

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

It will be the object of a future Article to examine the relation which the Lord's day bears to the primeval and Jewish Sabbaths, and the authority, if such there be, upon which a day of holy rest, under the Christian economy, can be securely and satisfactorily built and maintained.

ARTICLE III.

THE BIBLE IN SCHOOLS.¹

By Rev. J. H. Seelye, Pastor of the First Reformed Church, Schenectady, N. Y.

THERE is no tendency among us to revolutionize our present theory of government. The American public are content with this theory as it is ; and whether our civil institutions would satisfy us better if formed upon a radically different plan, is a question which no special interest is felt in discussing. There are, however, many cases arising where the precise application of this theory is a much disputed point. How should it regulate domestic servitude ? In what relation does it stand to a protective tariff ? Does it authorize or conflict with the doctrine that a certain portion of our public domain may be given away to furnish homes for the homeless ? What does it permit or prohibit respecting laws for preventing intemperance ? These, and other questions, relating solely to the application of our theory of government, have awakened a profound interest and an animated discussion. The subject of the Bible in schools belongs to this class, and is exciting much feeling at the present time. We propose to examine this in the present Article, hoping to

¹ Elements of Moral Science. By L. P. Hickok, D. D., Union College. 1854.

Right of the Bible in our Public Schools. By George B. Cheever, D. D. 1854.

Decision of Mr. Superintendent Randall in the Quigley Case. 1854.

bring out some of those principles upon which the whole matter must ultimately be adjusted.

The question before us does not relate to the Divine authority of the Bible, nor to the propriety of giving religious instruction to the young. It is admitted that the sacred Scriptures came from God; it is also conceded that children should, very early, be made acquainted with their Divine teachings. The simple question which we have to answer is, whether this instruction should be wholly left to the parents, the church, the special religious teachers of the child, or whether it should be incorporated as a fixed element in a public and secular system of education. Ought the Bible, as the word of God, to be read in our public schools? Ought the doctrines and the duties of the Bible to be taught in our public schools? These are the only points now before us.

In discussing this subject, however, a wide field has to be surveyed. How shall we determine what ought to be done, in a system of public education? The *ought* is never a question of expediency, but always of duty. It is not therefore to be settled by a calculation of questionable and changing advantages, but only by the attainment of unquestioned and unchanging principles. To determine what an individual, in any given case, ought to do, we must first attain some general principle for his action, and then settle the particular conduct in conformity to this. So also of a society, a community, a state. Whenever we speak of duty, or of something which ought to be done, we settle it, or at least should do so, not by any balancing of consequences, or drawing the line between different expediencies, but by fixing upon some principle which shall control all results, while itself shall be controlled by none. The principles which should regulate the conduct of a state, are essentially different from those which should control the action of an individual man, because the state and the man have each a radically different end. The end of the state is the highest freedom of its subjects, the end of the man is the most perfect union with God. The principles, therefore, which will establish the duty of the

one, need not necessarily settle the duty of the other, for the standard of right in the two cases is not the same. Much difficulty has been experienced in discussing the question respecting the Bible in schools, from assuming that that which is right for the man, is therefore and necessarily right for the state. The duty of the two may coincide, but it is to be determined, in both cases, upon different principles. Without inquiring, now, what ought to be the conduct of the individual, in reference to the teaching and circulation of the Scriptures, we shall seek only to attain those principles which shall establish clearly the duty of the state upon this point.

We start by affirming the position, that *the state can only exist on the basis of some form of religion*. "Government," says Burke, "is a contrivance of human wisdom for the protection of human rights." This definition, if it be designed to express a full theory of government, is imperfect, but as a partial statement it cannot be disputed. It is certainly one end of government to protect the rights of its subjects. We may call that government a failure, which allows the unchecked and undisputed sway of wrong within its borders. Every government must provide itself with some machinery by which its laws for the protection of rights shall be faithfully enforced. Thus a system of police becomes necessary; officers, courts, prisons, and other instruments of judicial and executive procedure, are required as means by which the great end shall be secured. All these are undoubtedly within the province of government. It would be folly to say that these means may not be used; they must be used, or the government must abandon one of the very objects for which it was formed. We cannot protect human rights simply by legislating; we must, in the present condition of the race, have a force also to execute, or legislation would be but a waste of words. Now it is this necessity for an executive force, grounded as it is in the very nature of government, which demands some religion for the state. No state can perfectly execute its laws for the protection of rights, except through the aid of religious sanctions. We may have penalties

which shall be of unmitigated severity, courts that shall be altogether impartial in adjudging them, officers and a police system as perfect in watchfulness and fidelity as anything human can be, and yet the vices and crimes which we would check by these means alone, will run riot and trample beneath them all these restraining influences. There must be an unseen principle in the government, which shall appeal to the unseen and spiritual being of its subjects; there must be something which shall lay hold upon the religious susceptibility of man, which shall control the conscience and sway the soul, by bringing in the constant supervision of a Sovereign who can see where no human eye can penetrate, who can punish where no human arm can restrain, and who has an eternity for his just and unavoidable retributions. No human control can be omnipresent in its influence; no system of police espionage can be omniscient; no force which human authority wields, can be omnipotent; and yet a government, in order to its perfect success, needs something which shall be everywhere present, all-seeing, and almighty. It needs some kind of a religion, and it must have this, or it is powerless.

But there is a profounder principle on which this connection of the state with religion may be affirmed: The state is not a mere aggregation of the individuals who represent it; just as the man is something more than the sum of the particles which compose his body. Neither do these individuals, together with the laws which connect them under one government, constitute the state, any more than do the particles of a man's body, in their union through dynamic agencies, make up the man. There is a spirituality which is the man; and it is this same spirituality, in a broader sense, which is the state. There is in human nature a principle of authority, a reason, a conscience, a will, which is not only valid to control the individual in whom we first find it, but can utter universal maxims and principles, which have authority in the actions and sentiments of men. The state is the actual exhibition, it is the real carrying out and maintaining of these universal principles which the reason, the

spirituality of every man announces. They are not accidental, they are not invented, they are not forced upon us, but they spring up necessarily with human nature itself, and without them human nature could not be conceived. They are like those Divine commands of which Sophocles says, in the *Antigone*, "they are not of yesterday, or to-day; no: they live without end, and no one knows how they came or when they came." The state is, at the same time, the embodiment of these universal principles, as they come out in the institutions of any people; and it represents, also, that true and substantial spirituality in man, from which these principles spring; just as to Minerva, among the Athenians, belonged the twofold significance of bearing the name of the people as a whole, and being also the goddess who represented their inner character and spirit.

The state is thus essential to human society. It is not the result of any agreement or compact among individuals, as though it would not exist were the compact wanting. No one has any more right or power to say that he will not grow up under the sway of some state, than to say that he will not grow up into his own manhood. The state is as necessary to him as his own manhood, and he can therefore no more throw off the one than the other. "It is manifest," says Aristotle, "that the state is one of the things which exist by nature, and that man is, by nature, an animal living in states."¹

All this brings out the intimate and necessary connection of the state with religion: the two grow out of the same element in the human soul. It is the reason, the conscience, the will of man, which makes him a subject of God, and it is this which constitutes him a citizen of the state. It is this spirituality by which he can hold communion with his Maker; and it is this, also, which gives him a real community with his kind. Public law, if it shall be established and defined, must spring from that same spirituality where religion itself has its seat. Religion, in order to its full exhi-

¹ πολιτικὸν ζῶον.—*Polit.* I. 1.

bition, needs a social relation, among men and the state; in order to its valid existence, needs a religious condition in man. The state cannot be conceived without religion; for it is the essence of the state to be an arrangement and exposition of ethical principles; and this would be inconceivable without a religious ground. The state and religion form, together, one ethical whole, which, though they may sometimes be spoken of as separate, are yet ever united in one germ, in one common and living root; just as the soul, in the individual man, is one undivided whole, though we sometimes speak of its separate faculties, as understanding, susceptibility, and will. We can no more separate, in the present condition of man, religion and the state, and consider the one as independent of the other, than we can any two faculties of the human soul.

But we need not dwell upon these philosophical principles. If we turn to the actual condition of things, we find that religion and the state have always been connected in the history of the world. No state has ever yet existed without resting on the basis of some religion. The earliest state constitution of which we have any clear record is the Egyptian, and this was distinctively a theocracy. The Hebrew state was, at first, theocratic; and when God gave this people a king, the religious element in their constitution was not withdrawn. The old kingdoms of Assyria, Phenicia, Media, and Persia, all made use of some special religion as an auxiliary to their civil rule. India was, and still is, a priestly aristocracy. In China, the emperor of the state has ever been the high-priest of the religion. The Roman state regarded its emperor as the representative of its god. Cesar not only reigned by the will of Jove, but he was considered as occupying the same position among mortals as Jupiter among the immortals. The Saracenic empire sprang up, of course, in a religious interest, and had its whole character and conduct shaped by its religion. Among modern states, not a single one will be found where the civil rule is dissociated from religion. France tried it once. She wrote on her palaces and gateways, *There is no God*; but the atheistic inscription was

washed out in human blood. She uttered aloud from the forum, from the tribune, by orator, by judge, and by legislator, that there is no religion, and nothing divine; but the cries of anarchy, the roar of strife, the tumult of mad passions unchecked, drowned the denying voice. It is sometimes said by the worshippers of Napoleon I. that he manifested his great insight by restoring to France some kind of religion; but it required no great insight to see a fact which is so plain upon the page of history that only a blind man could pass it by. It would certainly have shown a curious character, if the man who could plan the Spanish campaign and write the code which he gave to France, could not also have seen that the state, separated from religion, is destroyed.

Our own country offers no exception to this universal rule. It is a great mistake to affirm that we tolerate all religions, and have, therefore, none of our own. We do not tolerate all religions; we simply allow a wide latitude of religious belief; but when it comes to a broad question of religious practice, we tolerate nothing but what is essentially Christian. A Fejee islander might live among us, and indulge his unshaken religious belief that his gods could only be appeased by human sacrifices, and there would be none to molest him or make him afraid. But let him undertake to carry this belief into practice, and how long will it be supposed that our law would tolerate it, or leave him in impunity? The Thugs of India make it a prominent duty of their religion to strangle men; they may believe it as long as they please, but they practise it, within our borders, at their peril. A Mohammeden might build his mosque among us, and we might allow him certain of his religious rites which would not interfere with any of our own; but let him call the muezzin on a Christian Sabbath, or in any other way infringe upon anything belonging to the practices of the Christian religion, and he has his peace no longer. If it be said that we have chosen extreme cases, and that the cannibal or the Thug would be punished for their practices here, not upon religious but upon civil grounds, we answer, that the very objection is an argument for the truth we affirm. For why

do we regard it as a crime to strangle enemies, or to offer our captives in sacrifice, except for the reason that our laws have been formed on the basis of a religion which is at war with such practices? The fact, moreover, of judicial oaths among us, of our laws against blasphemy and against the violation of the Christian Sabbath, the fact that no civil contract entered into upon the Lord's day, is allowed to be valid in our courts, all show, not only that we have a distinctive religion, but what that religion is. Christianity is interwoven with all our government and laws, and with every civil institution we possess; so that it cannot be removed, without entirely transforming the character and destroying all that is true and substantial and vital in the institutions themselves. This point will appear still more distinctly in the progress of our discussion.

From all this it follows, with unbending necessity, that the state must teach its religion; though this is to be done, not for the sake of the religion, but for the sake of the state. The state must rest upon the basis of some religion, and it must preserve this basis, or itself will fall. But the support which any religion gives to any state, will obviously cease, the moment the religion ceases its hold upon the popular mind. Of course, if the people care nothing about the religion, or know nothing about it, it has altogether lost its power as a means of influence in behalf of the state. Religious pains and penalties are good for nothing as a restraint upon men unless they be believed in; but how shall men believe in what they have not heard, and how shall they hear without a teacher, and how shall they teach except they be sent. The very fact that the state must have some religion as a support for its own authority, demands that some means for teaching this religion be employed. It would be suicidal for the state to neglect this. Better for it to give up all other instruction, than that its religion should be disregarded in its schools. The state itself has a more vital interest in the continued influence of its religion over its citizens, than in their culture in any other respect.

All this is true, moreover, of any state, without raising

any question respecting the truth of its religion. Whether the religion be true or false, in a given instance, the state relies upon it, — its whole character is employed in giving force to the civil authority; and, as such, it must be kept up, and the people must be educated in it. We are looking now, not to the eternal but to the temporal interests; not to the divine but to the civil relations of man; and, viewing the question in this aspect, we are forced to the position that the state ought, always, to do that which will best promote its own permanence; and, as this, from the nature of the case, can only be secured through the permanent influence of its religion, this religion should be taught, by the state, in its schools.

Now, as already indicated, the religion of this country is that of the Bible. No one can properly dispute this. No matter whether the Bible be true or false; it is the exponent of our religion, and is the book containing the principles which have moulded all our civil institutions. It is that which gives character, and force, and stability to our government and laws. You might as well take out the heart from the body, and suppose that it would be a living body still, as to take away the Bible and all its influence from our institutions, and expect that these would be preserved from decay. He that does not see, and will not acknowledge, the power of the Bible in building up the whole framework of American institutions, is either unwise or insincere. "There is nothing we look for with more certainty," says Mr. Webster, "than this principle, that Christianity is part of the law of the land. Everything declares this. The generations which have gone before, speak to it and pronounce it from the tomb. We feel it. All, all proclaim that Christianity, general, tolerant Christianity, independent of sects and parties, that Christianity to which the sword and the faggot are unknown, general, tolerant Christianity, is the law of the land."

It is therefore the most vital demand upon the American state, that the Bible be taught in American schools. Whether the American state be a true and right one, or not, is not a subject for it to discuss; for no state may ever raise such a

question respecting itself. The American state is as it is; and its highest law, the law of its own self-preservation, is, that it remain unchanged. It can only do this by keeping hold of the Bible; but this hold would be lost irrecoverably, so soon as the Bible should be left out of its schools. It is of the highest importance to our state that the Bible be taught to the whole mass of our citizens; but this will only be done when the state itself engages in the work of instruction. It is idle to talk about any other agency doing this, — as the church, the Bible Society, the individual Christian, — because this is an interest of such moment to the state, that it cannot properly be suffered to depend upon any merely voluntary agency. The government of China requires that the doctrines of Confucius be taught in its schools; the spirit of the Koran pervades the schools of Turkey and Mohammedan lands; the Shasters and Vedas direct the instruction which is furnished by the priestly rule in India; and none will dispute the propriety of this as a mere question of state policy. On precisely the same principle, the Bible should have its place in American schools.

We have dwelt more particularly upon these points, because they are very apt to be overlooked in the discussion of this question. Those who advocate and those who oppose the Bible in schools, generally do so upon purely religious grounds; while the great question is, in fact, a distinctively civil one. Purely religious considerations ought not to enter into the discussion; for a state has, in reality, nothing to do with these. Religion in an individual character is an end, but in the state it is only a means. A state must always have some religion; but it must have it in order that it may use it in procuring something farther for itself. When we say that the state should teach its religion, this is in order that the state should be preserved as it is; and thus when we say that our own state should place the Bible in its schools, this is in order that it may keep its being and character unimpaired; and, as a question which the state has to settle, there is no higher principle for it to be guided by than this.

The argument thus far advanced, is of universal validity.

It is applicable to every state, no matter what that state's religion may be. But there is an additional reason for a Christian state to cause the Bible to be taught in its schools, which can be used in favor of the books of no other religion. Just so far as the Bible is taught and obeyed, not only is the state authority respected, but the public weal is secured. There is no means for restraining lawless passions, for removing vice and immorality, for breaking down every evil and building up every good in society, so mighty as the Bible. Whatever we may say respecting its Divine authority, or respecting the genuineness with which it has been handed down to us, it requires more hardihood and less wisdom than most men among us possess, to deny that were its precepts but faithfully followed, the highest well being of society would be the inevitable result. Viewing men simply in respect of the interests of this present life, the teaching of the Bible is of inestimable worth in moulding their character and shaping their actions. If we look at the condition of the human race, we must acknowledge the infinite change for good which would result, if the Bible were universally known and universally obeyed. What makes the world so dark? Why is a faithful picture of human society one of such wretchedness and woe, that we close our eyes in horror upon it? What makes humanity so poor, so down trodden, so degraded, that the scenes of its sorrow meet us at every step we take, and the wail of its misery is borne, on every passing breeze, to our ears? It is only because the principles of the Bible do not sway the human heart. There is no solution of the much-talked-of social problem, so profound and so comprehensive as that which the Bible gives. Intemperance, licentiousness, in fact, every vice which can be named, with all its attendant miseries, has its root and starting point, and is dependent for its continuance in the world, in the simple fact that the Bible does not control the heart and life. The Bible demands the supremacy of the spirit, the reign of conscience in the individual man; and it is in the failure to recognize and yield to this demand, that every vice has its ground. Every vice is because the

spirit is held in bondage to the flesh, and conscience has been driven from the throne.

Just so of crime: the Bible, if obeyed, would drive it all from the world. A crime is the violation, by one man, of the rights of another; but the Bible forbids all such violation. If I obey the Bible, my neighbor's person and property and character will be sacred to me, for this is the principle which the Bible teaches. We should never have any crime in the world; all violence and fraud and defalcations and over-reaching of one man by another, would cease; the gallows-tree might still grow in its native forest, and the prison-stones lie undug in their quarry bed, and the sword of punishment remain forever sheathed, if every man did but regard his neighbor's rights as his own, just as the Bible tells him to do. Here is certainly a picture far transcending the actual condition of the human race. The sources of vice are dried up, the fountains of crime are destroyed, the burdens under which the race has groaned for ages are removed, man becomes once more a dweller in Eden, and earth is changed back again to the Paradise of God! Is there nothing in this worth striving after, and which the state itself may properly aim to reach? And yet the Bible will bring it all to pass. Let the Bible have free course, let it be obeyed as it teaches, and the perfection of human society would ensue. We speak not now of those infinitely higher blessings which the principles of the Bible, if followed, would secure for man in the coming life, for with these the state has nothing to do; but the Bible is profitable for the life that now is, and this places it in a position where no Christian state may wisely disregard it. The Bible is certainly fitted to bring untold blessings to civil society; and may not the state seek for these blessings through the only channel in which they can come? Is it not wise for the state to teach the Bible in its schools; or, in fact, to do anything by which this sacred book should become known and respected and obeyed, and thus the priceless boon which it brings be secured? It would be, in fact, worse than folly to leave this undone.

It would be interesting, here, to notice what the Bible has

actually done for the elevation and perfection of society ; but we pass this by with the briefest remark. Our position is not merely a theoretical one ; it is supported by strong practical testimony. It is true, there has never been found, in fact, a perfectly organized state, and yet the most perfect, the happiest, the wisest, the highest, the best, are certainly those where the Bible has had the greatest influence ; and these come below a perfect standard, because the Bible has been kept back from its perfect working. It certainly needs no argument to show the superiority in public civilization and culture, in social refinement and happiness, in individual peace and prosperity, in fact, the superiority in everything relating to the commonwealth, of any Christian over any heathen state. And the Christian state is thus exalted and blessed because of its Christianity, and in proportion to it.

The conclusion, which follows with strictest necessity from these positions, would seem to be this : The Bible has certainly done very much for human society ; it is fitted to do far more ; therefore, let its influence be kept up, and let the state especially see that its principles are taught to all within its borders. Against this conclusion, no possible argument can be brought except that of the Romanist. He answers to us: You go too fast in your reasonings. The Bible is fitted to do all that you say it is ; but it will never accomplish this by being placed in the hands of all men. The superiority of Christendom to pagan lands, has been owing to the Bible, to be sure ; but it is not because the Bible has been taught directly to the masses. Common minds cannot understand this book ; it will not elevate and improve them if they read it ; give it to the clergy, but not to the laity ; let the teacher have it, but keep it away from the pupil. The Romanist would, in this way, evade the force of our position ; but we may hold to the position still. It were easy to reply to his answer theoretically and conclusively, but let us look at it practically. We may safely take issue upon the matter of fact.

Christian nations differ from all others by professing the religion of the Bible. Protestant nations differ from papal

ones, by placing the Bible in all hands alike. The right of every man to have the Bible, and to interpret it according to his own private judgment, is distinctively Protestantism; just as the denial of this right is as radically Romanism. If, now, we can compare the state of society in Protestant and Roman Catholic lands, we shall find a practical exhibition of the working of these two principles; we shall then be able to conclude, with infallible certainty, whether the state ought to see that the Bible is taught in its public schools, for we shall then see whether the general dissemination and inculcation of the Bible, is really conducive to the public weal.

A general survey of Protestant and papal countries would unquestionably support our position. Viewing these two classes in their general aspects, it could not be denied that the Protestant has the superiority in order, peace, general diffusion of knowledge, equality of social rights and privileges, and in liberty. This is certainly much; but a specific examination renders this far more conclusive.

Protestant lands, the lands of a free Bible, have incontestably the superiority over papal countries in all that relates to national advancement. We think it would be fair to take, as an illustration of this, Ireland and Scotland, two lands of the same climate, and lying side by side; but this comparison might be objected to on the ground of the different treatment which these two lands have received from the same government. But no objection can be raised against comparing Protestant and Romanist Ireland together. The province of Ulster is largely Protestant; that of Connaught is essentially papal. A recent census of these two provinces will throw some light upon the workings of each system. According to this census, the proportions of the population who can neither read nor write are: Protestant Ulster, thirty-three per cent.; papal Connaught, sixty-four per cent. Again, Protestant Ulster contains one third of the population of Ireland; but it requires only one seventh of the police force, and furnishes only one sixth of the convicted criminals. In the years 1849 and 1850, twenty-three executions for capital crime took place in Ireland; but of these only two occur-

red in Ulster. Says E. M. Dill, in his work upon this land: "You cannot but feel, in traversing the country, that Ulster is at least fifty years ahead of its sister provinces in all the true elements of national progress."

Take Protestant and papal Germany, and let Prussia stand for the one and Austria for the other,—a perfectly fair comparison. In Prussia, the number of students is one out of every six of the inhabitants; in Austria, it is only one out of ten. In Austria, there are committed, in proportion to the population, four times the amount of crime against persons as in Prussia. Quetelet, in his "Researches on the Propensity to Crime," makes this out as follows: In Austria, crime against persons is committed out of every ten thousand inhabitants; while in Prussia it is only one of forty thousand. Of crimes against property, there are twice as many, in proportion to the population, as in Prussia.

When England was papal, the nobility and clergy possessed nearly the whole of her wealth. Now, her revenue is divided as follows: nobility, one fifth; learned professions, one fifth; farmers, one fourth; tradesmen, one third; other classes, the remainder.

Protestant Scotland shows, on an average, one assassination, or attempt to assassinate, out of 270,000 of its inhabitants; papal Spain, one out of 4,000; papal Naples, one out of 2,500; and the Roman States themselves, one out of 750. We might extend this comparison to a great length, and the result would be the same. The cause of this diversity cannot be mistaken. Christianity is the great educator, elevator, and civilizer of the race; but its beneficent working is only secured through the popular diffusion of its oracles. Says M. Cousin, in his Report upon the Public Instruction in Germany: "The general system of instruction is grounded on the Bible as translated by Luther, the catechism, and Scripture history; and every wise man will rejoice in this; for, with three fourths of the population, morality can be instilled only through the medium of religion. Luther's forcible and popular translation of the Bible is in circulation, from one end of Protestant Germany to the other, and has greatly

aided in the moral and religious education of the people." The distinguished philosopher also observes, that he regards it as a great calamity for France that they have not a translation of the Bible of equal merit, and of as wide a circulation.

We come, now, to notice the objection from conscience, to the use of the Bible in schools. It runs in this way: You may not require that the Bible should be read, because the papist, the Jew, the Mohammedan, the infidel, has conscientious scruples against it. The objection may be very summarily answered. The authority of the state may never be subordinated to the individual conscience. The state has its own end, of highest freedom; government has its end, of securing to its subjects the enjoyment of this freedom. The state uses religion as a means to this end; but religion itself is never an end with the state. Everything relating to the moral and religious life of its subjects, is of interest to the state only so far as the state can use it for its own ends. The state has nothing to do with the inner character, and cares nothing about this, so long as the outward action pleases it. To the individual, conscience is of more importance than the state; but to the state, nothing is so important as its own supremacy. If the will of the state come in conflict with the will or the conscience of an individual, the individual may suffer martyrdom, but the state may not waver. That the safety of the public is the supreme law, is a maxim of universal application, and liberty of conscience may never interfere with the public weal. This right of the state to be governed by its own views of duty, resolves itself, in fact, into the most absolute necessity; for, if the laws should be dispensed with whenever they happen to come into collision with some supposed religious obligation, the state would be perpetually falling short of the exigency. We have laws against polygamy; yet the Mormon or Mohammedan cannot claim an exemption from their operation, or freedom from punishment imposed on their violation, because they may believe, however conscientiously, that polygamy is an institution founded on the soundest political wisdom, and has inspired revelation in its support. No mat-

ter what your individual conscience may think, says the state, I will it otherwise; and you must either submit or bear the penalty. A true conscience will bear the penalty rather than submit, but the state has no alternative between these two.

The real difficulty in this question lies in confounding two things radically different. The state is for time; conscience, for eternity. The state knows nothing higher than itself; conscience is responsible to God. With the state, religion is a means; with conscience, it is an end. When, therefore, these two spheres come in hostile conflict, we need not ask which should yield to the other; each must triumph on its own ground: the state, for this world; conscience, for the next; the state enforcing its own claims, and conscience adhering to the claims of God; the state using conscience as a means, and conscience triumphing in it as an end.

There is another point which should here be noticed: any argument which affirms a connection of the state with religion, and the duty of the state to maintain its religion, is very apt to be met with the objection that this might sanction any extent of religious persecution. The Grand Duke of Tuscany would thus be perfectly justified in his treatment of the Madiari; and no fault could be found with any act, however severe, put forth by a state with a view of defending or maintaining the supremacy of the religion on which it might rest. But the objection overlooks some of the principles we have advanced, and has no force against the others. Religion is not, in any proper sense, an end of the state. The state, though having its ground in the spiritual or religious element in humanity, has no aim beyond this present life. Its relations are altogether to mankind as an organized community; and its peculiar and entire province is, to guide the working of this community according to the highest civilization and freedom. This is its true and highest end; and while it may use everything else subordinately to this, it may use this for nothing. Religion may be employed by the state as a means to secure the end of civilization and freedom; but these latter may never be yielded to

subserve any religious advancement. With the individual, religion is primary and an end; with the state, it is only secondary, and a means. To suppose that there could be any other true relation between the two, would make the state a nullity. Hence whenever the demands of civilization and of freedom are disregarded, and the state tramples on these interests for the sake of any religious considerations, it has gone beyond its true bounds, and altogether transcended its legitimate authority. We may say that the state in such a case is wrong, not because it has sought to maintain its religion, but because it has made this its supreme end, and reduced to an inferior importance what are really its highest objects of pursuit. The principles upon which we must determine the right and the wrong of a state's action, in any given instance, are not those Divine laws which are to control the spiritual life of the individual for eternity. There are temporal and earthly interests for the individual; and it is to subserve these that there is a state, a community, among men. These interests are undoubtedly secured more perfectly through the agency of some religion; and hence the proper and necessary connection of religion with the state. But in this connection, religion is ever the servant, never the sovereign. It is to be used to secure some end; and may never be changed by the state so as to become, itself, the end to be secured. The highest question for the state to ask is, not what does religion demand, but what are the demands of civilization and freedom? since these cover the individual's highest temporal and earthly interests. The wrong of persecution by the state, can be demonstrated on no other grounds. It is wrong because it makes religion an end, and interferes with the highest civilization and freedom, the only true end of the state. The Grand Duke of Tuscany should not have imprisoned the Madiari, because this end of the state did not demand such an act, but denounced it. It is to the principles of civilization and freedom, that the ultimate appeal must be made in regulating any decision of state policy. These principles are coming out, more and more clearly, in the progress of time, and are already appre-

hended distinctly enough to settle every great question that can arise. When then the appeal is made to these, we determine, without any discrepancy, the right of the state to teach its religion, and the wrong of the state in persecution. Religion may be taught as a means to the highest civilization; but when persecution is employed in its support, it ceases to be a means, but becomes an end, to maintain which civilization itself is overborne.

ARTICLE IV.

THE MOSAIC NARRATIVE OF THE CREATION CONSIDERED GRAMMATICALLY AND IN ITS RELATIONS TO SCIENCE.

By E. P. Barrows, Professor at Andover.

By the discoveries of geology the Mosaic narrative of the creation has been invested with new and extraordinary interest. These revelations, as might have been anticipated from the history of all past discoveries in science that touch upon the sphere of revelation, have been treated in two opposite and extreme methods, both of them alike uncandid and unphilosophical. One class of men take the position of entirely neglecting the facts of geology; generally on the ground that the science is yet in its infancy, that its cultivators are at variance among themselves, and that everything which pertains to it is uncertain. But if these men would make themselves acquainted with the subject, at least in its outlines, they would learn that it is the certainty of the great facts of geology which furnishes a basis for all the controversies among its teachers and expounders; the problem being, not whether they are sustained by valid evidence, but how they are to be accounted for. They would further learn, that while they have been disregarding these facts, others