeal of our charter. It is not so very many long years ago that the chaplains of the two Houses of Congress conducted Sabbath service in the Capitol, which was attended quite largely by the members and their families and the general public. I presume if it were now proposed, whew! What an uproar there would be! "Union of church and state!" "An establishment of religion!" "Death and destruction to human liberty!" "This government is only a civil compact!" "It has nothing to do with religion!" "The Constitution says nothing about God or Christianity!" How many times has my friend reiterated this in ever-varying forms! Well, we have been so busy with what he is pleased to style "the mint, anise, and cumin,"—the other "non-essentials"—that we have hardly touched on the vital character of our institutions. But we will get there after awhile; the siege may be protracted, but the discussion, he says, will do good. In my next I want to "put a flea in his ear" about opening museums, art galleries, libraries, &c., on the Sabbath.

B. SUNDERLAND.

XV.

DR. CROFFUT REPLIES.

EDITOR POST: He who has partaken of the whole of this succulent and nourishing serial will observe that I have constantly insisted that all "Sunday rest" must be based on the secular needs of the citizen, and not on his theological needs—on worldly and not other-worldly

considerations. I understand Dr. Sunderland—gentle as is his voice—to insist upon exactly the contrary. He says that it is “an unchristian statement” to declare, as Washington’s treaty-makers declared, that “the government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion.” I think it probably is unchristian. But the question is, is it true? I think it is true. If the United States government is founded on the Christian religion, then the union of church and state is already complete, and there is no reason why everybody should not be taxed to pay the ministers’ salaries as they are now taxed to pay the churches’ taxes. I warn Brother Sunderland that he is skating on thin ice here, and he had better look out for the signal, “Danger.”

I would have on Sunday a condition of real rest—not of mere quietness; of refreshment and renewal, not of mere inertia; of enjoyment, not of enforced torpor. Very often nothing is so fatiguing as keeping still. Often playing is rest, dancing is rest, music is rest, jovial conversation is rest, bicycling is rest, driving is rest, laughter is rest, running is rest.* I would have a Sunday perpetually secured for Washington in which all these sorts of rest are attainable, and that, too, without any regard for what the Bible says about it, or any appeal to American statute books to see whether they contain any religious legislation or not. If our statute books do contain laws obviously religious, they must be expunged—that is the answer to that.

* “Rest is not quitting the busy career;
Rest is the fitting of self to the sphere;
Loving and serving the highest and best—
Onward! unswerving! O, this is true rest.”

Will Brother Sunderland tell us about those ten thousand Bibles?

Will he and the Churchman's League explain how the mention of Sunday in the Constitution as a day when the President may not sign bills makes it a religious holiday, any more than the mention of the Fourth of July in laws makes the Fourth of July a religious holiday?

“‘This government is only a civil compact!’ How often has my friend reiterated this in ever-varying forms!” inquires Dr. Sunderland, after some impatient-looking exclamation points. Why, yes; quite several times, I think, and may still have occasion to encore. The way for Dr. Sunderland to keep from hearing it any more is to shout it once earnestly on his own account. Unless he does he will remind us of the cantankerous Athenian who was irritated by hearing Aristides continually called “The Just.”

Dr. Sunderland says that the First Presbyterian Church, after living more than half a century without a charter, was incorporated by Congress in 1868, and adds, “I don't know what Brother Croffut will do about this.” Nothing, if the First Presbyterian Church will pay its taxes. If it continues to hold valuable property and shirk its taxes—if it persists in occupying its premises at the expense of others—if it declines to be bound by the reciprocal rules of equity which bind all other business corporations in this city—it will hear a loud and continually swelling chorus of remonstrance which will ring in its corporate ears till justice is done. So much for that.

Dr. Sunderland said in his letter of March 9, “Now we come to the Tripoli treaty. George Washington had

nothing to do with it." I thereupon showed that Washington had almost everything to do with it. The Doctor now explains:

He said Washington signed the treaty. I replied Washington had nothing to do with it. What does this pronoun "it" stand for?

I supposed "it" stood for the treaty. But the Doctor says no, it stands for the "signed." Well, all I have to say is that it must wrench the vitals of a personal pronoun most dreadful bad to make it stand for an active-transitive verb! I beg that the Doctor will take notice that personal pronouns have some rights: they have feelings like unto us, and it behooves us not to subject the poor dumb things to such inhuman—not to say "unchristian"—treatment. I trust he will not be guilty of this sacrilegious conduct any more..

W. A. CROFFUT.

XVI.

DR. SUNDERLAND REPLIES.

EDITOR POST: Brother Croffut gives it up. Washington never saw nor signed the Tripoli treaty. Let us have no more misrepresentations of it.

My friend flatters me overmuch. He even compares my writings to the sacred Scriptures. Johnson reported no bill, only a resolution that the committee be discharged from further consideration of the subject. If no action of the House after the motion to print means that "Congress adopted the report of the committee," then he is

accurate. If not, not. I leave parliamentarians to decide.

My friend is coming to be more precise. We may both profit by the scrutiny. I will amend my former statement by saying "the First Congress directed the importation of 20,000 copies of the Bible." See Journal American Congress, vol. 2, page 261 et. seq. He will also find there some interesting reading, which would sound strangely in a meeting of "the Secular League" of our day.

I thought the discussion was to be between us two. Good Dr. Elliott I leave to speak for himself. I fully appreciate my friend's remarks on the subject of "fanatics." Is this also one of the "non-essentials"?

Now he is going in for opening the public libraries, museums, art galleries, monuments, &c., on the Sabbath. If he carries that measure through, what shall hinder us from holding religious services in those places on that day? You have no right to interfere with the free exercise of religion. You can't shut it out from those places if you open them at all on the Sabbath. The world will have no monopoly of them. Now set them open if you want public worship there. Some may object that the attendants who have been serving all the week need a rest day; that it seems unchristian to deprive them of it. Brother Croffut, being a secularist, may reply that it will be no harder for them than for the coachmen "who drive lazy people to church." There are several ways of looking at things. Let us keep on looking.

Now he says "the Constitution forbids Congress to make any law respecting religion." I deny it. There is no such thing in the book. He says our government is

a "civil compact." Yes ; civil and religious too. It was set up by "civil" men, most of whom were Christians. They provided in the Constitution the *modus operandi* of the government, and protected the free exercise of the Christian religion, for that was the only religion then in vogue in this country among our people. Nothing was then heard about the hifalutin "unknowable," the nebulous "supernatural," the Mormon religion, and the Second Advent craze of later days. Even Thomas Paine believed in God. He had been once a Quaker preacher.

My friend still insists that "our government is in no sense founded on the Christian religion," though that heresy was squelched in 1805-'6. In the name of all reason, what, then, is it founded on? He replies, "On the right of man to govern himself in secular relations." But we have already seen that man has other rights and other relations clearly recognized and provided for in the Constitution. That document was the legitimate outgrowth and special product of the Christian religion, and never could have been formed, so far as we know, aside from the influence of that religion. Has my friend forgotten that thrilling scene in the convention when all was on the brink of failure, and Franklin's speech about looking up to God for help in that crisis? When the vote for prayer to God was taken, there was only a single negative. The "Secular League" at that trying moment consisted of one member. Oceans of testimony might be produced to show the overwhelming power of the Christian religion in forming that national charter.

Yet he still says the words "God" and "Christianity" are not in the charter. And what of that? So the phrase "popular sovereignty" is not in the charter, yet does

not every schoolboy know that this is a government "of representatives chosen by the people"?

Four times the Constitution requires an oath of office to be taken before any man can perform the slightest official duty. That oath is a direct appeal to God, the searcher of hearts. The Bible is to-day the book of common law in all our courts. On it the oath is taken. The very date of the Constitution is a recognition of Christ and religion. Blackstone says that "the law of nature and the sacred or divine law are superior in obligation to any others; that no human laws are of any validity if contrary to them, and that no human law should be suffered to contradict them." Com. B. I., p. 41-2. We shall hear enough of this matter before we finish.

B. SUNDERLAND.

XVII.

DR. CROFFUT REPLIES.

EDITOR POST: Some churchly zealots, who rely on their fancies for their facts and on their emotions for their conclusions, are imposing on my amiable collaborator, Dr. Sunderland. It is wanton trespassing. I won't have it. *Cave canem!* They will keep this up at their peril!

Ten days ago, being, perhaps, thus inspired, he was moved to say: "The first Congress made an appropriation for the importation of 20,000 copies of the Bible."

On April 1 this was modified so as to read: "The first Congress directed the importation of 20,000 copies of the Bible."

I find the facts to be as follows: During the second year of the Revolutionary war all necessities of life became very scarce. The Continental Congress was informed that there was keen suffering in different parts of the country on account of the scarcity of Bibles; and on September 11, 1777, in a moment of inadvertence, it passed, by a vote of 7 to 5, by States, this:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce be directed to import 20,000 copies of the Bible.

Ordered, That the consideration thereof be postponed to Saturday next.

This postponement was to consider the appropriation for them. The subject was not taken up on Saturday. It was not even taken up on Sunday, or the "Lord's day," when Congress met, without any allegation of necessity, mercy, or exigency, and transacted a lot of worldly business. It was never taken up at all, as far as I can ascertain from the Journal. Those Bibles were never imported. Why not?

Because that very hour, when the Bibles were being voted for, Washington suffered his terrible and bitter defeat of Chadd's Ford; a letter from the Secretary, Thomas Paine, brought the news from Washington's headquarters before midnight; and next morning Congress fled in panic from Philadelphia to reassemble at Lancaster. Perhaps members thought that if God was so ostentatiously on the side of tyranny, they wouldn't buy any of his books. But they did some other things about this time. They bought shoes for the barefooted patriots retreating through the Jerseys. And they "unanimously" passed the following:

Resolved, That Gen. Washington be empowered to increase the Ration of Soap at his discretion.

Feeling that cleanliness was next to godliness—next preceding—they ordered soap instead of Scriptures. Honest, now, doesn't Brother Sunderland think they did the right thing? I am his best friend, and he can tell me confidentially—*nous avons*, as Mrs. Malaprop says.

These apostles of misinformation also deceived Dr. Sunderland on that same All Fools' day about Franklin's plea for prayer in the constitutional convention.

He said :

Has my friend forgotten that thrilling scene in the convention when all was on the brink of failure and Franklin's speech about looking up to God for help in that crisis? When the vote for prayer to God was taken, there was only a single negative.

The real, true, genuine facts are these : Franklin made a speech June 28, 1787, declaring that without prayer every day the convention could not form a government that would be good for anything, and made a motion for a chaplain. Hamilton warned the assembly that if persisted in it would bring on a "disagreeable" discussion. Williamson said that there were no funds, and intimated that no minister would pray without pay. Now, I quote Madison's Debates :

After several unsuccessful attempts for silently postponing this matter by adjourning, an adjournment was at length carried without any vote on the motion.

And in a note Dr. Franklin himself says : "The convention, except three or four persons, thought prayers unnecessary."

So Benjamin Franklin's memory that all but "three or four persons" were against his motion doesn't exactly tally with Brother Sunderland's recollection that "there was only a single negative." It seems to me, however, that B. F. had the best chance of knowing all about the "thrilling scene." Anyhow, there were no prayers.

Dr. Sunderland says: "My friend flatters me overmuch; he even compares my writings with the sacred Scriptures." I haven't done anything of the sort; for that would be unkind to him. I contrasted them. Dr. Sunderland's writings are not only a great deal more refined than the Bible, but they are a great deal more correct in their statements of fact.

Reverting to the allegation of Washington's treaty-makers that our government "is in no sense founded on the Christian religion," Dr. Sunderland asks: "In the name of all reason, what, then, is it founded on?" On that which he invokes—All Reason. It is founded on the fraternal feelings and the sense of equity of the average man—on his judgment enlightened by experience. Ours is not a government of God, by God, and for God, but distinctly a government of the People—with a capital P.

W. A. CROFFUT.

XVIII.

DR. SUNDERLAND REPLIES.

EDITOR POST: My friend with classic elegance refers to Aristides the Just. Does he also recall that other Aris-

tides who was more fond of a joke than of truth? He warns me to begin to shout if I wish to survive his encores. If he will allow me, I prefer to shoot. I wish to pour a broadside into this Chinese junk of "modern secularism." Much like, I fancy, the boat of Charon, ferrying shades to Tartarus. (No offence intended.)

The book is entitled "Christian Life and Character of the Civil Institutions of the United States," by B. F. Morris. See Congressional Library. In 700 words I can do no more than refer to the subjects and pages to which I invite my friend's particular attention. He will find it profitable reading: George Washington, pp. 271-298, pp. 380-382, pp. 429-431, pp. 442-478, and pp. 479-520; John Adams, pp. 117-119; John Quincy Adams, pp. 181-186; Thomas Jefferson, pp. 134-136 and pp. 173-174; James Madison, pp. 155-156, pp. 177-178, and pp. 549-550; James Monroe, pp. 157-175; Andrew Jackson, pp. 186-191; Benjamin Franklin, pp. 127-134 and pp. 249-255; Thomas S. Grimke, pp. 25-40, and p. 625; Lord Bacon, p. 228; John Calvin, p. 59, and pp. 110-111; Presbyterian Church, p. 432; District of Columbia, p. 633; Admiral Foote, p. 790; Theodore Frelinghuysen, pp. 265-266; Daniel Gardner, pp. 611-612, and Sir Matthew Hale, pp. 635-665.

Read these pages carefully: John Hancock, p. 117; Patrick Henry, pp. 115-116; Thomas Hooker, p. 645; John Jay, pp. 149-153; Chancellor Kent, pp. 655-657; Rufus King, p. 658; Lamartine, pp. 203-205; Henry Lee, p. 303; Abraham Lincoln, pp. 557-813; William Livingston, pp. 161-164; John Marshall, pp. 637-638; George Mason, pp. 137-138; Gouverneur Morris, pp. 138-139; Judge Nash, p. 276; Ordinance of 1787, pp. 275-276;

Judge Parsons, p. 264 and pp. 650-655; Religion, pp. 206-207; Rawle on the Constitution, pp. 245-270; Richard Rush, pp. 141-143; Sabbath, pp. 199-200, pp. 224-225, pp. 264-265-266, and pp. 785-790; Winfield Scott, pp. 782-783; William H. Seward, pp. 714-744; Statesmen of the Revolution, pp. 110-180 and pp. 167-168; Judge Story, pp. 257-259, p. 269, and p. 639; Daniel Webster, p. 169 and pp. 198-202, and Women, pp. 388-419 and pp. 793-796.

Now, when my friend has "read, marked, and inwardly digested" these historic excerpts, we may be better able to compute the value of his opinion that "our government is in no sense founded on the Christian religion."

I will here add but one more witness—a writer of the revolutionary period. Speaking of "a continental charter," he said, "it should be understood as a solemn obligation, which the whole enters into to support the right of every separate part, whether of religion, personal freedom, or property.

"But where, say some, is the king of America? I'll tell you, friend. He reigns above, and doth not make havoc of mankind, like the royal brute of Britain. Yet that we may not appear to be defective even in worldly honors, let a day be solemnly set apart for proclaiming the charter—let it be brought forth, placed on the divine law—the word of God!

"For myself I fully and conscientiously believe that it is the will of the Almighty that there should be a diversity of religious opinions among us. It affords a larger field for Christian kindness. Were we all of one way of thinking, our religious dispositions would want matter for probation. And on this liberal principle I

look on the various denominations among us to be like children of the same family—differing only in what is called their Christian names.”

Now, Brother Croffut, who do you guess* wrote the above? There are several points in my friend’s Saturday letter which should be corrected for the sake of historic accuracy—want of space only prevents.

B. SUNDERLAND.

XIX.

DR. CROFFUT REPLIES.

EDITOR POST: I would not, like a fanatic, abolish our Sunday, or, like a fanatic, impose it on others. My friend, Dr. Sunderland, is far superior to any of the voluntary assistants of the Churchman’s League—superior to them in logic, good sense, good temper, good grammar, and, especially, in wide and exact information about the Unknowable; and it is impertinent and egotistical in them to go to clapping on twelve-ounce gloves and rushing to the rescue.

One of these superserviceable acolytes declares that a man can have no more right† to work or play on Sunday than to rob and murder! This is very foolish talk;

* Don’t know. Thomas Paine?—W. A. C.

† Some orthodox ministers are more reasonable. Note, for instance, this: “While the State makes laws to compel the observance of a Sunday sabbath, and to punish by civil penalties all who do any secular work on that day, it violates its own bill of rights as well as the Constitution of the United States, and the moral sense of the civilized world.” So says Rev. E. T. Hiscox, D. D., Baptist.—W. A. C.

Dr. Sunderland would never indulge in it. The wickedness of robbery and murder depends not at all on the Decalogue or any command of any god. The moral law was established by human necessity ten thousand years before Moses or Abraham was born or Adam manufactured; it was "enacted" by the relations of primitive man, and there could have been no human society above savagery without its recognition and enforcement.

I wish the Churchman's League would cease inflicting their home-made facts upon Dr. Sunderland. He is my especial preserve, and I don't intend to permit untrustworthy and irresponsible poachers to go shooting over him!

Kindly alluding to me, Dr. Sunderland says:

Now he is going in for opening the public libraries, museums, art galleries, monuments, &c., on the Sabbath. If he carries that measure through, what shall hinder us from holding religious services in those places on that day?

Nothing except the severe laws, which always protect them against noisy intruders. Beware, lest at any time the janitor shall deliver thee to the cop, the cop deliver thee to the judge, the judge deliver thee to the bailiff, and thou be cast into quod. To have my friend and brother immured in an uncomfortable dungeon for excess of zeal would afflict me sore.

As to why the Almighty was denied the hospitality of the Constitution: In 1789 the Presbytery of the Eastward convened at Newburyport, Mass., and wrote an open letter to President George Washington, in which they said:

We should not have been alone in rejoicing to have seen some explicit Acknowledgment of the Only True God and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent, inserted somewhere in the Magna Charta of our country.

Washington at once replied (see *Columbian Centinel*, December 5, 1789,) as follows :

Here I am persuaded you will permit me to observe that the path of true piety is so plain as to require little political direction. To this consideration we ought to ascribe the absence of any regulation respecting religion from the Magna Charta of our country. To the guidance of ministers of the Gospel this important object is perhaps more properly committed. I pray the munificent rewarder of virtue that your agency in this work may receive its compensation here and hereafter.

GEORGE WASHINGTON.

A pious appeal to them to attend strictly to their own affairs !

There was a reason for all omitting the name of God.

“King George the Third,” says Buckle, “paid a court to the clergy, to which, since the death of Anne, they had been unaccustomed, * * * and therefore they zealously aided him in every attempt to oppress the American colonies.”

“The clergy are astonishingly warm in the war,” wrote Burke to Fox, in 1778, “and what the Tories are when united with their natural head, the crown, and animated by their clergy, no man knows better than yourself.”

So it happened that when Americans declared that “governments derive their just power from the consent of the governed,” and vindicated that declaration, they permanently retired two august personages from active

participation in politics—I allude, of course, to God and his Vice-Regent, George III. In 1776 they, as our law-makers, lost their authority forever.

In a little while Sunday will be wholly a day of rest and recreation ; chaplains will be abolished from army, navy, and Congress as a useless expense, and made to earn their own living ; theological charities will be supported entirely by voluntary contributions ; all church property will be taxed ; public-school children will not be kept from their lessons four days in succession because one happens to be Good Friday and the other Easter Monday, and all religious ceremonies, instead of being inflicted on the state, will be left exclusively in the hands of the ministers of the gospel, to whom, as Washington remarked, they are “perhaps more properly committed.”

W. A. CROFFUT.

XX.

DR. SUNDERLAND REPLIES.

EDITOR POST: When a man likens one thing to another, is it contrast or comparison ?

So, then, they did order the Bibles! No amount of soap can wash that out. If there was then a scarcity of Bibles (the more's the pity) there are plenty of them now. In spite of derision and obloquy they are daily increasing. Is that fact deplored by the “Secular League” ?

The story of the "thrilling scene" in the convention still remains (E. C. McGuire's book, pp. 149-153; also Morris' book, pp. 249-253). The business of the convention was about to fail. Franklin made his speech, ending with a motion for prayers in the future. It was seconded by Sherman, and debated by Hamilton, Williamson, and others, in the midst of which Randolph made a different motion, on which no vote was taken, and they at length adjourned. Madison's Debates are mere abstracts, and not full reports. Years after, Franklin said only three or four thought prayers necessary, evidently meaning that only three or four spoke in favor of prayers. This has nothing to do with the vote on his motion, which was carried, with only one negative, and the subsequent sessions were opened with prayer. Yet my friend says "there were no prayers"! How does he know? It must be by some process of transmigration (metempsychosis, I think they call it) that he himself was present and knew all about it. But neither Madison nor Franklin denies that a vote was taken on Franklin's motion, with the result before stated.

He finally admits that our government is founded on the "All-Reason." God only is the "All-Reason" and the author of the Christian religion. He is referred to in the Declaration of Independence. If this be so, what is my friend contending for? He says this government is the people's government. And who are the people? They are men who, according to the Declaration, have been endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. But their Creator has never given them the right to deny His existence, defy His laws, reject His word, profane His Sabbath, and set up a purely secular

government, having no relation to His divine government, and owing no allegiance to His divine authority.

Yet, if I understand it, this is the doctrine of the Secular League. In their creed the terms "piety" and "impiety" are not known. It is a system fit only for our lower animal nature. Hence they call for a secular holiday instead of a Christian Sabbath, for a day of animal divertisement, such as we find at the "Zoo," and not a day for men endowed with immortal powers and such inalienable rights as do not conflict with their Creator's rights. In short, they deny that our government has any right to enforce any divine command, which is an absurdity in terms. They utterly ignore the question of religion, and relegate it to the church and Sabbath-school. Yes, and while we at our end are trying to imbue the generation with piety and reverence for God and His commandments, the Secular League, at the other end, is doing what it may to outroot them.

The real question is, are our existing Sunday laws constitutional? My friend says no, and demands their repeal. He predicts the wiping out of all traces of the Christian religion in every shape and form, so far as our government is concerned. To do this he must destroy the recorded opinions of all the great characters of the past; he must burn all the provincial constitutions and laws, all the State constitutions, statutes, documents, proclamations, treaties, and correspondence, and with rare exceptions all the decisions of all the courts—even that so late as April 27, 1891, when the decision of an inferior court in Texas rendered on the Sabbath was for that very reason declared void by the Supreme Court of the United States, while as late as February 9, 1892, the same

great court declared* this to be “a Christian nation.” It will be a mighty overturn when “modern secularism” shall succeed in changing our Christian laws, institutions, and customs! *Quid post diluuium?*

The reason for leaving the word “God” out of the Constitution assigned by my friend is amusing, since in the Declaration, a few years before, God is fully recognized as the author of all human rights, and even human existence. Hamilton ascribed it to inadvertence. It was in the Declaration. Repetition would have been only a pleonasm.

B. SUNDERLAND.

XXI.

DR. CROFFUT REPLIES.

EDITOR POST: Most people cherish one day of rest because it is salutary. Enough will continue to do so without the aid of policemen. With St. Paul, Luther, and Milton, I say: Let every man who wants a religious Sabbath have one, but let him celebrate it in such a way as not to interfere with anybody else.

My friend, Dr. Sunderland, doubted that any American colony had compelled people to go to church on Sunday. I immediately quoted two severe Virginia laws to that effect. Connecticut had similar laws, for my own

* This assertion is erroneous. The Supreme Court in the Trinity Church case did not decide that this is a Christian nation, but only that a good many people have held it to be a Christian nation—which is quite a different declaration.—W. A. C.

father was there arrested in my presence for going on a visit to his mother on Sunday instead of going to church. I now* quote Massachusetts: In the General Laws, vol. I, page 410, is another of these beautiful ecclesiastical goads (1692), which reads, word for word,† as follows:

Whereas the observation of the Sunday is an affair of public interest; inasmuch as it produces a necessary suspension of Labour, leads men to reflect upon the duties of life and the errors to which Human Nature is liable, and provides for the public and private Worship of God the Creator and Governor of the Universe, and for the performance of such acts of charity as are the ornament and comfort of Christian Societies, and

Whereas, irreligious or light-minded Persons, forgetting the duties which the Sabbath imposes, and the benefits which these duties confer on society, are known to profane its Sanctity, by following their Pleasures or their affairs; this way of acting being contrary to their own interest as Christians, and calculated to annoy those who do not follow their Example; being also of great injury to society at large, by spreading a taste for Dissipation and dissolute Manners,

Be it enacted and ordained by the governor, council, and representatives convened in general court of assembly. that all and every Person and Persons shall, on that day, carefully apply themselves

*Lecky says: "At the close of the seventeenth century 'travel, play, and work on the Lord's day' were prohibited in Massachusetts by law; and injunctions were given to constables 'to restrain all persons from swimming in the waters, unnecessary and unreasonable walking in the streets or fields of the town of Boston or other places, keeping open their shops, or following their secular occupations or recreations *in the evening preceding the Lord's Day*, or any part of the said day or evening following.'"—*England in the XVIIIth century; vol. II, p. 19.*

This seems to cover the ground.—W. A. C.

†I have here copied in full the law of which, in *The Post*, only an abstract was given.—W. A. C.

to the duties of Religion and Piety; that no tradesman or laborer shall exercise his ordinary calling, and that no Game or Recreation shall be used on the Lord's Day, upon pain of forfeiting ten shillings (\$2.50).

That no one shall Travel on that Day, or any part thereof, under pain of forfeiting twenty shillings (\$5.00);—that no vessel shall leave a Harbour of the Colony; that no Persons shall keep Outside the Meetinghouse during the time of Public Worship, or profane the time by playing or talking, on penalty of five shillings (\$1.25);

Public Houses shall not entertain any other than Strangers or Lodgers, under a penalty of five shillings;

Any person in Health who, without sufficient reason, shall omit to Worship God in Public during three months, shall be condemned to a fine of ten shillings;

Any person guilty of misbehaviour in a place of Public Worship shall be fined from five to forty shillings.

These laws are to be enforced by the tithing-men of each Township, who have authority to visit public houses on the Sunday. The innkeeper who shall refuse them admittance shall be fined forty shillings for such offence.

The tithing-men are to stop Travellers, and to require of them their Reason for being on the Road on Sunday:—any one refusing to answer shall be sentenced to pay a fine of not exceeding five pounds sterling (\$25.00). If the Reason given by the Traveller be not deemed by the tithing-men sufficient, he may bring the traveller before the Justice of the Peace of the district.

In 1797 a new law of the Legislature increased these fines and gave half of the money to the informer, and even as late as 1816 the measures were confirmed and re-enacted.

John Calvin and Melancthon would have rejoiced at these laws, as they did at the burning alive of Servetus, because they differed with him about the Trinity—he thinking that God, the Father, must be somewhat older than his Son.

Brother Sunderland declares that "the Bible is to-day the book of common law in all our courts." This statement has created a good deal of amusement in "all our courts," and there seems to be a general desire that somebody shall come into court armed only with the Bible and conduct a case!

Dr. Sunderland adds: "On it the oath is taken." Sometimes, brother, but not often. In four-fifths of all the courts of America no Bible is ever seen, and in none of them is any oath required; a simple affirmation suffices.

Catholics believe in treating Sunday rationally. I have seen Catholic priests in this country playing ball on Sunday. Cardinal Gibbons has written:

You may read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation and you will not find a single line authorizing the sanctification of Sunday.

Cardinal McCloskey has said:

Had not the Catholic church such power she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday, the seventh day of the week, a change for which there is no scriptural authority.

But Dr. Sunderland's acolytes should remember what Episcopalians have said about Sunday. Henry Alford, the eminent Dean of Canterbury, wrote:

The obvious inference is that Paul knew of no divine obligation of one day in seven, but believed all times and days to be alike to the Christian. I infer that Sabbatical obligation to keep any day, whether seventh or first, was not recognized in apostolic times.

And a greater Episcopalian than Dean Alford, Rev. Frederick Robertson, has written :

I must reverse all my conceptions of Christianity before I can believe that Mr. ——— may, without infringement of the fourth commandment, drive his carriage to church twice every Sunday, but the poor man may not drive his cart; that the two or three hours spent by a noble lord over venison, champagne, dessert, and coffee are no desecration of the command, but the same time spent by an artisan over cheese and beer in a tea garden will bring down God's judgment on the land. It is the spirit of Phariseeism which our Lord rebuked so sternly.

All this is from Brother Sunderland's point of view—not mine; he may, therefore, consider it.

W. A. CROFFUT.

XXII.

(*Wednesday, April 15.*)

DR. SUNDERLAND'S LAST REPLY.

EDITOR POST: My good friend, Dr. Croffut, appears to be in mortal terror of being compelled to go to church when he wishes to be somewhere else—in Metzerott-Hall, on a steamboat, in a buggy, or out at some playground with the priests playing ball Sunday.

We have heretofore been discussing the Bible authority of the Sabbath institution. My friend started out with the proposition that there is no such authority. After a while he abandoned that phase of the question and left it to be settled among ourselves. He now re-

turns to it by citing a few meager excerpts from Gibbons, McCloskey, Dean Alford, Robertson, and others, expressing their individual opinion, which is of no earthly consequence in view of the facts of the case. Why, if he wants dogma merely, I will refer him to Coxe's "Literature of the Sabbath," where he will find no end of it. The book is in the Congressional Library.

The point I made as to colonial laws was that my friend insisted they compelled "every person" to go to church. The Virginia statutes he cited did not show this. I reminded him of the still more rigorous church discipline in the Eastern colonies. I'm sorry for the arrest of his father before his very eyes! Probably he was a church-member and they unceremoniously scooped him up.* I cannot account for it in any other way. I confess it was hard usage anyhow. I don't see the reason of my friend's animus toward Calvin. I thought he approved of Calvin's playing "tenpins" on Sunday. The doctrine of the Trinity is a side issue in this discussion. Brother Croffut is apt to bring in side issues. He has loaded down the debate with a number of them, and after a while discarded them all as "non-essentials."

The following is Bancroft's opinion of Calvin:

The genius of Calvin infused enduring elements into the institutions of Geneva, and made it for the modern world the impregnable fortress of popular liberty, the fertile seed-plot of democracy. He that will not honor the memory and respect the influence of Calvin knows but little of the origin of American liberty.

If my friend will recur to my letter, the last in *The Post* prior to this dual discussion, he will find an account

* My father was never a church member.—W. A. C.

of the Servetus controversy which I believe to be in strict accordance with the truth.

My friend spoke of my "acolytes," and says, "all this is from Brother Sunderland's point of view—not mine." I fear my friend is getting somewhat muddled as to what the real "point of view" is. He cannot have forgotten my distinct statement that I am presenting my own views on the Sunday question, and no other man's. Why he should seek to thrust the opinions of "acolytes" on me I do not understand, unless he is running short of legitimate argument. I have no "acolytes."

Wherever the oath is taken in court it is on the Bible. This is all I have affirmed. The Bible is frequently referred to in the trial of suits as the book of common law.* My impression is that it is so regarded by the legal profession. I may be wrong in this. Over and over I have seen juries and witnesses in our courts here sworn on the Bible. How it is in the country at large I am not informed. My friend's sweeping statement would seem to need verification.

There are two phases of the Sabbath question:—

1. The divine authority of the Sabbatic institution.
2. The manner of its observance in our times. On this latter point there is a great deal to be said, and of which I have, as yet, said but little. It is a broad subject, requiring the largest wisdom and the profoundest faith in God to know how to deal with it.

I am not anxious to close this discussion, but if it is to be closed here let me say *The Post* has been singularly generous and impartial. Many things I would

* ! ! !—W. A. C.

have noticed have been excluded for want of space. I will revert only to one point. My friend said Congress refused charters to local churches. Being advised that Congress had chartered our church, he becomes ominous with thunderbolts of protest unless we pay our church taxes, &c. Now, if we take that trip together this summer, I hope no prior undue excitement will unfit him for the voyage. My friend, I beg you, don't do it. Don't burst off any buttons. Don't ring the fire-bell or the fog-bell before the time. Let us be calm. We profess to be a law-abiding people. Let the case be made up, and let the Supreme Court decide it. If we must pay taxes without representation, or if the cops will snake us out of the Library for preaching there on Sunday, then "a new thing under the sun" will usher in the twentieth century.

Now, my good friend, I want to say that not a bitter word causing me pain have you written. You have been frisky, of course, as it is your nature to be. I think you are by far the smartest man in the "Secular League." I also hope I have not wounded your feelings, as I surely never meant to do. The only sorrow I have is that we do not seem to see religious things alike. God knows our hearts. May He dispose us ever to seek and follow the right. Now, for a season, good-bye.

B. SUNDERLAND.

(*Friday, April 17.*)

XXIII.

GOOD-BYE FROM DR. CROFFUT.

EDITOR POST: An almost universal howl goes up, demanding the termination of this discussion. I do not wonder. The average reader is an epicure, constantly requiring delicacies. Since learning that these letters have crowded out the thrilling details of a human conflagration in Texas, of an awkward hanging in Montreal, of an overlooked garment of Mrs. Dimmick, of an excruciating triple suicide in Harlem, of the consumption of two infants by a hog in Detroit, and of a most interesting dog fight in Schott's alley, I have felt quite ashamed of having wasted so much space on a merely serious subject. My good friend and collaborator, Dr. Sunderland, undoubtedly feels the same way. Our readers have exhibited most commendable patience.

It is obvious that the time has come when the most sacred and most exasperating questions known to human life can be freely, frankly, rationally, and boldly discussed without exciting private hostility or public alarm, without descending to offensive dogmatism, and without ending in vituperation, like the "friendly talk" of Rev. Nehemiah Holdenough and Dr. Rochecliffe in Scott's "Woodstock." And if the First Presbyterian Church doesn't send Dr. Sunderland to Rome with my party this summer it does not deserve ever to have a faithful, industrious, and self-denying pastor again.

One or two points require a word, when I shall permanently withdraw and push Dr. Sunderland in front of

the curtain to finish the salaam begun by him on Wednesday. Brother Sunderland remarks :

While we at our end are trying to imbue the generation with piety and reverence for God and His Commandments, the Secular League, at the other end, is doing what it may to outroot them.

This is pretty nearly correct, but not quite. A few of the Secular League are Christians. Of all the others, probably, the above estimate is true. They have, after serious and diligent search, failed to ascertain anything about the being whom Brother Sunderland calls God, and so they do not even pretend to worship him ; they think they spend their time more profitably in studying man's relation to his fellow-men. If there is a God, no man can either help or harm him ; but every man can help or harm his parents, his brother, his sister, his wife, his child, his friend, his neighbor. We can be useful to other human beings and they can be useful to us, but there can be no reciprocal assistance, so far as we are aware, between us and the unknowable. Love is too valuable to waste on any emotional figment. Such a God as the Jews were afflicted with we would not worship, even if we knew he existed. If there is a God anywhere who is just and humane, we will give him appropriate recognition when we find him.

Dr. Sunderland is correct in saying that the Secular League has no use for the words "piety" and "impiety." The words it has special use for are "honesty," "uprightness," "justice," "generosity," "equity," "amity," and "liberty," and even in these respects they are "miserable sinners." But they try to do those things which they ought to have done and leave undone those things which they ought not to have done, and they earnestly

disapprove of intolerance and bigotry, even when they themselves are guilty. And they rejoice at the rapid progress which mental emancipation is making in America. I may add that the Secular League greatly desires to gain real information about God, and to that end it invites all the clergymen of Washington to accept the courteous hospitality of its platform any Sunday at 3 P. M., assuring every guest that he shall have his proportion of the time, and for his remarks respectful consideration. But the League wants facts—not dreams or rumors or guesses.

I am surprised that Dr. Sunderland thinks that God is mentioned in the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence. It is the "Creator" that is mentioned there. Probably the men who wrote it thought that this "Creator" was the God whom Brother Sunderland talks about; but Science has demonstrated that Environment and Heredity is the only creator—that they, or, rather, it, is the creator of man and all his works. Environment and Heredity are, or, rather, is, two in one—a biune god—each being equal to both—the Doctor will understand this—and so it is that Jefferson builded wiser than he knew and told a great and splendid truth when he thought he was merely falling in with a harmless fashion.

Au revoir to the readers of *The Post*, and thanks to its generous editor, and for my amiable friend who has not misunderstood my little jokes, my cordial regards.

W. A. CROFFUT.

[Dr. Sunderland generously declined the opportunity offered him to close the discussion, and the above letter was the last.]

HISTORY OF THE SABBATH.

There are traditions found recorded in ancient books that before the Abrahamic period it was customary in some parts of the world to abstain from work periodically—sometimes every seventh day ; but the observance of Saturday as a day of rest and worship first appears distinctly among the Israelites after the exodus from Egypt. Then Moses brought down from the mountain and issued to the people the command, “Remember the Sabbath day and keep it holy.”—the word “remember” seeming to indicate that this was an enforcement of an old Gentile or Egyptian custom. Then, too, the author of this fourth commandment, though he permits the streams to flow and the winds to blow every day in the week, made feeding the Israelites an exception, not permitting any manna to fall from the sky on the seventh day.

In Exodus, chapter xxxi, we read: “And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying: * * * Whosoever doeth any work in the Sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death.” This injunction was actually obeyed, and men were assassinated for picking up wood on Saturday.

The reason given why the Sabbath should be wholly devoted to honoring God was that in creating and equipping this planet and “the stars also” he had rested on the seventh day, but it was also alleged that it was kept because God had emancipated the Israelites in Egypt.

Joshua did not pause in his aggressive wars and sieges on that day ; but after Nehemiah the Sabbath was so

closely observed that for more than a century the people and soldiers of Jerusalem refused to defend the city when it was attacked on Saturday, but left its defence entirely to the Lord. The result was that it was repeatedly captured by small armies of Ptolemy, Antiochus, Herod, Pompey, and Titus, who climbed over the walls on Saturday and in some instances took the citadel and the temple without losing a man.

Turning to the New Testament, we find that Jesus never enjoined the observance of the Sabbath as a moral duty in any form or on any day. He not only violated the Sabbath himself, but commanded others to violate it. Indeed his disrespect for the Sabbath was one of the causes which led to his being lynched, for we read (John v, 16): "And *therefore* did the Jews persecute Jesus and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the Sabbath day." And Paul followed the example of his chief, for he said (Colossians ii, 16), "Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days."

In the Eastern Christian churches Saturday continued to be observed as the Sabbath till the fifth century, and the practice still prevails throughout the great Christian church of Abyssinia,—perhaps the oldest in the world—which "keeps" Saturday. Justin (Martyr), in the second century, says that the new sect called Christians sometimes met on Sunday, but they "kept" Saturday, at least as strictly as Paul and Jesus did, and their Sunday assemblings were probably for business and social purposes. Indeed, in sharp contrast with the commandment to keep Saturday because the Lord rested on that day, Justin says the Christians began to meet on Sunday

because the Lord did not rest on that day, but worked without cessation and “created the heaven and the earth.”

As a matter of fact, during several centuries after Christ there was no such thing as a Christian Sabbath. Christians rested and worshiped on no particular day. Some churches met on Sunday, some on Wednesday, some on Friday, and some on Saturday. Mosheim, in his “Ecclesiastical History” (pt. II, chap. i), says:

“Many also observed the fourth day of the week, on which Christ was betrayed; and the sixth, which was the day of the crucifixion.”

Rev. Dr. Heylyn, in his “History of the Sabbath” (pt. II, chap. iii), says:

“The Sunday in the Eastern churches had no great prerogative above other days, especially above the Wednesday and the Friday.”

Sunday was not generally regarded and kept as the “Sabbath” till the famous edict of the Emperor Constantine, March 7, 321, began to be enforced by his officers. That edict is as follows:

“Let all the judges and townspeople and the occupation of all trades rest on the venerable day of the Sun; but let those who are situated in the country freely and at full liberty attend to the business of agriculture—because it often happens that no other day is so fit for sowing corn and planting vines—lest the critical moment being let slip, men should lose the commodities granted by Heaven.”

Of the character of this Christian emperor there are no two opinions. It is fairly summed up by Col. John E. Remsburg:

“A man who deluged the Roman Empire with blood; a man who threw his captives to wild beasts; a man who killed the husband of his sister and the father of his wife; a man who tore his nephew, a little boy of eleven years, from the arms of a pleading sister, and murdered him; a man who plunged his own wife into a bath of boiling water; a man who consigned to a cruel death his own innocent son. All of these crimes were committed, not while he was yet a Pagan, but after he had embraced the Christian faith.”

After this, for centuries, Sunday-breaking, like all other heresies, was extirpated with the rack, dungeon and torch.

In 386 a law of the Roman Empire was passed declaring all transgressors of Sunday to be guilty of sacrilege. Forty years later a law was passed forbidding circus exhibitions on Sunday, “in order that the devotions of the faithful may be free from all disturbance.”

The curse of God was added to the cruelties of men to protect the holiness of the first day of the week. In 1201 St. Eustace appeared with a parchment, purporting to be a proclamation written by God in heaven and laid upon the altar of St. Simeon in Jerusalem. Christian prelates pronounced the document genuine, and Innocent III gave it the papal sanction. Among other things, this divine decree contained the following:

“By my right hand I swear unto you, that if you do not observe the Lord’s day, and the festivals of my saints, I will send unto you the Pagan nations, that they may slay you.

“I will open the heavens, and for rain I will rain upon you stones, and wood, and hot water, in the night, that no one may take precautions against the same, and that so I may destroy all wicked men.

“I will send unto you beasts that have the heads of

lions, the hair of women, the tails of camels, and they shall be so ravenous that they shall devour your flesh, and you shall long to flee away and hide yourselves for fear of the beasts."

To aid in the enforcement of the universal worship of God on Sunday, numerous well-attested miracles were announced. A man going to plow on Sunday was immovably fixed to that implement and could not let go of it for two years. A miller starting his wheels on Sunday ground out blood instead of flour. No dough could be made to bake on Sunday, however hot the fire. Men who went to walk on Sunday, and ungodly boys who went to play, were struck dead in their tracks. An English monk even declared that fish would not bite "on that holy day."

In England Henry VIII found time between wives to enforce the pious observance of "the Christian Sabbath" by most stringent penalties.

The next enactment to enforce Sunday observance was by James I of England, who had the present version of the Bible translated. He was one of the most vicious men that ever sat on the throne of England. The American Encyclopedia says of him: "He early exhibited that fondness for masculine favorites which left a cloud upon his name. His death was caused by a tertian ague, acting upon a constitution that was undermined by intemperance."

The laws in Great Britain that relate to Sunday observance, and upon which the laws in the United States for the same purpose have been based, were enacted by Charles II, in 1661 and 1663. Of him Chambers's Encyclopedia says: "His life was most dissolute; his adul-

teries and the profligacy of his court are scarcely paralleled in British history."

Great Britain enforced a rigid observance of "the Lord's Day." It was made a crime to work or play at all between Saturday and Monday. It was declared a sin to cook or kindle a fire. A husband was not permitted to kiss his wife or a mother her child. Many were persecuted and put to death by the Protestants of England for arguing that Saturday was the true Lord's Day. In 1661, for rejecting the Puritan Sabbath, John James, a Baptist clergyman, was hanged and quartered. "After he was dead his heart was taken out and burned, his quarters were affixed to the gates of the city, and his head was set up in Whitechapel on a pole opposite to the alley in which his meeting-house stood."

In Scotland it was a sin to smile on Sunday, and history tells us that when Charles I visited his northern realm he was publicly rebuked by the clergy for venturing to laugh on that day. A party of humane landmen who went into the surf and saved shipwrecked mariners on Sunday were compelled to make public confession of their sin in thus violating the Sabbath day.

In America it was the same. In Boston an iron cage was set in the public square where all Sabbath-breakers were confined and exhibited. But such an exposure was not deemed sufficient punishment. "Three Quaker women were arrested for some trivial offense and convicted of Sabbath-breaking. This was their punishment: On a cold December day they were taken out, stripped to the waist, tied behind a cart, and publicly whipped through the streets of Boston and Roxbury, the

snow over which they passed being stained with the drops of blood that fell from their lacerated bodies.”*

In the public archives of Worcester, Mass., one Mary Fay stands convicted of Sabbath-breaking. The testimony shows the extent of her guilt. Late one Saturday night she heard that her married daughter, living at a distance, was taken suddenly ill. Next morning she hastened to her side on horseback. She was arrested, tried, convicted of violating the Lord's day, and compelled to pay \$300 to keep out of jail!

The recent history of “the Sabbath” is too familiar to need recapitulation; but it should be remembered that some of the best citizens of North Carolina, Virginia, and Kentucky are thrust in jail every year for the crime of resting on Saturday instead of on Sunday.

*“Sabbath-breaking,” by John E. Remsburg, p. 47.

NO NEED OF STRICTER LAWS.

Washington is a Model City in Sunday Observance.

(From the Washington Post, March 17, 1896.)

The District Commissioners reported yesterday the much-discussed Sunday bill, which is too radical for their approval. They say the provision in the bill making it unlawful to perform any labor, except works of necessity and mercy, would make a radical change in the laws of the District.

“Strictly constituted,” they continue, “it would prevent the hiring of bicycles or cabs, deliveries of milk and ice, the sale of mineral waters, Sunday papers; prevent Sunday work on Monday newspapers; the running of street cars, steamboats, hiring of horses or vehicles, the sale of railroad tickets, the use of telephones, &c.

“The Commissioners are not aware of any demand for the enactment of such legislation among the citizens of the District. Under the existing laws the first day of the week is recognized as a day of rest; scenes of disorder on that day are almost unknown*; the sale of liquor does not prevail, and no city in the United States can show a better record, so far as the peaceful and orderly observance of Sunday is concerned.” They therefore recommend that this bill be not passed.

* Nine months later the same Commissioners, Truesdell, Ross and Powell, passed the order outlined on the next page.—W. A. C.

THEY MUST SELL IN SILENCE.

Newsboys Forbidden to Cry Papers on Sunday in Washington.

(From the Washington Post, January 1, 1897.)

Thirty days from to-day, unless the Commissioners should revoke their order, it will be an offense for a newsboy to cry a Sunday newspaper for sale on the streets of the National Capital. The Commissioners yesterday so amended the police regulations that after February 1, if a newsboy should raise his voice on Sunday to effect the sale of a newspaper, he will be liable to a fine of five or more hard-earned dollars in the Police Court.

He will still be permitted to appear on the streets and silently expose his papers for sale, but he must not tell anybody his business much above a whisper, for it will cost him a "five" if he lets off one of those old-time yells. If the newsboy should invent anything to attract attention in place of his familiar call, which has been tolerated for ages, he is also liable to arrest.

[On this occasion there appeared before the Commissioners for the restraining order several clergymen of Washington, without any lay support whatever; and against it General Birney, D. W. Groh, Mr. Croffut, J. W. Adams, Baldwin Johnson, and H. M. Taylor, of the Secular League.]

DR. CROFFUT'S REMARKS ABOUT IT.

EDITOR POST: The preachers of Washington have secured the issue of a police order forbidding newsboys to cry papers on the streets at any time on Sunday. Will the Commissioners enforce such a cruel and heartless order? Will the police, at the instance of ministers, arrest and send to jail the poor, ragged, and industrious boys who try to support themselves by selling their readable wares? Would it not be a most ironical comment on the benefits of Christianity? Is not the Sunday newspaper a chief promoter of intelligence and enforcer of morality?

I do not affirm that it is an ally of the church. Revs. Butler and Ennis evidently think it is not, for, otherwise, they would not attempt to suppress it any more than they try to suppress the noisy Salvation Army, or the rackets street cars which bring folks to hear their sermons.

To be sure, it publishes far more religious matter than the preachers do. There were, perhaps, 20,000 churchgoers in Washington last Sunday. But there were 100,000 newspaper readers that day here; and if the columns of the newspapers that were read in Washington last Sunday had been placed end to end they would have reached from here to New York, and if the words had all been ranged in one line it would have extended to Persia. They contained more than 1,000 times as much as all the sermons. But the crusade against the poor newsboy proves that Rev. Ennis and Rev. Butler

think the Sunday newspaper is not an ally of the church ; and I am inclined to agree with them.

What right have ministers to demand that they shall have an exclusive right to do business and vociferate on Sunday?—that they alone shall have the privilege of working for pay on one day out of seven? Have they any standing that entitles them to ask special protection? Do they not now travel on half fare, like children? Do they not secure exemption from taxation for their places of business?

In this District alone there is not less than ten million dollars' (\$10,000,000) worth of church property that pays no taxes. Every Agnostic is unjustly taxed because of this exemption. Every workingman's dinner is more meager and his family's wardrobe more scanty because he must pay and does pay the taxes on this church property.

And now, forsooth, the respectable parsons, who accept the "call of the Spirit" where the highest salary is paid, undertake to prevent the penniless orphans of society from making an honest living! Is it possible that such an unjust and oppressive order can be enforced?

W. A. CROFFUT.

(From the Washington Post, January 3.)

EDITORIAL COMMENTS.

As to Mr. W. A. Croffut's protest against the police order forbidding newsboys to cry papers on the streets on Sunday, we agree to much that he says, but are not disposed to follow him altogether. We do not recognize

in this movement an attempt to prohibit the sale of Sunday newspapers, though it may be that such an attempt will logically follow later on. When that second attempt is inaugurated it will be time to make battle on the lines laid down by Mr. Croffut, and no doubt *The Post* will be found somewhere in the front.

Meanwhile, we are really at loss to know why this order was issued. There are moments when some of the boys seem to us to be unnecessarily vociferous in the pursuit of their avocation. There was a time when it struck us that their vociferation began a trifle early in the morning. But the particularly noisy boys are only individual offenders, for whose sins others need not be punished, and, as for the early-bird aspect of the case, the worm has already been sufficiently protected by the prohibition against the crying of newspapers, either noisily or otherwise, before seven in the morning.* Why, then, meddle further with an arrangement which seems considerate of all? There are more people in this city who want newspapers on Sunday than there are people who do not want them. We venture to say that eight-tenths of the residents of Washington who know how to read and can afford to gratify that capacity devote a certain part of each Sunday to the secular literature in question. Reading newspapers does not draw men away from church. It does not detract from their Christianity. One may look over half a dozen newspapers and yet go to church if he wishes to. And even if the fact were otherwise, why should the District authorities interfere? It is no business of theirs, at any rate. * * * The church made its fight against secular literature several centuries ago and lost it.

* Or after ten in the morning.—W. A. C.

FIRING INTO THE BUSHES.

EDITOR POST: "A Washington minister" who, without revealing his name, pays his respects to me in this morning's *Post*, does but follow his professional instincts by hiding in ambush when he hasn't a pulpit at hand, and by speaking only when the man he attacks is not permitted to talk back. A monolog is much more gratifying to vanity than a dialog.

Avoiding any apology for the crusade which the clergymen of Washington are making on the poor and industrious newsboys—an assault of which every minister who has any self-respect ought to be ashamed—he speaks about "Mr. Croffut's sudden zeal for the newsboys," and says that he and other Christians have built the Newsboys' Home, furnished it, and supplied all the entertainments and all the dinners, Agnostics "never having given any aid to speak of, as far as we know."

He is probably correct in saying that Agnostics have never given anything "to speak of." That would hardly be modest. But I happen to know of one Agnostic who has given to the Newsboys' Home all that he could afford to. He has contributed to the whole outfit more than one dinner. He has furnished several entertainments—perhaps not very brilliant affairs, but the best he had.

Having got as near the facts as this, the gentleman in ambush advises me to come to the front and "subscribe liberally" for the newsboys' comfort. Having induced the Commissioners—Messrs. Ross and Truesdell—to forbid newsboys to cry Sunday newspapers at all, lest he

and his flock should be disturbed, he thereupon calls upon Agnostics to come forward and support the penniless children whom he has deprived of the privilege of earning a living! If I were dealing with a mere worldling, I should call this "cheek." As I am dealing with one whose ostensible business it is to furnish mankind with a sense of justice and a system of morals, I merely designate it as immeasurable gall. I have in my mind a picture of Rev. Mr. Innominatus next Sunday handing a ragged newsboy over to the police and jail for advertising his wares, and then calling aloud for Agnostics to come and "subscribe liberally" to help the newsboys. What a cartoon it would make! Where is Thomas Nast? O, for an hour of Coffin!

W. A. CROFFUT.

FOR AND AGAINST.

Notwithstanding many remonstrances, the church kept busy. Twenty ministers of Washington held a meeting and unanimously approved of the suppression of the newsboys, and voted to "hold up the hands" of the Commissioners.

The Secular League took vigorous action in denunciation of the new order; a great indignation meeting was held in Willard Hall, calling for the repeal of the order by the Commissioners; and Dr. Croffut delivered before large and enthusiastic audiences seven lectures, illustrated with lantern slides, for the benefit of the newsboys, raising a considerable fund to strengthen the treasury of the Newsboys' Club, and to furnish means of de-

fence for such as should be arrested. The earnest protests caused the Commissioners to think a second time, and to issue such instructions as have made the "order" of New Year's day pretty nearly a dead letter. Sunday papers have since been cried on the streets as usual and only five little "offenders" have been arrested. These have been fined \$2 apiece and their fines have been paid out of the newsboys' fund.

CORRECTING DR. MACKAY-SMITH.

EDITOR POST: Dr. Alexander Mackay-Smith, of the Episcopal Church, writes to you in a reasonable and kindly spirit in favor of suppressing newsboys' cries: and he presents arguments which are so plausible that they are liable to mislead if not corrected. He, himself, indeed, is entitled to know the exact facts in the case as far as he is in error.

Dr. Mackay-Smith expresses the opinion that "just as many papers can be sold" by mutes as by newsboys who state to wayfarers what they have to sell. In this he is mistaken. It is a matter of fact, not of conjecture. He can easily ascertain by inquiry that very many less papers are sold here every Sunday than were sold before Commissioner Wight's cruel order was enforced. Will he give up his contention in favor of this order if it shall be demonstrated to his satisfaction that it does materially interfere with the earnings of these little merchants? Or will he still demand that they be fined and sent to jail?

Dr. Mackay-Smith remarks again: "Why should Wash-

ington be an exception to other great cities in the march of improvement? I am not sure, but I am told that newsboys of New York, Philadelphia, and Boston, and a hundred other places, are not allowed to shout their wares." This is not correct as to Philadelphia.

It is true that in New York boys are not allowed to hawk papers on Sunday. The police order forbidding it there was issued at the bidding of a syndicate of newsstand owners, who were rich enough to suppress the competition of the boys by getting Tammany's police justices to send them to jail. Do we want such a monopoly in this city? Do we need a newsstand Combine to swallow all the profits and compel the enterprising little fellows who now sell papers to give up their business and all go to blacking boots? If I may inquire without offense, is this why Dr. Mackay-Smith is "President of the Board of Trustees of the Newsboys and Children's Aid Society"? Does he favor a newsstand Trust, which will deprive his humble protégés of the means of earning a living honestly? What is he going to do with them—or with the one-fiftieth of them who are in his Aid Society—when their means of support is entirely taken away from them? And will he then continue to call the institution of which he is an honored trustee an "Aid Society"?

It is depressing to see a man of Dr. Mackay-Smith's enlightened and liberal spirit ranged by the side of the narrow-minded advocates of the Puritan Sunday. It is not very long since his church celebrated "the Sabbath" in quite a different way. He says "Sunday as a rest day is demanded by all citizens." Very well; but he knows that this is not the real reason for the arrest of the news-

boys. He knows that in ninety-nine cases out of every hundred where people are punished for "violating the Sabbath" there has been no disturbance of any citizen's rest. The "rest" theory is a mere pretext for enforcing a dogma of the church by the machinery of the state.

The three boys caught on Sunday, October 24, were arrested and punished, not for disturbing anybody's rest, but for crying papers between 7.30 and 10 o'clock in the morning, before meetings had generally begun, and when citizens were eating breakfast.

One of the prisoners, a white boy, said to me, "My father is dead, sir, and my mother is in the hospital."

Another, a colored boy, not higher than my table, said: "I was not hollering at all, for I knowed it was wrong to do so. But I seen a man stop and look at me acrost the street, an' 'sposin' he wanted to 'buy, I jes' hel' up a paper an' said *Post*? An' then he come over, an' wen I handed him the paper he grabs me, an' they said it was a cop in citizen's clothes." What does Brother Mackay-Smith think of this?

Is he sure that the game is worth the candle? Is he sure it will pay the churches to make war on the smallest, feeblest, and poorest of our wage-earners? Are there not in Washington enough real violators of the public peace and welfare who need the attention of the police? There are pickpockets among us, and burglars—and gamblers—and forgers—and embezzlers—and murderers—felons who assail the rights of property and of life under every guise. Is it worth while to attack with the weapons of the law respectable little newsboys who are trying to be of service to the public, and to snatch from them their hard-earned money or throw them in jail for

the offense of not keeping Sunday, merely because God some thousands of years ago commanded Moses to kill everybody who did not keep Saturday?

W. A. CROFFUT.

TALMAGE AND DARWIN.

EDITOR POST: In Dr. Talmage's New Year's sermon, printed in *The Post*, he remarked, in a generous summary of benefits which the old year had conferred: "The Nineteenth Century has brought us many blessings * * * —Charles Darwin giving \$25,000 to the Missionary Society!"

The authority for this statement was obvious enough. *Ex pede Herculem*. I see his ear-marks! But, to verify the conclusion, I wrote at once to Darwin's friend, Mr. Herbert Spencer, and to Mr. Darwin's son and executor. Mr. Troughton, Mr. Spencer's secretary, writes to me as follows:

"Mr. Herbert Spencer requests me to say that he has no knowledge of any such donation by Mr. Darwin, and does not in the least believe that he made it."

Mr. Darwin's son replies thus:

"My father, Mr. Charles Darwin, did not, as a rule, subscribe to any missionary societies. For some years he used to subscribe £1 (\$5) a year to a society in the Falkland Islands. He had been in these poor islands and was interested in them, and an old friend who was there with him asked him to subscribe. This is, no

doubt, the origin of Dr. Talmage's romance. I am my father's executor.

"Yours, faithfully,

"W. E. DARWIN."

Of course, the erroneous statement will not be corrected, either in the First Presbyterian pulpit or in any of the pulpits where it has since been proclaimed, for such stories never are. All that can be done in the interest of truth is to brand it in a free press as belonging to Dr. Talmage's kind of facts.

W. A. CROFFUT.

SUICIDE AND DISBELIEF.

EDITOR POST: What curious coincidences there are in this world! For instance: On Sunday Rev. Dr. Talmage preached a sermon on suicide, in which he declared that all the sane suicides in the world had been caused by disbelief in the Bible. He added (I quote from Monday's *Post*):

"After Tom Paine's 'Age of Reason' was published and widely read there was a marked increase of self-slaughter. And Infidelity holds the upper end of the rope for the suicide, and aims the pistol with which a man blows his brains out, and mixes the strychnine for the last swallow."

Turning to other pages of the same paper on the same morning I find just four suicides announced. Rev. Dr. Gibson, M. E. Church, Baltimore, died suddenly on hearing of the suicide of his intimate friend, Richard

Cornelius, a defaulting bank cashier. Francis J. Murray, student in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, took morphine and died. John M. Gossler, bank cashier and "teacher of a large Bible class in the Lutheran Church," shot himself fatally in the head; and Mrs. W. H. Baker, of Trenton, N. J., cut her throat with a razor while taking a bath, of whom a New York paper says "she was a most useful member of the church." Brother Talmage's remarks were interesting, but he ought to have had some understanding with the telegraph operator beforehand.

W. A. CROFFUT.

CROFFUT TO TALMAGE.

Pulpit Story of a Revolutionary Hero in Controversy.

A RETRACTION TWICE REQUESTED.

Supported by Documentary Evidence Dr. Croffut Denies that
Ethan Allen, Famous as an Infidel, Counseled His Dying
Daughter to accept Her Mother's Christian Faith.

(From the Washington Post, April 12, 1896.)

In Dr. Talmage's morning sermon of March 29 he related the following anecdote:

Col. Ethan Allen was a famous infidel in his day. His wife was a very consecrated woman. The mother instructed the daughter in the truths of Christianity. The daughter sickened and was about to die, and she said to her father: "Father, shall I take your instruction, or shall I take my mother's instruction? I am going to die now; I must have the matter decided." That man, who had been loud in his infidelity, said to his dying daughter: "My dear, you had better take your mother's religion."

In reply to this Dr. W. A. Croffut wrote Dr. Talmage as follows:

“MY DEAR DOCTOR: In your sermon of March 29 you repeated the oft-exposed fiction that Ethan Allen, the illustrious ‘infidel,’ advised his daughter, on her death-bed, to accept her mother’s belief rather than his; a story invented by some Christian for the purpose of showing that the hero of the Revolution, being an infidel, must also have been a hypocrite.

“Around me, as I write, are trunks full of the literary remains of Maj. Gen. Hitchcock, a distinguished grandson of Ethan Allen, and in his written diary I find this alleged incident repeated, and the following words added:

“‘I had often heard my mother speak of the death of that sister, and remembered having heard her say that she attended her in her last moments, and I desired to know whether there was any foundation for the story. My mother told me on two occasions that there was none whatever. I regard the story, therefore, as a pure invention in behalf of certain opinions to which my grandfather was supposed to be unfriendly.’

“The hero of Ticonderoga has many descendants living, and they are naturally pained by the wide circulation you now give to the old calumny.

“I need not ask if you will correct the statement and contradict the story in your published sermon, for I know that, being a fair-minded man, you will hasten to do so, and to give the truth the same circulation to your continental audience that the falsehood has enjoyed.

“I know you will do this quite heedless of the question whether the confession of having made an unfounded statement so carelessly concerning one who was at once a hero and a martyr will tend to weaken the confidence of your hearers in the stories you tell of the frenzied death-beds of Paine and Voltaire, and the awful example of Vernon.

“If you need a picturesque illustration for a sermon, I will give you one concerning this same man—Ethan Allen—a story which is believed by his relatives to be

true. The minister of the church he (sometimes) attended—a Presbyterian—preached one Sunday on ‘Predestination,’ and, illustrating that sublime dogma, he said: ‘How many will be snatched from everlasting fire? Probably not one in a thousand! Probably not one in ten thousand! Possibly not one in a million!’ Whereat Ethan Allen smote the desk in front of him with his fist, and loudly exclaimed: ‘I wouldn’t give a damn for a ticket in that lottery!’ You may tell this anecdote if you please, though, as it is not positively known to be true, it is better not to announce the name of the preacher.

“Will you kindly give me an early answer to this request? Yours, most truly,

“W. A. CROFFUT.”

To this in due time came the following answer from Dr. Talmage:

“DEAR MR. CROFFUT: Yours received, and I have only time now to say if the distinguished American did, as you say, so lose his temper in church as to strike the desk in front of him, and use profane language, I have no further faith in him. If your impression of what he did on that occasion is accurate (and I know you believe it to be accurate), he was a vulgar and blasphemous man, and any contradiction that he made of what he said on another occasion would have no weight with me. I believe the story told of him, for I know of another case just like it. Infidelity may do for one in health and prosperity, but it always fails a man in great crises.

“Your friend,

“T. DE WITT TALMAGE.

“WASHINGTON, *April 8, 1896.*”

The following rejoinder from Dr. Croffut closes the correspondence as far as heard from, though he declares

that he still expects Dr. Talmage to withdraw the illustration :

“REV. T. DE WITT TALMAGE :

“MY DEAR DOCTOR: Your note of yesterday amazes and grieves me. When we worked together on Frank Leslie's papers, I looked upon you as a sincere and fair-minded man who preferred truth to anything else, and when I recently availed myself of your politeness and occupied your pew at the First Presbyterian, I was glad that you had room in your vigorous sermon for an apotheosis of truth.

“Now, if I read your letter aright, you refuse to withdraw a libelous falsehood which you have carelessly repeated, on the ground that the victim of it was ‘a vulgar and blasphemous man,’ and his contradiction of the story would have ‘no weight’ with you.

“I beg to remind you that I have not asked you to correct your erroneous statement on the word of Ethan Allen, which was never impeached, but on the testimony of his daughter who was present on the occasion referred to, as solemnly repeated by his grandson, a very distinguished American soldier. I can also furnish you a contradiction by Ethan Allen's son, if you wish for corroboration. Do you reject such evidence? I do not believe that you have a pewholder who will. And I believe that all who wish you well will be extremely sorry to see you willing to revile the dead, and unwilling to correct the calumnious statement when it is disproved.

“I will take the trouble to bring to you Maj. Gen. Hitchcock's denial of it in his own handwriting, if you desire to see it.

“You are shocked at Ethan Allen's vigorous repudiation of the barbarous hellfire dogma. You would have been vastly more astonished if he had been among the congregation in your church when you charged him with being an arrant hypocrite. It would have been very warm there for a few minutes. I fear you would have

thought his manners extremely unconventional. It is safer to utter such slanders against a dead man than a live one, and, Brother Talmage, I am glad, for your sake, that he was not there. When a tortured prisoner of war on board the Gaspe schooner, he bit off a ten-penny nail in his handcuffs to show some British officers who insulted him and reviled his country what he would do to them if he could get out of his dungeon. It is just as well that he did not attend church that morning when you preached about him. I admit that Ethan Allen's language concerning the heavenly lottery of Presbyterianism was somewhat rude but it is, perhaps, better that an allegation should be profane and true than pious and false.

“It is chiefly for your sake that I earnestly ask you to reconsider your decision and withdraw the baseless story. Hoping to hear from you when you are clothed and in your right mind, I am, yours most truly,

“W. A. CROFFUT.”

IRRELIGIOUS POEMS

BY W. A. CROFFUT.

A SKIPPER'S STORY.

They sat on the steps of the station
And waited for trains to connect—
A minister, eating his ration :
A skipper, who twice had been wrecked :
And the strangers began conversation.

The skipper was wrinkled and hoary—
His skin was the color of leather ;
The preacher looked hungry and sorry.
Well, after discussing the weather,
The skipper struck into his story :

“ I'll tell ye of three men I know'd uv
Who give up thar lives fer thar brothers—
A sort ye may not hev allowed uv,
But chaps that'll die to save others
Is beins fer folks to be proud uv.

“ The ship Swaller, Cappen James Bee,
In a fog off the Hatteris coast,
Was wrecked on a ledge to the lee ;
Jim stood like a rock to his post—
Went down in a gulp uv the sea.

“ We knocked us together a raft
And he crowded her full es she'd float ;
Then jumped to the davits abaft
And lowered and loaded each boat,
But stuck to the battered ole craft.

“ He saved every life but his own :
Men, women, an' childern an' crew,
And, when the last dory wuz gone,
' Chock full ! ' he sung out, fer he knew,
An' he went to the bottom alone ! ”

“ My friend ! ” asked the listener grim,
“ Had Bee made his peace with the Lord ? ”
And he laid down his cracker. “ What, Jim ? ”
Said the skipper—“ I shouldn't spose Gord
'Ud be mad at a feller like him !

“ Another wuz young Andy Bell,
Who worked in the Cumberland coal ;
He come to the mouth uv the well
Whar the mine wuz afire, and the hole
Blazed up like a furnace uv hell.

“The men wuz imprisoned below ;
 The women wuz screamin’ above ;
 And the boss asked, ‘ Who faces the foe
 And goes to the rescue for love ?’
 And Andy remarked, ‘ I will go ;

“ ‘ There’s nothin’ to hender ; I haint
 Nary father ner mother ner wife.’
 And down in the bucket he went—
 Saved twenty by losin’ his life !
 O, strenger ! warnt Andy a saint ? ”

“ Did he pray God,” the minister cries,
 “ To help him to fight with the flame ? ”
 “ Dunno, but,” the skipper replies,
 “ I’ve heard Andy mention His name
 More frekent than some would advise ! ”

“ He loved Jesus ?—bowed at his shrine ? ”
 Asks the preacher, “ O, then it is well !
 The skipper says, “ ‘ Thar wuz no sign—
 But ef Jesus didn’t love Andy Bell
 I don’t want no Jesus in mine !

“ The third one—Newt. Evans, my friend,
 Took his ingine to Praary du Chien ;
 Seen a speck on the track at the Bend
 An’ yelled to the stoker, ‘ Eugene !
 Ef that ain’t a brat I’ll be denned !

“ ‘ A baby—an’ maken mud pies !
 Mind train !’ To the shriek uv the bell
 Jumped forerds—sprung out fer the prize—
 He saved the girl, cappen, but fell—
 His legs wuz cut off at the thighs ! ”

“ Was he washed in the blood of the Lamb ? ”
 Asked the preacher, “ and saved from his sin ?
 The skipper arose, “ ‘ Ibedam !—
 Lemme jest git my bearins agin,
 An’ sorter make out whar I am.’ ”

He walked to the office—was mute—
 When the agent asked what he desired,
 He tapped on his pate in salute,
 Then turned out his thumb and inquired,
 ‘ Who is—this dam crazy—galute ? ’ ”

JIM ROOT.

[The most terrible fire that ever swept through the pine woods of Minnesota was in the summer of 1894. There had been no rain for four months, and it is estimated that five hundred people lost their lives in this conflagration. The towns of Hinckley, Sandstone, Miller, and Pokegama were completely burned up. The passenger train from Duluth caught fire, but when it stopped at Hinckley hundreds of fugitives boarded it. Engineer James Root, kept from burning to death by his fireman, John McGowan, who threw water on him from the engine's tank, held the train in the awful heat until all the people that could be crowded on board were taken on, and then he ran the engine back six miles through the flames to a desolate, ill-smelling swamp, where the people threw themselves into the shallow water. There the train took fire and burned up, but most of the passengers escaped. Engineer Root was taken to the hospital in St. Paul badly burned.]

The tall grass shudders shoulder high ;
 The sun uncurtained shines,
 And twig and turf are tinder-dry
 In Minnesota's pines,
 When sudden from the arid earth,
 By winds infernal fanned,
 The fires of nether hell burst forth—
Say, Jim Root ! give us your hand !

The fires of hell burst forth, I say,
 Devour the thirsty ground,
 And settlers fly in dire dismay
 Before the bellowing sound ;
 In slimy sloughs they seek for breath—
 In swamps they make a stand,
 And grimly, gamely fight with Death—
O, Jim Root ! give us your hand !

They fight with Death through weary miles ;
 The fiery furnace red
 Is flaming round the ghostly piles,
 The living and the dead.
 The battle's awful roar they hear :
 A struggling, faltering band
 Still faintly cry, " Is Hinckley near ?"
O, Jim Root ! give us your hand.

A whistle answers to their moan,
 When through the crimson vaults
 The night express comes thundering down
 And in the furnace halts !
 Old engine Sixty-nine, impressed
 And by a hero manned,
 Is in a flaming garment dressed—
O, Jim Root ! give us your hand.

A garb of flame that swirls and soars,
 Like Gabriel's fiery car
 The prophet rode from Jordan's shores
 And sought the morning star :
 A chariot sped for human weal,
 And in it, calm and grand,
 A live man grasps the throttle steel—
O, Jim Root! give us your hand!

He holds the heated lever square,
 While, driven far and wide,
 The hunted hosts are hastening there
 Upon the fiery tide.
 They leap before Death's fearful sword
 From off the blazing land
 To frantic cry of "All aboard!"
O, Jim Root! give us your hand!

"Quick! All aboard!" he cries, and spurns
 His flaming visor grim,
 While sturdy Jack McGowan turns
 The stoker's hose on him :
 He answers with defiant shout
 That shows he's got the sand;
 And jerks the blistering lever out—
Here, Jim Root! give us your hand!

O deed divine! The engine flies
 And drags a flaming train
 To safety, which shall ne'er arise
 To take the track again—
 And hundreds leap to solid ground
 Beyond the deadly strand,
 And one a hospital has found—
O, Jim Root! give us your hand!

If on some cloud or shining star
 The homes of seraphim
 And saints and gods and angels are
 They'll ask no creed from him ;
 And when he's done his earthly task
 The whole transcendent band
 Will stoop and say—a boon to ask—
Hail, Jim Root! give us your hand!

SOME PLEAS FOR JUSTICE.

A pensive maiden gently moaned, "Ah, me!
It can not, can not be

That no Heaven is where recompense is wrought,
Where Time is lost in one eternal span,
Where Hope finds fruitage in the perfect plan,
Where Wickedness is stayed and Wisdom taught,
For justice then were nought."

A youth his glance upon a mirror cast
And sighed, "Such grace will last.

I see the truth of what the preachers say:
I am a noble, splendid, perfect thing,
Quite godlike and not made for perishing—
These charms must shine in Heaven's immortal ray,
Through one eternal day!"

A dying man I saw and heard him groan,
"The next life shall atone!
This pain shall be forgot in yonder skies;
The wrong that harries and torments us here
Shall perish in God's luminous atmosphere;
Justice shall triumph when this soul shall rise
And soar to Paradise!"

I heard a heavy-laden dray-horse say,
"Alack! Alack-a-day!
Some Heaven there is, as every horse agrees,
Where, all uncumbered of life's weary load,
And spared the cruel bit, the lash, the goad,
We shall be free to wander where we please
Through clover-beds of ease!"

I heard a vivisected fox-hound cry,
"Ah! what a martyr I!
But just beyond the grave there is a place
Where mortals shall be spared life's bitter cup,
And pain and pleasure shall be evened up—
Where foxes shall be furnished for the chase
In one eternal race!"

I saw a fox, wounded unto the death,
That whined, with latest breath,
"To Reynard Heaven, beyond the veil, I go,
Where hounds, to Hades banished, chase us not,
Where horns of hateful huntsmen are forgot,
Where homes of fowls nor locks nor palings know,
And chickens roost them low!"

I heard a hen cluck with her dying voice,
 " Though tortured, I rejoice !
 I fly unto celestial meadows fair,
 Where murderous foxes never come to slay,
 Nor axe announces dread Thanksgiving Day,
 And bugs are savory and tender there,
 And nice worms everywhere !"

I heard ten thousand maple buds complain,
 Torn by the April rain :
 " That this is final death can never be !
 The ' Law of Nature ' we sublimely scorn
 That hath for us no resurrection morn—
 What mockery, if some other bud than we
 Shall rear the perfect tree !"

And then I heard a sage : " Our lowly birth
 Was redolent of earth—
 Our consciousness may end as it began :
 Who has assured us we shall live again
 Till pleasure shall by measure equal pain ?
 Why should we dream that Nature keeps for man
 Some reimbursement plan ?

" The fanciful equation is beyond
 Great Reason's pledge and bond.
 I have had more of life than was my meed,
 And kept some sweet babe tarrying for me ;
 All pardon crave I for delinquency,
 And wave farewell—bidding the child, indeed,
 Good morrow and good speed !"

THE MINE AT CALUMET.

Excoose ! Be you the dominee
 That folks call Parson Boone ?
 Wal—Jane an' me hes called to see
 Ef you'll ride Monday noon
 To Calumet, to bury Jim—
 James Baker—he is dead—
 Death hil too strong a hand for him,
 Es you have often said.

“Perfess?” He didn’t perfess. He hed
 One simple way all through.
 He merely practised, an’ he said
 That that would hev to do.
 “Prayed?” Never—not es I hev known—
 ’Cept mebby with his han’s,
 An’ ’stead of claspin’ of his own
 He clasped his feller-man’s.

“Under conviction?” The idee!
 He never done a thing
 To be convicted fer; why, he
 Wus straighter than a string.
 Oh, say! He was a nifty man!
 Oh, he was brave an’ square,
 His mighty heart was bigger than
 That meetin’ house out there!

Eh? “Jined the church?” You don’t ketch on!
 You couldn’t a-knowed ’im, pard!
 To them as did, now he is gone
 Your questionin’ sounds hard,
 I told ’m up to town to-day,
 “Above the sexton’s dirt
 Let Parson say his little say;
 He can’t do any hurt.”

“Fire in the Osceola mine!”
 Jim heered the awful cry
 That rose from level 29,
 Es he wus passin’ by;
 An’ down the burnin’ shaft he went
 To where the flames begun,
 An’ up the half-dead miners sent
 Es fast es skips could run.

Through other drifts he searched around
 An’ lyin’ stifled there,
 A dozen helpless men he found
 And dragged to light and air;
 An’ my boy, Timothy—my Tim—
 He found, too weak to crawl,
 An’ got him in the skip—but Jim—
 He didn’t come up at all.

We waited fer him all night long
 An' watched an' hil our breath,
 A sufferin', tearful, hopeless throng,
 Around that pit of death;
 An' when the smoke blew out, my son
 Crep down to learn his fate—
 He reached him, but the worst wus done—
 He found him—just too late!

He died adoin'

What he could find to do.

“ Did he perless ? ” Wal——

I never knowed him to.

Don't notice if my talk is broke

An' if my eyes should leak,

Tain't Tim—nor mother—but the smoke

Hes kinder made 'em weak.

What! “ How about his soul ? ” Look 'ere!

Intendin' no offence,

Your dumb-fool questions doos appear

To show a lack of sense.

If I repeat 'em, like es not,

When you come moseyin' down

You'd find our place most awful hot—

They'll make you jump the town!

Don't come! Hunt other souls to save!

His neighbors at the Green

Will gather round Jim Baker's grave

An' tell the things they've seen.

Ef God don't know what's good and true

An' wants to punish him,

Why, rather'n go to Heaven with you,

I'll go to hell with Jim!

SILENCING THE NEWSBOYS.

[The new order, therefore, will hardly lessen sales (I wish it would), but will only protect those who agree with Horace Greeley's saying that the Sunday paper is a social demon.—Rev. W. F. Crafts.]

The Sunday morning paper is a fiend—

A demon of inordinate degree—

It fetches information it has gleaned,

And sells as cheap as anything can be.

If people wouldn't buy it,

Nor consume the dreadful diet,

They'd have a chance of listening to me!

It gathers up such puerile reports
 Of what mere human folks have done and said—
 The news of balls and markets, wars and sports,
 And people are unhappy till they've read ;
 If they missed its lively column
 It would make them pretty solemn,
 And they'd have to go to meeting or to bed !

If preachers stated only what they know—
 From Darkness never borrowing a gleam,
 Insisting on what Reason says is so,
 And basing no conclusion on a dream,
 They might be wise and witty,
 But how paltry and how petty
 And very superficial they would seem !

The paper would be better if 'twere worse ;
 It mixes up religion with its stocks ;
 Has sermons, science, vaudeville and verse,
 And ever at intolerance it mocks ;
 It has merriment that tickles,
 And it pockets half the nickels
 Intended for our contribution box !

The Sunday morning paper is a fiend—
 A demon of inordinate degree—
 Its victims are with difficulty weaned
 From appetites whose willing slaves they be ;
 If they only wouldn't read 'em
 It would be the truest freedom
 For they'd have a chance of listening to me !

THE NAUGHTY NEWSPAPERS.

“ Come, Jake ! It's almost meetin' time ;
 Throw down that paper streaked with red,
 Filled full of filth and vice and crime—
 Them papers is a raisin' Ned !
 Ef you would read yer Bible more,
 Ye'd mebbly reap the blest reward
 Of that ole saint I named ye for—
 The good old prophet of the Lord !”

“ Yes, pa ! be gosh ! There is some queer
 An’ crooked things gits into print !
 Las’ night I seen a paper here
 Thet hed high-flavored stories in’t.”

“ What wus they, Jakey ? Might es well
 Go on an’ say, now you’ve begun ;
 It ain’t no special harm to tell,
 But papers shouldn’t publish one.”

“ Wal, pa, a laborin’ man, it said,
 Hired to a farmer way down East,
 An’ rounded up his stock, and fed
 Sheep, cows, and every kind of beast,
 And toiled along for several year
 Fer jest his board, until one day
 He quit, and told his boss, ‘ See here !
 I guess it’s time I hed some pay.’

“ The old man answered, ‘ Times is hard !
 Mutton ’s a drug and money scurse.
 Don’t ask fer cash fer yer reward,
 Fer that would drain my poor old purse.
 My oldest darter hes sore eyes,
 But tother’s perty, folks declare—
 Two lively bits of merchandise—
 Take both the gals and call it square ! ’ ”

“ Both on ’em, Jake, at onct ? Two wives ! ”
 “ Yes, pa, the paper gives their names—
 He took ’em ; they lived pious lives ;
 Hed lots of children—so it claims.
 And, pa, what gen’rous souls was theirs !
 Thet he might be a fruitful limb,
 They called two sêrvant girls upstairs,
 And made both on ’em marry him ! ”

“ Four wives at onct ? The horrid wretch !
 He went an’ married all the four ?
 Now, Jake, I wish you wouldn’t fetch
 Such wicked papers here no more.”
 “ An’ then he robbed his father-’n-law—
 Stole all his stock, the paper says—
 Took all the cows and sheep he saw
 An’ lighted out between two days ! ”

' Wal, Jakey! Did they catch the thief
And chuck him in the county jail?"

" No, pa: he never come to grief—
His projecks didn't seem to fail;
And when he went to fetch the cows
God met him, and remarked, ' My friend,
You've acted square and kep your vows—
I'll stand right by you to the end!'"

" Pshaw, Jake! A likely yarn indeed!
What paper lies at sech a rate?"

" W'y, pa, the one you always read—
The Meth'dis Christian Advocate!"

" The Meth——" " Yes, pa, and you've abhorred
The patriarch that you adore—
That good ole prophet of the Lord—
The gentleman you named me for!"

" Jacob! This here is Atheist talk!
Foolin' your father! Think it's wit?
Out of my house this day you walk
Fer makin' fun of Holy Writ.

I'll cut you off without a cent!
Git out! Pack up your duds an' post!
My son! my son! He's ben an' went
And sinned against the Holy Ghost!"

A WORD WITH PHARAOH.

[Dr. Croffut lectures every winter, and has an interesting and varied repertory, including "Egypt," "Palestine," "Rome and Athens," "The Bermudas and Bahamas," "Yucatan and Mexico," "The Yellowstone," and "The Trails to the Klondike," all abundantly and beautifully illustrated with stereopticon views. In his lecture on Egypt, Dr. Croffut presents a fine lantern-slide of the head of King Ramses II, "The Pharaoh of the Oppression," who is known in history as Sesostris the Great. The Jews have a tradition that this Pharaoh was in youth a schoolmate of Moses. The lecturer thus addresses the photograph of Pharaoh, whose embalmed body was a few years ago discovered and is now exhibited in the Boulak Museum.]

Hail, Pharaoh! Sesostris! Great favorite of Ammon,
Osiris and Horus, Hamarchis, and Mammon,
Are you the dread war-god who made an invasion
Of Persia and conquered the Turk and the Asian?
Whose laureate, Pentaur, proclaimed a *te deum*
Therefor in the halls of your own Rameseum?
Whose throne is the earth, and whose title "the great" is?
Whose anchor was dropped in the mighty Euphrates?
Who captured the kings of the peerless Phœnicians,
Made slaves of the Arabs, subdued the Ephesians,
Assaulted Damascus the splendid, and took it,—?
Well, may be, your Majesty, *but*,—you don't look it!

You thought that when three thousand summers should make up
 The period of penance, the mummy would wake up,
 And, crowned in the halls of Amenti, the spacious,
 Would spring into life again, young and vivacious.
 Your Majesty must have been slightly mistaken ;
 Your tenement still is entirely forsaken.
 We look on the world of amusement a minute,
 Then glance at your mummy and say, " He's not in it ! "

Old Egypt, O king, on antiquity nourished,
 Is not what she was when your dynasty flourished ;
 Fear, ignorance, sloth, and devoutness have kept her
 Somewhat in the rear since you wielded the scepter ;
 While prostrate, bewailing distress and disaster,
 Young infants in arms have arisen and passed her.

The sun, that you worshipped with Apis and Taurus,
 We make paint our portraits and photographs for us ;
 We walk, or we talk, or we dance, and our action
 Is caught for all time, without loss of a fraction —
 The play of the lip or the eyelash's flutter
 Entrapped to illustrate the words that we utter.
 We whisper our thought o'er the ocean or under,
 And use for the whisper the trumpet of thunder ;
 We fly round the earth, o'er sea, mountain and mesa,
 Before you could travel from Karnac to Gizeh !

Right under your royal beak, Ramses the second,
 Reform has awakened and Progress has beckoned ;
 Old Thebes enjoys incense and offerings votive,
 In the smoke of a seventy-five ton locomotive !
 A yacht just from Boston ties up at El Hamel,
 The bicycle spins in the track of the camel,
 And the phonograph carols and ventures to render a
 Pinafore snatch in the ruins of Dendereh !

O, Sire, if your father had borrowed a Kodac
 While Moses and you were in college at Lodac,
 And got a snap shot, while the boys, deep in study,
 Conned pageants majestic for victories bloody,
 Conned how your great-grand sire, thro' Joseph's advices
 Got a corner on wheat and an option on prices,
 Conned how Mrs. Potiphar patiently perished,
 A nunnery hiding the dreams that she cherished !
 Ah, that little " if " is a word that is fateful ;
 But, Pharaoh, we'll take what is left, and be grateful.

Your features are calm, though you never shall waken,
And haughty your head, though the gods have forsaken ;
If sore disappointed, your face does not show it ;
Though sleep be protracted, you never shall know it.
Anubis may doze by Eternity's portal,
But hope, amaranthine, will blossom immortal.
So not all in vain were the Bull's sacred stables,
And not all in vain were the priests and their fables,
And not all in vain the bright ribbon of Iris
That belted the clouds in the land of Osiris.

RECENT POEMS

OF

POLITICS AND SENTIMENT

BY W. A. CROFFUT.

JONATHAN AND JOHN.*

- “You're trespassin' on neighbor V.,”
Says Jonathan to John,
“For that's his land, I plainly see,
You've built your fences on ;
I heard him sendin' up his plea
That you'd go off an' let him be :
You're dreadful careless, seems to me,”
Says Jonathan to John.
- “'Tain't his— it's my own pastur' ground,”
Says John to Jonathan :
“My cattle broke acrost the bound,
An' on his medder ran,
An' then I 'ad to fence 'em round
So 'at they allus could be found,—
Wich makes my claim hintirely sound,”
Says John to Jonathan.
- “Your reasonin' 's amazin' new,”
Says Jonathan to John ;
“Your line's the old one Shambug drew
An' stuck his stakes upon ;
Now let me tell you w'at to du :
The titles let us neighbors view
An' jedge w'at b'longs to him an' you,”
Says Jonathan to John.
- “The land's all mine, as hi 'ave said,”
Says John to Jonathan,
“An' hi'll defend it till hi'm dead,
An' show you that I can.
W'atever owner was ahead,
That blawsted owner never'll tread
On medders where my stock has fed,”
Says John to Jonathan.
- “Consarned cantankerous you air,”
Says Jonathan to John ;
“Yo've been encroachin' everywhere
Your pesky folks hes gone.
But ez to V., you ken repair
The damage,—show yer titles there,
An' arbitrate the hull affair,”
Says Jonathan to John.

* John Bull and Neighbor Venezuela being concerned.—1896.

“ I’ll arbitrate with Mister V.,”
 Says John to Jonathan,
 “ All that I’ve stole quite recently
 An’ mapped upon my plan ;
 But w’at I stole before can’t be
 Subjected to a new decree—
 For that, uv course, belongs to me,”
 Says John to Jonathan.

“ You rogue ! I’ll teach you what is what ! ”
 Says Jonathan to John ;
 “ I’ll send my judges to the spot
 Where these ’ere lines are drawn,
 An’ hev ’em measure off your lot,
 An’ find exactly w’at you’ve got,—
 Nor don’t you touch another jot ! ”
 Says Jonathan to John.

THE SEARCH FOR HAPPINESS.

“ How can I be happy ? ” sighed Cleon, the King,
 “ And never unhappy again ?
 I wonder if ’tis an attainable thing ? ”
 And he summoned his maids and his men.

“ ’Tis known,” said a courtier, “ that whoso will find
 A man who is happy all day,
 And wear that man’s shirt, it will quiet his mind—
 He’ll be happy for ever and aye.”

The King rode afar, thro’ all countries and climes,
 Fast galloped he many a mile,
 And he found several men who were happy sometimes,
 But none who were so all the while. .

At last he o’ertook, to his boundless delight,
 Slow trudging along in his track,
 A man who was happy from morning till night,—
 But he hadn’t a shirt to his back !

TO AND ABOUT A LOCUST.

Rise! venerable infant under ground!

Hullo! Art never to have second birth?

When I was but a boy, and loitered round,

I saw thee dig thy cavern in the earth

So deep and dark that thou couldst not be found—

—Almost a score of years he keeps

His fortress of protection,

And still within his coffin sleeps,

Awaiting resurrection.

Aha! Good morning! Comest to the light?

How hast thou lived these many, many years?

Hast thou been nourished through the long, long night

With *dreams* of wheat-fields and their golden spears,

And wakest now for pillage and for flight?

—The chrysalis is finding wings,

And after meditation

He climbs a flowering shrub and clings

To take an observation.

Take care, young veteran, or thou'lt split thy back!

Look out, nor dance too recklessly! Take care!

Keep still! Thou'lt shake to pieces in thy track,

Thus twisting constantly and twitching—there!

Thou'st done it! Thou art bursting through the crack!

—He wriggled from his wrinkled rind

As fast as he could scramble,

And left his counterpart behind

A-clinging to the bramble.

My soaring Proteus! In the shifting scene

Shedding thy clothing, thou wilt catch a cold—

In pretty polonaise of ocean green,

In leather-lace fichu and belt of gold,

Palpi of silk and musical machine—

—With claws of steel it clasped a thorn,

The robe that was discarded—

And through dead spectacles of horn

The runaway regarded.

Blithe minstrel of the woodland clarionet!

I've cornered thee at last, elusive elf!

They said thou wert invisible, and yet

I find thee hiding on thy curtained shelf

Demure and silent, as if thou had'st met—

—Whist! Now he sees me with surprise,

And turns about to con me,

And casts his thousand-pupiled eyes

Inquiringly upon me!

Fly not, O sylvan singer! Tarry, while

The day reveals thine opalescent hues—

Thy rich lace gown and head-gear quaint of style,

Thy mottled stockings and thy soft grey shoes,—

O, stay, thou charming stranger! Stay, and I'll—

—Sh! Down the midget sits again;

His myriad optics glisten;

Perhaps he's going to pipe a strain

While I am here to listen.

Sweet! Sweet! Thou Mario of the maple, thanks!

Encore! Again that rich and quavering note!

Thy mellow song of liquid sweetness ranks

With rich, ecstatic anthem from the throat

Of nightingale on Guadalquiver's banks—

—“So insincere?” Well, where's the wrong?

One's bound to be delighted

And clap his hands at every song

Where one has been invited.

Thy throat thou dost not use, thou gifted one,

Nor agitate thy lungs, not ope thy mouth;

I see thine elbows twitching in the sun,

As if a hurdy-gurdy of the south

Thou did'st propel for melody or fun—

—Aha! Behold! The trick is known!

For as the locust lingers

He drums upon his collar bone

And fiddles on his fingers.

How varied the acquirements! Thou hast song!

The mother of thy brood has not a note;

And while thou chirpest, chirpest all day long,

She, toiling, files the dainty cradle out

In which shall wake to life the larval throng—

—He thrills, while she, with busy saw,

Prepares for home's expansion,

As Choctaw whistles while his squaw

Erects the family mansion.

Orthopteran ! Why hush thy plaintive horn ?
 Why faintest when thy strident note is sped,
 And droppest on the leaves a thing forlorn ?
 What ! piper, art thou in a moment dead,
 Who took so many years to get thee born ?
 —Departed ! Dead as Marley's ghost—
 The vaulting, vaunting gryllus ;
 With what strange thoughts his splendid boast
 And small achievements fill us !

Ethereal spirit ! Whither hast thou flown ?
 Why leavest thy forsaken casket here ?
 Hast thou an elfin bugle to be blown
 And spectral bag-pipes in some sunny sphere ?
 And what the philosophic moral to be drawn ?
 —A "moral" is like luscious mead—
 Whatever sun may strike it,
 Let each man draw his own, indeed,
 And then he's sure to like it.

THE YOSEMITE.

O, words ! how poor and vain and weak
 When of the masterpiece we speak—
 Of emerald vale and starry peak—
 The grandeurs of Yosemite !

What know we of the age remote
 When, on azoic seas afloat,
 Great Nature sailed her granite boat
 And dreamt about Yosemite ?

When demon thrones were upward hurled
 And fiery flags were high unfurled
 From bastions of a nascent world
 Beneath thy gulf, Yosemite ?

When Vulcan, tired of labors tame,
 Lit up his furious forge of flame
 And smote young Terra's molten frame
 And fashioned wild Yosemite ?

We only know this Titan's home
 Of ribboned fall and purple dome
 Is crystal of the primal foam
 That bathed thy beach, Yosemite.

Fair jewel ! Gold and pink and brown
 In splendor shining softly down,
 The Kohinoor in Nature's crown—
 Magnificent Yosemite !

SALUTATION TO MOLOCH.

(AIR: "BONNIE DUNDEE.")

To the Moloch of Nations 'twas Grover that spoke :
 Our children will spurn your piratical yoke ;
 Hands off ! They are free but they are feeble, and so
 We will read you the lesson of Colonel Monroe.

CHORUS : Come, fill up my cup ; come, fill up my can,
 Bring saddle for horse and equipment for man ;
 If the thief of the planet more insolent grow
 We will teach him the morals of Mister Monroe.

This Johnny Bulldozing it never will do,
 Ere weaklings are rifled, we've rifles for you ;
 On the soil you have stolen our judges shall go
 And lay down the tape-line of Colonel Monroe.

(CHORUS :)

Ere lifting the gantlet lookout ! By the Powers !
 The Irish in Ireland are fewer than ours—
 From Bantry to Dublin and North Kinnegoe
 They'll march with the banners of Colonel Monroe.

(CHORUS :)

We've counted your warships, asleep on the tide ;
 Your merchant-ships, myriads, uncounted they ride !
 What prizes we might have to gobble, you know,
 Enforcing the " Doctrine " of Colonel Monroe !

(CHORUS :)

First justice, then peace ! " Out of date " at this day,
 And " not international law "—as you say ;
 Defense of the weak from a swaggering foe—
 Quixotic injunction of Colonel Monroe.

(CHORUS :)

Great Braggart of Nations ! Your strength shall decay !
 Your cheek is of brass, but your feet are of clay ;
 Halt ! Right about face ! and less covetous grow
 As you study the lessons of Colonel Monroe.

CHORUS : O, Philip McCupp and Philip McCann
 And Yawcob and Hans will enlist to a man
 To bring the world's bandit and plunderer low,
 And teach him the morals of Mister Monroe.

THE EPHESIAN DOME.*

Ho! Watchman on the walls afar!
 Again the tigers rove;
 Hate's fiery star is fierce with war
 The peaceful earth above;
 Now, haste! The gates of Janus bar
 With bolts of triple love.

In puny wrath the infant cries
 Beside the island sea,
 And, as its angry wails arise,
 And all unheeded be,
 It to the world the torch applies
 And calls it being free!

No war for any greed of gain
 Is worth a widowed wife,
 Or child bereft, or father slain,
 Or, stretched in bloody strife
 Along a single battle plain,
 A single human life!

No creed e'er cradled in the heart
 Is worth the hellish mood
 That makes Tasmanian devils start
 And pour a fiery flood
 O'er vale and mountain, moor and mart,
 And drench the earth with blood.

The cross and crescent, fierce in fight,
 Who calls the battle blest?
 The flag whose right is banded Might,
 With peace upon its crest,
 All gleaming white in morning light,
 That banner is the best!

Ho! Watchman on the walls afar!
 Again the tigers rove;
 Chain up the furies' crimson car,
 Lest brutal Ares move—
 The gates of Janus lock and bar
 With bolts of triple love!

* Greece in 1876.

THE QUARRELSOME URCHIN.

In the county of Osman and town of Karete
 A bad litte boy rushed into the street
 And struck every man he happened to meet,
 Then raised an angry bawl,
 "I'm the chap that nobody dares to beat,
 Because I'm so very small."

He ran amuck through the startled town ;
 His whip he flourished up and down ;
 With the lash he answered his victims' frown
 And threatened the strong and tall—
 "He'd ought to be spanked," said good Dame Brown,
 " But he is so very small ! "

He found a man too sick to stand,
 And shouted, " You robber ! Get off from your land ! "
 And a brickbat flung with reckless hand,
 Then raised a joyous squall ;
 " I hit him right into the head ! That's grand ! "
 But he was so very small !

From his father's store he was able to add
 A deadly gun to the chafing gad,
 Then shot in the crowd and killed a lad,
 And the town cried, " Hasn't he gall ?
 It is too bad ! Exceedingly sad !
 But then he's so very small ! "

He lighted a torch and carried it through
 The town till a conflagration grew,
 And his neighbors cried, " We never knew
 So wicked a boy at all—
 But let him do as he wants to do,
 Because he's so very small ! "

His name it was Greece, I heard them say,
 And he wailed and bullied them day by day
 Till they said, " In order to stop the affray,
 And the horrible quarrel and brawl,
 We'll let the little imp have his way,
 Because he's so very small ! "

CUBA.*

O, fertile, fair, and fruitful isle
 Of summer's gift and graces,
 Thou'st been oppressed a weary while—
 To thee we turn our faces;
 We lay our hand upon thine own,
 We find our heart repeating
 The music of thy plaintive tone—
 Our pulse in concert beating.

We, too, have felt the insolence
 Of Europe's mad aggression;
 We, too, in battle's hot defense
 Have met the hireling Hessian;
 So now we wait, till, prey no more
 To absentee and jobber,
 Thy sons from all thy radiant shore
 Shall hurl the alien robber.

Soon may thy mercenary foe,
 Made wise by death and distance,
 More prudent grow and learn to know
 A freeman's wild resistance.
 May happy homes where love endears
 Make bold the patriot raider,
 And bayonet-hedge, like cactus spears,
 Receive the hired invader!

O, land of flowers, and cane and vine,
 O, Queen of fair Antilles,
 The arm of Spain shall yield to thine,
 Like Hector to Achilles;
 Their guilty doom Hidalgos hear
 And Bourbons meet disaster,
 Till no man in our hemisphere
 Shall call a king his master!

In Philip's western realm thou hast
 No longer a companion;
 Thou, little islet, art the last
 Of haughty Spain's dominion.
 Then arm each cane-brake, copse, and crag,
 Until, no longer vassal,
 Thy sacred blood-anointed flag
 Shall float from Moro Castle!

* Read at the meeting in behalf of "Cuba libre," Washington, 1896.

Wherever freemen may aspire—
 Wherever freemen may go,
 From land of ice to land of fire,—
 Greenland to Del Fuego,
 If they, self-poised, self-governing,
 Disdain the rule of others,
 And spurn the craft of priest and king,
 We hail them as our brothers!

Then fling upon the hordes of Spain
 Young Cuba's fierce battalion—
 To wreck a throne or break a chain
 We welcome man's rebellion.
 We hail thy fearless little band,
 And millions will abet us
 To forge a brand and lend a hand
 As far as Grover'll let us.

Oh, summer land of smiles and tears!
 In hope thy sorrow traces
 Its martyrdom through crimson years—
 To thee we turn our faces.
 We lay our hand upon thine own,
 Like drums our pulses beating;
 Answer the bugle thou hast blown,
 Our heart the song repeating.

AT AN APPLE-STAND.

(WHAT I SAID.)

Hi, boy! I've come to get some more—
 Those apples that I had before—
 Yes, these, my little shaver.
 One bite brings back my boyhood; I'm
 Transported to a by-gone time
 By their familiar flavor.

Alas! since from a neighbor's trees
 I plucked exactly such as these,
 With cheeks to crimson shaded,
 And taste like this—a pleasant tart—
 And sound and perfect to the heart,
 Full twenty years have faded.

How often, on the way to school,
 I took the path above the pool
 Beneath that fruity shadow,
 Through which the sun of summer bright
 Cast down a dappled net of light
 Upon the emerald meadow!

And how that leafy covert rang
 When all the feathered minstrels sang!
 The twitter of the linnet,
 The merry robin's gurgling gush,
 The bluebird, bobolink, and thrush,—
 I hear them all this minute.

And there sweet Kitty Ransom came
 With eyes of blue and cheeks aflame,
 As home from school she wended,
 As nimble-footed as a fawn,—
 A fleck of light upon the lawn,
 Of grace and goodness blended,

I clasped her trembling finger-tips
 One morn, and kissed her glowing lips,
 And pledged my love to Kitty;—
 But twenty years have fled since then—
 And that was Kennebunk in Maine,
 And this is New York City.

(WHAT THE BOY SAID.)

Say! I was borned in Kennebunk,
 And, 'fore she married Jacob Munk,
 My ma was Kitty Ransom!
 These is the fruit yer talkin' 'bout!
 Now, Mister, hev a peck?—Shell out!
 You'd ought to come down han'some!

A STUDY IN SOCIALISM.

QUESTIONING THE BEE, BY L. S. BEVINGTON, IN "LIBERTY LYRICS."

How have you managed it, bright busy bee?
 You are all of you useful, yet each of you free.

What man only talks of, the busy bee does;
 Shares food, and keeps order, with no waste of buzz.

No cell that's too narrow, no squander of wax,
 No damage to pay, and no rent, and no tax.

No drones kept in honey to look on and prate,
No property tyrants, no big-wigs of State.

Free access to flowers, free use of all wings;
And when bee-life is threatened, then free use of stings.

No fighting for glory, no fighting for pelf;
Each thrust at the risk of the soldier himself.

Comes over much plenty one summer, you'll see
A lull and a leisure for each busy bee.

No over-work, under-work, glut of the spoil;
No hunger for any, no purposeless toil.

Economy, Liberty, Order, and Wealth!
Say, busy bee, how have you reached Social Health?

ANSWER OF THE BEE, BY W. A. CROFFUT, IN NEW YORK TRIBUNE.

Buzz, buzz! Are you blind? For you certainly make
In your list of my comforts an awful mistake.

I've seen you sit there in your cabin and plan,
And have said to myself, "O, that I were a man!"

Don't you know that my life's a continual fight
From larva to grave and from morning to night?

Don't you know we have fought every hive in the row
And that every big swarm in the town is our foe,

And that whether on warlike or saccharine cruise
We're armed with a spear it may kill us to use?

Don't you know we've a queen who's as cruel as Cain,
And slaughters whoever of toil would complain,

Who has thousands of warriors and drones in her court
And princesses proud that we have to support?

She slays all her sisters in murderous mood,
Then stabs the kind father of all her brood;

And if she should perish, as mortals will do,
The whole hive, just out of respect, must die, too!

Don't you know we are slaves all our down-trodden lives
And never can have either children or wives?

My mandibles ache and my palpi are sore
Erecting wax walls and defending the door,

And hunting up nectar nutritious and sweet
And fetching wine-jelly for big-bugs to eat.

So, sometimes I kick, on my Socialist shelf,
And wish I could vote and could govern myself.

We're always in danger from birds, moths, or bees,
Or we're smothered in smoke or we starve or we freeze ;

We never expire in a home's peaceful fold,
But die with our boots on like bandits of old.

Compete ? I should think so ! I led a foray
To capture the fort of our rivals to-day ;

Her majesty sends us to put to the sword
That hiveful of thieves on the end of this board !

Hullo ! There's a swallow ! To dodge him I'll try—
O, murder ! He sees me ! He's got me ! Good bye !

A REBEL'S CONFESSION.

Yaas, I fit in the War. I wer on the losin' side—
A Johnny Reb,—I mention it, but 'taint no cause of pride ;
Fer I wer down in Dixie wen the trouble come to me—
I wer riz in Alabama, way up the Tennessee.
Thet's how it come about, you know—Secesh wer in the air—
The State wer boss, the Fedril Guvment wusn't anywhere ;
O, you'd a-done the same, prehabs. ef you'd ben rizen thar ;
For ole John Brown hed stole our nigs, ole Abe hed follered suit,
An gwine to march his minions down to tread us under foot.

It made us mad, this sort o' thing : we swore it shouldn't be ;
So wen, in Alabama, way up the Tennessee,
The ole Tuscumby Battery inlisted fur the fight,
I signed the roll and waded in, not doubtin it wer right !
An after we hed mustered under Cap'n Deacon Brown,
We halted off aginst the church, ez we wus marchin' down,
To git the benediction uv the oldest man in town,—
He fout behind the cotton bales—my uncle, Marion Rowe,—
An left a leg at New Orleans nigh fifty year befo'.

He leaned out on the winder sill an looked along the line—
 On his white har an shakin crutch I see the candle shine,
 An tears wus runnin down the cheeks uv Uncle Marion Rowe,
 An in his hand a little flag he hill, an waved it—so—
 “My boys,” cried he, “turn back! turn back! the warnin uv a
 friend!

The trouble you air bringin on you'll never see it end.
 For wot you break in anger is allus hard to mend—
 Don't fire upon the flag! Turn back!” we see him tremblin stand,
 An then he dropped and died right thar, the banner in his hand!

Some said it wer a judgment; some thot he wer insane;
 Some 'lowed twer second chilehood, an failin uv the brain;
 At any rate, the drums struck up; we took the path once mo',
 An hed right smart of fightin' from the mountings to the sho'—
 At Corinth, Shiloh, Donelson, and Chattahoochie Sound,
 At Nashville, Dalton, Mission Ridge, an all the hills around
 Ole Kennesaw, till half uv us wus furloughed under ground.
 An frequent, with a solemn smile, wen we wa'n't feelin gay,
 We'd talk uv Uncle Marion, an wot he use to say.

We sometimes drempt of him, and on picket line at night
 We'd see him wavin' of his flag—a dreadful shivery sight—
 And wen a crony died, and we'uns layin' him away,
 “To meet yer Uncle Marion” wus wot the boys'd say.
 Wal, finally it petered out; the ole shell busted in;
 Our Mammoth Cave with that un in Kentucky wus a twin,
 An we retreated on a lope to start the world agin.
 An wen old 'Lysses settled it thet Uncle Sam should rule,
 Two things he let us tote home—meditation an a mule.

Wal, Jim, I hev got shet uv them ole obsolete idees.
 I've looked around for years an seen wot everybody sees:
 I've seen that Dixie wus behind an Yankee ways wus best,
 I've seen that ole Abe probly knew wot ole John Brown hed
 guessed;

I've seen the niggers chuckle at the thought uv bein free;
 I've seen wealth rollin on to thet astonishin degree
 That some has reached Tuscumby on the upper Tennessee—
 An wen I set at night an think, the fact is mighty plain
 It wusn't Uncle Marion but me that wus insane.

I'm proud uv these United States es any man to-day;
 Proud uv the flag wen under it my joyful child'en play;
 Proud uv the schools thet teach 'em things I never heard about
 Till they come tellin' uv me wot the teachers hes found out;
 Proud uv the land whose prizes go to industry and worth,
 Which holds its head as high as any nation on the earth,
 An every mother's baby hes a blessin' with its birth.
 Wat a confounded idjot I form'ly use to be
 Wen I listed in Tuscumby on the upper Tennessee!

I'm glad the ole Confed'racy was blighted in the bud ;
 I'm glad thet we wus walloped by the chaps uv kindred blood ;
 I'm glad the States is keepin step an marchin on es one,
 From Floridy to Mexico, from Maine to Oregon ;
 An I will mention three men, whose teachins I despise,
 Who filled my heart with hatred an stuffed my ears with lies,
 An dulled my brain with ignorance, and bandaged up my eyes,
 An sent me thet fool's urrand from the upper Tennessee—
 I 'lude to Jeff'son Davis an Robert Toombs an me !

THE OLD SCHOOL-HOUSE.

The old red school-house on the hill—
 I see it wheresoe'er I go—
 The forge, the brook, the singing mill,
 The lot where apple-blossoms blow—
 I smell their fragrance now, although
 New visions flit, as visions will.

Old Memory plays such tricks with me !
 Beyond the pomp of lettered men
 And arrogance of art, I see
 That teacher tall who comes again
 With smile and kindly voice as when
 I learned my letters at his knee.

Whene'er the smile his face forsook,
 And loud he summoned to his side
 An urchin with neglected book,
 Abundant love still conquered pride—
 The lightness of his arm belied
 The awful sternness of his look !

Above the turmoil of the chase,
 The victim's groan, the victor's cheer,
 The clang of Mammon's maddening race,
 And Pleasure's laugh and Sorrow's tear,
 Once more his gentle word I hear—
 Once more I see his patient face.

New visions flit, as phantoms will :
 The Parthenon and Hadrian's hall,
 King David's tower, Siloam's rill,
 And Memnon's lips and Karnak's wall ;
 I see behind and through them all,
 The old red school-house on the hill.

Beneath that hill the twilight hour
 Fell on the smithy dark and low,
 Where, symbol of mysterious power,
 Our rustic Vulcan, blow on blow,
 Still wrought, his fiery arm aglow—
 His hammer in a starry shower!

The old red school-house!—'round about
 A listening field of daisies white,
 Whose hearts responded to the shout
 That told of jocund spirits light,
 And thrilled with sweet regret at night
 When earth was still and school was out!

In hurrying throngs I often see
 That master whom I idly praise—
 (I learned my letters at his knee—)
 And catch a glimpse in crowded ways
 Of them who in the far-off days
 Sat on the lowest bench with me.

And one was there whose sacred kiss,
 Seal of a sister's loving heart,
 My young step led from aught amiss—
 Fair child of Nature's artless art,
 Now sleeping in the field apart—
 Sweet acre of the Silences.

So Fancy plays her tricks with me!
 While that old school-house on the hill
 Forever anchored seems to be,
 New visions fade as phantoms will,
 And that friend, kind and patient—still
 I learn my lessons at his knee.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 022 171 590 1