

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXIV.—NO. 4.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXXIII.

ARTICLE I.

FORM OF GOVERNMENT OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH.

Philippians i. 1, 2: Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons: grace be unto you, and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.

Macedonia, of which Philippi was one of the chief cities, was conspicuous among the ancient nations as the kingdom of Alexander the Great. According to Daniel's interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, Macedonia was represented by the brazen part of the great image, and destined to be the third of the four universal kingdoms, that should precede the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Philippi was distinguished in profane history for the decisive battle between Mark Antony, Octavius, and Lepidus, the friends of Julius Cæsar, and the exponents of imperial power, on the one side; and Brutus and Cassius representing the Roman Senate, on the other. In ecclesiastical history, it is also celebrated as the seat of the first Christian Church in Europe. This Church was founded by the Apostle Paul, who was attracted thither by the vision of a man of Macedonia calling to him, in these words: "Come over into Macedonia and help us." The apostle went to Philippi, and began the work of founding a

delivered to the saints, and the simple worship practised by the apostles, and the primitive constitution of the Church, yet it is not our duty to be hasty in judging others—or violently to disturb the unity of the Spirit, or to forbid others that do not follow with us to cast out devils. So long as any communion proclaims the truth as it is in Jesus, and has the attestation of the Holy Spirit, we shall recognise their ecclesiastical acts as the acts of elders, though called by another name and acting irregularly, leaving to time and divine providence the results of this conflict of opinion. But this we believe and say that every religious error like vice, is of the nature of disease, which sooner or later will manifest its morbid character, and which must be thrown off by the recuperative energy of the afflicted system, or in time it will extend to all the organs of the body, and terminate in death.



ARTICLE II.

THE MORAL AND RELIGIOUS ASPECTS OF LOTTERIES AND OTHER MODES OF GAMBLING.*

The intelligent observer of passing events scarcely needs to be reminded of the steady and alarming increase of late years in the patronage extended by our people to the various lottery schemes, public and private, which, under the pretext of humanity, charity, and religion, threaten to deluge the land with a

*While not formally a review of any treatise these pages refer to several previous publications: 1. Green on Gambling; Zeiber & Co., Philadelphia, 1847. 2. Essay of Richard Hey, Esq., LL.D., Cambridge, England, 1812. 3. Pamphlet by Job Tyson, Esq., "On the Great Evil and Wide Extent of Lottery Schemes in the United States;" published by citizens of Philadelphia, 1833. ("Smyth Library," Columbia, S. C.) 4. History of Playing Cards, by the Rev. Edward S. Taylor and others; John Camden Hotten, London, 1865. 5. Complete Works of John M. Mason, D. D., Vol. III., pp. 265-316; Edition of 1832, New York. It is matter for regret to the writer that his efforts failed to secure, for his perusal, Dr. Junkin's treatise on the Lot, now out of sale.

tide of avarice and crime like that which excited the just fears of men forty years ago. It was then that the "Great Union Canal Lottery" in Pennsylvania, and other such abominations, swindled the credulous out of millions of money, and created such an amount of domestic distress, of fraud, thieving, forgery, bloodshed, and suicide, that there arose a loud and universal cry against them, resulting in their suppression, and inducing most of the States to pass prohibitory statutes against these prolific fountains of vice. How much of the present revival of lotteries may be due to the same widespread decline in morals to which the country is indebted for the Credit Mobilier and kindred schemes for promiscuous plundering and speculation, it does not fall within the scope of these pages to discuss. But the fact itself is flagrant—the railway traveller meets it in the shape of "prize candy," a villanous paste compounded of flour and sugar, which would be unsalable but for "prizes" of brazen "jewelry" and fractional currency which serve to corrupt the morals of children, and at the same time to poison their stomachs. Proprietors of leading newspapers, like the *Louisville Courier-Journal*, for example, catching the cue, it may be, from these newsboys, seek to enlarge their subscription list, by offering a "grand prize" of \$5,000, say, for which subscribers are permitted to draw lots, at some time during the year. Enterprising dealers in dry goods view with dismay counters and shelves piled with fabrics likely to be thrown out by capricious Dame Fashion before another season; but all fears vanish at the happy suggestion of a "gift-prize." Forthwith handbills are struck off announcing that "Messrs. ——— & Co., gratefully appreciating the liberal patronage of a generous public, have resolved to distribute the following gifts among their friends. Tickets to be given with each bill of goods sold amounting to ——— dollars, which will entitle the holder to a chance at the drawing." The *grateful* Messrs. ——— & Co., have not miscalculated. Hosts of feminine wants, unsuspected hitherto, or else peremptorily dismissed on the ground of "hard times," now become intolerable. The fair customers, who are both game and gamblers,

throng the "dépôt of fashion." The suspected fabrics disappear, as snow from the hedge. And the shop-man,—

"So child-like and bland,"

coolly reimburses himself for this "grateful appreciation" of public patronage by pocketing the extra charges.

But of course the public-spirited and enlightened citizens who look after our internal improvements, following the example of their predecessors in the first third of this century, take note of this patent method of turning the "small vices" of men to a good account. And so under their skilful management lottery schemes are employed to furnish amphitheatres and the general outfit of fair grounds for agricultural exhibitions, whose chief attractions are henceforth to be horse-races and betting. A wealthy city demands a public library in order to cultivate the intellect and improve the morals of her people. And as her millionaires have better uses for their money, recourse is had to "grand gift concerts" manipulated of ex-governors. And so the library is paid for by the hard-earned wages of inexperienced apprentice boys and uneducated mechanics, whose ignorance of mathematics conceals from them the wholesale pillage of their joint subscriptions to benefit the public. Wide regions of the war-wasted South are greatly in need of trust-worthy laborers to till her idle fields. And the lottery is invoked again, but with no other result, so far as known, than angry surmises about the disposal of the funds, and a further impoverishment of our poor, deluded people. Patriotism sighs at the thought of Confederate heroes sleeping in foreign graves liable to desecration by aliens and enemies; but the money to bring their precious dust to the land for which they died can only be had, it seems, by the same, all-powerful machinery, and a "General" is found willing to give the respectability of a gallant soldier's name to the thing.

This is something considerable; but it is not all. The vice "grows by what it feeds on"—private trade and public enterprise, candy boxes, journals, shops, agricultural fairs, libraries, immigration schemes, and Confederate monuments, cannot satisfy its insatiate appetite. It must be permitted to lay a defiling

hand upon the white robes of charity and religion also. We have heard with shame of tickets for church raffles hawked about for sale by pretty, young girls, in palpable violation of the law of the land. But we were hardly prepared for the announcement of a grand church, to be built at the cost of \$200,000, by the sale of lottery tickets! And we sympathised heartily with the *Religious Herald*, the able organ of our Baptist brethren at Richmond, Va., which, while relating the astounding proposal, in a burst of honest indignation, reminds these would-be church builders, that the Holy One of Israel has expressed his abhorrence for unclean sacrifices, by forbidding men to bring the price of a dog or the hire of a harlot into his sanctuary. It is well that religious people give heed to the mild, but telling rebuke of Governor Washburn, who in a recent message to the legislature of Wisconsin uses this language, which we are glad to see copied by various religious journals:

“Even the Church (unwittingly, no doubt,) is sometimes found doing the work of the devil. Gifts concerts, gift enterprises, and raffles, sometimes in aid of religious or charitable objects, but often for less worthy objects, lotteries, prize packages, etc., are all devices to obtain money without value received. Nothing is so demoralizing or intoxicating, particularly to the young, as the acquisition of money or property without labor. If you can devise some law to break up these practices and bring them into discredit, you will deserve the thanks of all good people.”

These words sound like the strokes of a friend, which are said to be better than “the kisses of an enemy.” The growing evil must be resisted by the combined efforts of the pulpit and the religious press. As for the secular journals, we grieve to find them generally the well-paid allies of the demoralising practice. Our reading has made us acquainted with one only among them all—a New York paper referred to without name in an exchange—which boldly denounces it. And let the pulpit contend against it, knowing that *communicants* in our churches, whether from ignorance or greed after filthy lucre, are being seduced by it.*

*The opinion of intelligent men as to the morality of “church raffles” (or lotteries), may be seen from an incident related to us by one of the origi-

It is with the design of promoting a more general and thorough discussion of this subject in its relation to Christian morals that we take up our pen, hoping that the results of patient thought, corrected by reading, and conference with abler brethren, may render some service to those who want the time or the opportunity to investigate for themselves. The task has been further commended to the writer, by the conviction that a thorough discussion of lotteries and gambling is not accessible to the readers of this *Review*. For having free access to three of the largest public libraries in the South no such treatise has been

nal parties since writing the above: Two clergymen of a certain Church, (not the Roman Catholic), upon meeting a gentleman on the street of one of our western cities not long since, accosted him in the most friendly manner as an acquaintance of long standing, when one of them, laying his hand familiarly upon the young man's shoulder, turned to his superior and remarked: "B—p, this is one of our boys" (he had *not* however been brought up in that Church) "whom I have long tried to get into the fold. I turn him over to you." The other, famed far and wide for his winning address, replied: "I accept the trust. Mr. F., a class is to be received into the church at such a time, join them, and be admitted," (naming the peculiar way). "Excuse me B—p," the young man replied, "I am not prepared for the step." "Ah, that is the result of your erroneous education. Come into the Church first, and get to be good afterwards." "No, B—p," the young man insisted, "I am unfit for the Church." "Come along; I'll take you as you are," persuasively said the ecclesiastic. Whereupon, the young gentleman, perhaps feeling that the point was being pushed too far, replied: "I am worse than you think me. I both drink and gamble;"—and mischievously enjoying the surprise occasioned in his reverend friends, he added: "You can judge for yourselves, gentlemen. Not long ago I went into a certain house in this town and, after drinking champagne at 50 cts. a drink, until I felt it, I was persuaded to spend the rest of my money (\$10) in a raffle. If that is not drinking and gambling, I don't know what is. And, B—p, *it was to aid in building one of your churches,*"—(naming the church). The young man was assured with becoming dignity that such proceedings were very displeasing to his interviewer. But as they have not been discontinued, (which the world believes he has ample power to require), the young man (sad scamp that he is!) is left to infer that the reverend gentleman made a slight mistake—the fact being, that *being thus reminded* of "such proceedings" was the really disagreeable thing. Alas, alas! we fear that the young man is unfit to be in the Church, since he cannot see that the end justifies the means.

found. Valuable material for it might be supplied by the publications already named. But the facts must be shaped by another hand, and combined with a more thorough discussion of the standard of Christian ethics in its applications to this vice. The treatises of Green, Hey, and Tyson, are arguments against gaming, based upon the evils which are found by experience to flow from it. The first may be regarded as the confessions, in the form of narratives from real life, of a reformed gamester, who saw much of what he tells in his homely way. In Hey, who was a Fellow of Cambridge, England, we find a more orderly discussion of the subject under the several heads of evils inflicted upon property, temper, and health. While in Tyson's Essay we have an array of facts, showing the misery, idleness, and crime, engendered by the great lottery schemes which became so popular during the first thirty years of the present century. Among these, the "Great Union Canal Lottery," drawn by authority of the legislature of Pennsylvania, as an aid to internal improvements, was the most conspicuous in its widely diffused injury to public morals. It was presented by grand juries as a nuisance, and finally suppressed by the legislature. The object of Mr. Tyson is to show that of all forms of gaming the lottery is by far the most pernicious, because it reaches such a wide circle of victims, multitudes of whom are led by its influence to lose character, property, and happiness, who otherwise bade fair to live and die peaceable and inoffensive members of society.

In searching for information as to the history of gaming, as practised among various nations and in different periods we have been led only to the most meagre results. The lottery, it seems, as a means of public revenue to the State was brought from Venice to France, and through France into England, in the fifteenth or sixteenth century. From the mother country it passed over into the United States, lottery tickets being sold by public authority, and a certain proportion of the proceeds retained for works of "internal improvement;" while the remainder was distributed by lot as prizes among the ticket-holders. The public benefit thus reaped we shall examine further on.

Meantime, most of us are aware that the French Government has continued to derive a revenue from the licensed gambling houses which are under its supervision and control. The results there have always been frightful, culminating in an average, says a French writer, of one hundred suicides a year. Similar consequences have followed in Italy. And in London, about the year 1800, says Mr. Tyson, a Government scheme was formed, with prizes of \$250,000 and \$500,000, which tempted multitudes to such desperate ventures that the night of the drawing was signalled by *fifty* suicides! The universal horror at this bloody tragedy caused a temporary cessation of governmental lotteries. But the ministry, feeling the need of the revenue of about \$5,000,000 per annum derived from lottery schemes, (it was the period of the Napoleonic wars when the Government was hard pressed for money), again endeavored to revive them, with every possible restriction to guard against the fearful evils. The experiment proved an utter failure. The British Government had not the power to get the revenue without incurring the guilt of inflicting direful injuries upon its own subjects. And so at length the pressure of public opinion forced the Government to discontinue them altogether. The experiment has its lessons. The German Governments have long drawn large revenues from the public "kursaals" at Baden-Baden and other watering places, whose gross immoralities are a scandal to Christendom. It is a pleasing omen of the Empire, to notice that steps have been taken for the suppression, at an early day, of these shameless dens of iniquity.*

*We append an item from the *Charleston News and Courier* of a late date, showing how the money oozes out of our cash-boxes to aid in protracting civil war in Cuba:

"The lucky lottery ticket-holder in Philadelphia has been the unconscious agent of awakening an unusual curiosity concerning the workings of the Havana Lottery. At present the lottery consists of 30,000 tickets, at \$20 each, making a total of \$600,000 collected by the Government at each drawing. But only \$475,000 of this amount is distributed among the ticket purchasers, as the Government takes \$125,000, or twenty-five per cent. of the whole, as its share of the business. About one ticket in thirty-seven draws a prize, and tickets not presented within a year are no longer valid,

The writer's attention was called by a learned friend to the information given as to gambling among the Greeks and Romans, by the patient researches of the accurate German scholar, Becker, into the life and manners of the classical peoples. For Becker's references to original sources, the reader is advised to consult his complete little volumes "Charicles," and "Gallus." But from his statements it may be safely inferred, we think, that the vice of gaming, at least in its modern proportions, was comparatively unknown in the better days of Greek and Roman history. The Grecian youth were content, in their primitive simplicity, to rear fleet horses for the Olympic course, and to train their own bodies with infinite care and self-denial, stimulated by the love of glory alone. And the victor's reward was a wreath of ivy, or of parsley-leaves, and an honorable mention in the odes of the poets. Statesmen encouraged these national contests, because they furnished, against the time of war, a most efficient infantry and splendid bodies of cavalry. To see how far these simple-minded Greeks were behind our enlightened utilitarianism, one has only to compare with this the published accounts of our modern horse-races, prize-fights, and cock-pits, where it is plain enough that "money answereth all things." And in excuse of the Greeks, it should be remembered that they lived before the era of the Parson Beechers, who go about

the Government earning another handsome sum every year from unclaimed prizes. Out of the 30,000 tickets about 15,000 were sold in Havana; 4,000 in Mexico and Guatemala; 2,000 in Central and South America and the West Indies, and 9,000 in the United States. The latter were again subdivided as follows: New York took 5,000; Boston and New England, 1,000; San Francisco and the West, 1,000; New Orleans and the South, 2,000. The sale of tickets for island consumption is decreasing, but it is increasing for the United States. For the purpose of carrying on the Spanish Government and the war, the people of the United States purchase 9,000 tickets for eighteen drawings per annum; this is equal to 162,000 tickets at \$20 each, making \$3,240,000, of which the Government receives twenty-five per cent. directly, or \$810,000, the ticket-holders running their chances for the remainder of their outlay, and receiving a larger or smaller premium. As only six large prizes are given, 29,994 people are disappointed every drawing; six out of 30,000 get a respectable prize, which generally finds its way back again to the coffers of the island treasury."

preaching the gospel of mammon from the text: "It takes a man to make money, and money to make a man."

Roman law prohibited all gaming for money, unless "ubi pro virtute certamen fit,"* the Roman usage of *virtus* suggesting, if not warlike accomplishment, at least an acquired skill which might be used in the public service. In the decline of the Republic and under the Empire this law was violated, and often nullified practically by the indulgences of the emperor themselves. At other times it was revived and rigidly enforced. But it was amid the universal license of the Saturnalia alone that all restrictions were removed. This law found its way into the early English codes, and testifies strongly of the vicious tendencies of gambling.

In the curious volume, "Cards and Card Playing," edited by an English clergyman devoted to antiquarian lore, an allusion is made to this vice as practised among our near kinsmen in ancient India, which might help out Darwin's theory of "inherited traits" if he knew it. The author cites the poem of Mahabharata, which represents Yudhister and his royal brothers losing at play not only their treasures, but their kingdoms also, although accounted models of royal wisdom. The same writer furnishes, in an extract from Montforts' "Voyage en Chine," (1854), a more recent account of the ravages of gambling among the Chinese—"Gaming is the ruling passion of the Chinese. No sooner does the artisan touch his scanty wages than he rushes off to play, without troubling himself to consider whether he thereby risks the necessaries of life. It is with them a perfect *mania*, which presents a curious contrast to their usual sordid avarice.† Moreover, it is by no means the lower class of the Chinese only who are thus imbued with the passion for play. Rich and poor,

*See "Gallus," Scene X., p. 501.

†Is not the contrast rather between two opposite phases of the same passion? For what is the main inducement to play but avarice?—It may be termed *avarice run mad*. No national trait appears more prominently in carefully considered accounts of this remarkable people than that "love of money which is a root of all evil;" and none seems to hold out more stubbornly against the gospel, not even their insufferable vanity and prejudice.

laborers and merchants, all are gamesters, and frantic ones too. And no people possess such means for gratifying their desires; with them anything will do for a game, provided there is a chance for winning and losing so as to keep the balance even. Games which with us are left to children, with them are played with avidity at any age. This does not hinder them from having games like ours, of a more piquant kind, where a stroke of good luck may double one's fortune, or an unlucky turn produce a correspondingly calamitous result. I have seen houses at Amoy quite up to the mark of the most scandalous of our" (*i. e.* Parisian) "*hells*; and what surprised me much, I discovered in the jargon of these players of the far East the same humorous and figurative expressions which we remark among our own."

A most instructive section in this quaint volume furnishes some account, drawn by the author from the letters, memoirs, etc., of the period, of that epidemic mania for gambling, which, breaking out in France among the nobles in the reign of Louis XIV., continued to rage with consuming fury until king and nobles were overwhelmed by the great Revolution. This passion for play was carefully fostered by the scheming Cardinal Mazarin, whose deep-laid design it was by every means in his power to weaken the influence of the nobility, to destroy their resources, and dissolve their ties to the people, that upon the utter ruin of feudalism he might securely lay the foundations of that gigantic despotism, in which the king might say with full effect, "Je suis La France." The scheming monk succeeded beyond all human calculation, and gaming-tables were prominent among his instrumentalities. New games were devised and introduced from abroad. The royal residences at Marly and Versailles were converted into veritable gambling "*hells*," in which the Cardinal and the "Grand Monarque" himself officiated as the masters of ceremonies. The nobility left their rural domains and thronged more and more the centres of fashion and play. Estates melted away at the gaming-table. Duels and suicides were multiplied. Low-born gamesters were freely admitted to the king's favor for no other merit but skill at cards. Women vied with men in their extravagant devotion to play, and it was

only too plain that their virtue declined as their passion for play swelled higher. King Louis may be taken as an example of the debasing and hardening influence of gaming, when upon the death of his brother, and afterwards of his grand-children, yea, while their remains were yet lying unburied in the palace, he made particular request that the visitors should resume their places at the card-tables without being interrupted by what had occurred! And among the last acts of his tyranny was forcing his beautiful, young kinswoman, the Duchesse de Berri, then bowed down by domestic grief, to come forward and take part in the play. Louis le Grand seems to have used gaming as a trick of state entirely, but not so the Cardinal, who was so passionate a gamester that he actually breathed his last in the very act of directing one to play for him, as his strength was too far gone to allow of his holding the cards. The game had only been suspended long enough for him to receive the last offices of the Church, which sent his sanctified spirit into paradise. It deserves to be remembered as a fitting sequel, that the Cardinal's beautiful niece, the Duchess of Mazarin, was among the most conspicuous victims of his scheme, for she lost in play not only the immense fortune of twenty-five millions which he had bequeathed to her, but her character also. But warnings like this were unheeded by the doomed nobility. The poison did its work thoroughly. The keen strokes of satire even could not awaken the dormant sense of shame in their besotted minds. "The deep-laid scheme of Mazarin had succeeded;" says our author, "frenzied gambling had deprived the nobility of any interest in France or its welfare; cards had killed conversation, and murdered political life." The nobles were bankrupt revellers, unknown to their tenantry and unloved. The king *was* France—despotism was absolute. But the end was not yet. Oppression and debauchery waxed worse and worse until an outraged and infuriated people, chanted the Marseillaise Hymn beneath the guillotine which dripped with noble and with royal blood. Years pregnant with great events have rolled by, but the throes of that volcanic spasm continue to convulse the limbs of poor, dismem-

bered France, while every throne in Europe has trembled with its vibrations. It is an instructive lesson to notice among the influences helping to bring on this terrible outbreak, the demoralising passion of play. The author's position is amply sustained by the statements of eye-witnesses, whose words he cites.

Gambling, our author goes on to observe, was a prominent feature of society in England during the period of the Restoration—the blackest page in her history—when the depraved heart of man seemed resolved to indemnify itself fully for the severe restraints of the Puritan supremacy. It was the age which saw the invention of whist. “I can never forget,” says the pure-hearted Evelyn, “the inexpressible luxury and profaneness, gaming and all dissoluteness, and, as it were, a total forgetfulness of God, (it being Sunday evening), which this day se’nnight I was witness of: the king sitting and toying with his concubines, Portsmouth, Cleveland, Mazarine, etc.; a French boy singing love songs in that glorious gallery; whilst about twenty of the great courtiers and other dissolute persons were at basset round a large table, a bank of at least £2,000 in gold before them.” This was Charles the Second's last Sabbath night. He died on the next Friday. The picture serves to show how naturally and inevitably the triad of social vices go together—gaming, wantonness, and drink.

With this meagre but suggestive sketch of gaming habits in different periods and among various peoples, let us turn to the task of testing the moral aspects of it by the standard of Scripture.

And in the very outset we encounter this remarkable fact, that the Scriptures contain no express deliverance as to the moral complexion of playing for money or its equivalent. For, leaving out of course the solemn appeal to God's arbitration in such instances as the division of the Promised Land among the tribes by his express direction, the only mention of anything approaching to gambling alluded to in Scripture, seems to be the Roman soldiers casting lots under the cross for the possession of Christ's seamless robe, (see Ps. xxii. 19; Matt. xxvii. 34, etc). In this

case the bare fact is noted as among the circumstances expressive of Christ's deep humiliation. No comment is offered by the prophet or by the evangelists upon the general question of the lawfulness of gaming, and none is expected by the reader who reflects at all upon the overpowering interest of that crucifixion-scene. The silence of Scripture, as to the existence of gambling among the Hebrew people elsewhere, while copious allusions are made to popular vices generally, might be explained by the reasonable supposition, that gaming was unknown among that primitive race. The reasonableness of this supposition appears, when we consider how much had been done by the Mosaic legislation to repress the passion of avarice. And it may be, too, that the sacredness attaching to the Lot, as a recognised mode of direct appeal to God, helped to prevent its employment for purposes of gain or amusement. Of the bearing of this use of the Lot among the Israelites upon "games of chance" now, we shall have occasion to speak further on. But this absence from Scripture of an express condemnation of hazarding money upon play shuts us up to the alternatives, either to acknowledge its lawfulness, or else to seek its condemnation upon the sound Protestant principle recognised in the Westminster Confession of a "good and necessary consequence" from Scripture. The flagrant evil of the thing cannot be reconciled with the supposition of innocence, nor can the guilt of it suffer us to doubt that it is condemned in that Book, which reveals completely "what man is to believe concerning God, and what duty God requires of man." The probability is strong, that if we do not somewhere find in Scripture an indisputable warrant for its condemnation, the fault is ours. But let us make the appeal, remembering that we cannot expect an explicit decision for every possible detail of human life and manners, as they appear in different lands and under diverse forms of civilisation. And this is, indeed, one of the unspeakable advantages of the scriptural code of casuistry, that instead of attempting to follow us into all the possible details of life, and thus bewildering the mind with endless discriminations, it gives us instead general principles capable of ready application by honest and humble minds to a thousand cases; excel-

lent models being meantime given to guide us in the application of the principle to analogous cases.*

In our attempts, therefore, to apply the standard of Biblical morality to the practice of gambling, we are free to follow one

*The thoughtful reader will not fail to see at once the parallel between the argument based upon Scripture in condemnation of gambling, and that used by our Church among others against certain "worldly amusements," whether or not with equal success, it is not necessary here to inquire. The fact is, however, that Scripture furnishes no comment upon social dancing or the theatre. In the Old Testament we have repeated allusions to certain bodily motions intended to express the intensest emotions of joy, usually, if not in every instance, of a religious character. These bodily motions were termed "dances," and the inspired Psalmist calls upon his brethren "to praise God in the dance." But every one possessed of the slightest acquaintance with Hebrew customs as represented in Scripture, knows, of course, that the *manner* of performing these sacred "dances" were as diverse from the fashionable amusements of to-day, as are the motives of those engaged. No instance is recorded in Scripture of men and women dancing together, unless it be in allusions to idolatrous riotings, as some think. Hence the impertinence of Dean Alford's note upon the "music and dancing" in the parable of the Prodigal Son, (Luke xv.), if he means a definite application to social customs among us. In fact, David's dancing before the ark is the only clear case of such action on a man's part, and Michal's scornful criticism implies that it was considered by her as unmanly as well as unkingly conduct. The criticism showed how truly she was Saul's daughter, blind to the significance of the occasion. The instance of Salome dancing before Herod is nearly allied to the "ballet," and passes under silent condemnation, along with the revelry of the adulterous court. We may safely assume that no instance of social dancing, as we see it, could arise under the customs of Oriental life. The same is true of the Greeks. And even at Rome where social customs approached nearer to the modern style, dancing was *tabooed* in good society as one can see from Cicero's remark, to the effect that no man danced unless he were drunk or crazy. The same observations apply to the theatre, with this addition, that in the apostles' time the stage was so completely identified with Pagan superstition and allusions to mythology, that, as a matter of course, Christians would be kept away. Besides, the "filthy communications" found to be subversive of good morals then, as now, were frequent themes of apostolic counsel.

So much by way of showing the parallel. No opinion is offered as to the relative conclusiveness of the argument in the two cases; nor as to the best method of dealing with these "popular amusements" in church courts.

or both of these two methods, viz.: (1.) By analysing the act itself, we may undertake to detect an element in it which palpably violates the letter of the law as it is summarily expressed in the ten heads of the decalogue; or (2), without such analysis being attempted, we may show from experience that the habit uniformly *injures men*. And if this charge be made good upon sufficient evidence, the practice is condemned *by the law of love to our neighbor*, which is the essence of the six commandments of the second table of the moral law.

1. In order to make the case clear beyond reasonable exception, we shall give in brief outline the facts by which experience establishes the sin and evil of gaming, on the ground that it inflicts injury, deep and serious, upon men, wherever it has been tested. And, under this head, it is well to refer the reader to the account furnished of the influence of gambling upon French society in the period preceding the great Revolution. But the evidence is before our eyes, showing beyond all question that the habit is constantly resulting in the ruin of men as to their character and property. For this obvious reason, it has been generally made unlawful by the statutes of civilised countries. The professional gambler is everywhere recognised as among the most vicious characters in society, devoid of honesty, and insensible alike to the ties of humanity or the claims of affection. The intelligent observer can witness the experiment in actual process. He can watch the gradual transformation of a kind-hearted youth, into the cold, unfeeling hawk, whose greedy eye and ravenous beak know nothing of pity for the inexperienced prey that falls within his clutches. It is true that drink and lewdness go hand in hand with gaming in producing the desperate villain, who is recognised as a beast of prey, cruel as the tiger and remorseless as the hyena. And this fact, that gaming in its unfettered state brings a man into contact with these other depraving influences, would be enough to stamp the habit as unlawful to one who abides by the code of Scripture. As one has well expressed it in that nervous language of which he is a master: "If it could be shown that my engaging in the harmless act of picking up pins would expose me to such depraving associations

as gaming, when left free to drift on in its own current, does, then I should sin against God by picking up pins." But facts show that not only the associations of gaming, but the *habit itself* exerts a depraving influence upon character. There are gamblers who have the self-command to steer clear of these associate vices, and yet are, if possible, the hardest wretches of the tribe, dead to the claims of God, of humanity, and of home—Ishmaelites, whose hand is against every man. The habit injures men in mind, body, and estate, and is therefore condemned by the law, which commands us to love God with all our heart, and our neighbor as ourselves.

Especially is the Essay of Mr. Tyson rich in facts establishing this point. He quotes at large from the sworn testimony of competent witnesses taken by a committee of the British Parliament, in 1808, showing that theft, forgery, murder, suicide, want, beggary, and domestic broils, all grow out of it; the cases being plainly traced back to this cause, and the corroborative statements of the parties given in full. Mr. Tyson's Essay is an attack upon legalised lotteries, on the ground of injury done to citizens. It was called forth by the ravages made in domestic and individual happiness by the gambling mania consequent upon the great schemes of the first thirty-three years of this century. He cites the records of criminal courts, the confessions of felons, the letters of eminent men, and the statements of the public press, all of which concur in the verdict, that developed gambling is ruinous to the morals, the finances, and the happiness of society. And of all kinds of gaming, he shows public lotteries to be the most injurious, because through disguising the evil motives of gambling under a show of benevolence, they reach an immensely wider circle of victims; multitudes of whom, but for these lotteries, bade fair to live and die peaceable citizens, who, through their seductive influences, have been set upon courses of vice, which in hundreds of instances result in crime and involve whole families in ruin. Surely one needs only such an exposure of the fruits of gaming to see that it is irreconcilably opposed to the law of God. And what was thus wrought out flagrantly under sanction of legislative enact-

ments in London and in Pennsylvania forty or fifty years ago, is now being produced more secretly under all the constraints of human law. The records of our courts still show that many a youth can look back from disgraceful flight or a felon's cell, upon the hour which began his ruin in a game of cards, or the small venture at the race-track.

Mr. Tyson deserves a patient hearing from all who propose or patronise "charity lotteries," when he shows the cruel inequality with which they distribute the burdens of this most uncharitable charity among the different ranks of society. It is, as he justly argues, not the rich, who can be most readily persuaded to incur the hazard of these so-called schemes of benevolence. The educated mind can detect the snare at a glance. But it is the inexperienced apprentice lad, the over-worked sewing women, the poorly paid clerk, or the journeyman mechanic, who can be most readily persuaded to risk their hard-earned wages in the hope of attaining to sudden wealth. Take as an instance of cruel deception, this heading in immense figures at the head of the advertisement of the Louisville Library Scheme, "\$100,000 for \$10!" The cruel deceit of such an offer is that, like the infernal tempters in Macbeth, it

"Keeps the word of promise to our ear,
And breaks it to our hope."

To speak plainly, but without unkind feelings to any one, (it being our purpose to discuss measures rather than men), we cannot see how such dealing can escape the charge of fraud. The qualifying facts are *studiously and of set purpose* kept out of sight, with the certainty that hundreds interested have no means of discovering them. It is to our mind perfectly parallel with the horse-jockey's cheat, when he says not a word of the fatal defects in an animal, well knowing that you cannot discover them, and so ignorantly take him as sound. Ignorance of those qualifying facts is essential to their obtaining money. For it is certain that no man who possesses common sense would venture the money so essential to the comfort of himself and family if he once comprehended the aggravated risks incurred by taking chances in charity lotteries. We are under obligations to Pro-

fessor William Carroll, the accomplished head of an excellent high school for girls in Memphis, Tennessee, for the following calculation of the real value, when tested by rigid mathematical calculation, of a ticket in such a charity lottery. He says:

"In order to show the ruinous effects of lotteries, let us analyse the probability of loss, which results from the relative number of prizes and blanks. The principle of Ternary combinations is the one engrafted upon nearly all the schemes of the present day and the number upon which it is based is 78. The number selected determines the number of Ternary combinations and consequently the number of tickets to be sold. The number of Ternary combinations, of which the number 78 is susceptible, is 76076. At the usual price, \$10 a ticket, the aggregate value of the tickets would be \$760,760. Usually about twenty per cent. is expended in publication and in the payment of agents, and about fifteen per cent. is reserved for the benefit of the enterprise or for charitable purposes, when such is the object contemplated. I notice that in the Library Gift Concert, Louisville, Ky., the sum set apart for expenses and for the benefit of the library is fifty per cent. In the case supposed, after deducting fifty per cent. there would be left \$380,380 to be distributed among ticket-holders, when the same ticket holders have paid in \$760,760. In the aggregate they are compelled to lose half their money.

"Suppose a scheme with prizes as follows:

"One grand cash prize,	\$80,000
" " "	40,000
" " "	20,000
" " "	15,000
" " "	8,000
" " "	4,000
18 cash prizes, at \$1,000	18,000
40 " " 500	20,000
60 " " 400	24,000
100 " " 300	30,000
150 " " 200	30,000
400 " " 100	40,000
5,138 " " 10	51,380
<hr/>					<hr/>
5,912					\$380,380

"Now the question arises, what chance has a purchaser of a ticket in a lottery of this kind of drawing one of the grand cash

prizes? The chance of obtaining the 1st prize is one in 76,076; the 2d, one in 38,038; the 3d, one in 25,358; the 4th, one in 19,019; the 5th, one in 15,215; and in the 6th, one in 12,679.

“Aside from the baneful effects upon the religion and good morals of a community, and looking at lottery schemes in a business-point of view, what folly to engage in an enterprise when the chances of loss almost amount to a certainty! Would a sane man invest money in a mechanical or mercantile enterprise, when the prospects of success were so desperate?”

Such is the value of an investment in the “charity lotteries,” so highly commended by an ignorant, or else a bribed press. And to these frightful figures we must add, upon direct and trustworthy information, that the managers frequently arrogate to themselves the right still further to sacrifice the interests of ticket-holders, (many of whom are incapable of detecting the injury), by arbitrarily arresting the process of distributing the prizes promised in the advertisement, when only a small proportion of the chances have been tested; and thus saving a large additional sum for the “charity” in hand, by multiplying the chances against drawing a prize as much as *sixfold* upon the above calculation of Professor Carroll! Of course such a palpable breach of faith in those who handle trust funds is never to be excused; and the only palliation for thus wronging the helpless, to which we can listen however indignantly, is that the funds so alienated have not been taken for private gain. The managers cheat, but not for their own profit. It is shameful that the proper officers of the Commonwealth allow such frauds to be perpetrated upon ignorant and defenceless people under the shadow of a legal enactment. A friend who watched the results of a recent drawing, mentioned to the writer a painful feature of public lotteries, which forever condemns them as charitable agencies. A large proportion of the ticket-holders were inexperienced boys, or laboring men who could least of all afford to contribute to the public enterprise aimed at. And it was only too plain that many went away to drown their disappointment in the neighboring grog-shops, or, perhaps, to mend their “bad luck” in a keno den. Let others think as they will of these

“public enterprises,” we can never see such fair grounds or libraries without being painfully reminded of the poor families who were deprived of their meagre comforts, and of lads tempted to a course of dissipation and crime, that others might enjoy such privileges.

Mr. Tyson's pamphlet gives instances to prove the terrible extravagance of lotteries, viewed as schemes of public finance. Of these instances, we select the “Great Union Canal Lottery” already alluded to as the occasion of so much distress and crime forty years ago. The Legislature of Pennsylvania authorised this scheme in 1811 for the purpose of raising \$340,000 for the construction of the Union Canal. But after it had been operated for twenty-two years with infinite mischief to the community, Mr. Wallace submitted a report to the Legislature in 1833, showing that lotteries had been drawn *to the astounding sum total of \$26,562,947, and yet without raising the comparatively trivial sum of \$340,000 required for the canal!* (See Tyson's Essay, pp. 9 and 10, and note).

Unfair dealing is an essential feature of all gambling establishments, as a clever writer in the *Eclectic* for September, 1872, triumphantly demonstrates. And even the seemingly small advantage of $1\frac{1}{2}$ to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per centum in their favor, (as the German *Kursaäls* admit,) is amply sufficient when immense sums are handled to insure them against occasional heavy losses, besides paying burdensome taxes to the Government and enriching the “bankers.” We may hail it as the fruit of Bismarck's elevated statesmanship that the German Governments have determined to sacrifice revenues which make them partners in that widespread demoralisation resulting from gambling, which has given to Baden-Baden its unenviable notoriety.

Surely enough has been said under this head to demonstrate our point, that, tested by its known consequences in different ages and countries, gaming for money is sin against God and crime against man. And further, that of all kinds of gaming the most baneful is the lottery, because it covers up the vice under a show of public benefit and charity, thus becoming all the more surely a “school of gambling” to multitudes, who there

begin a course of idleness, profligacy, and crime, that renders them a curse to themselves and a pest to society.*

And this proves how truly wise and scriptural is the position of our Church speaking through the General Assembly. (Minutes of 1818, as cited in Baird's Digest, p. 805). "The vice of gambling has also been forced upon our attention. We indeed hope that few or perhaps none of our actual professors have indulged themselves in the practice of what they consider as gambling. But perhaps there are some addicted to this practice who have evinced a predilection for our Church, and who are not unwilling to receive a word of admonition from us. Such we would earnestly exhort to consider, in the most serious manner, the consequences of the course they are pursuing, and the awful lessons which the experience of the world is every day exhibiting on this subject. But it is our duty further to testify, that all encouragement of lotteries and purchasing of lottery tickets; all attendance on horse-racing, and betting on such, or any other occasions; and all attempts of whatever kind to acquire gain, *without giving an equivalent,*" (italics ours), "involve the gambling principle, and participate in the guilt which attaches to that vice." Nine years later (Minutes of 1827) the Assembly felt called upon to protest again: "Gambling, that infatuating and destructive vice is still maintaining its accursed sway over thousands of its hapless victims.† By this remark we intend to condemn the practice of gambling by lottery, which, under the sanction of legislative patronage is, in several places within our bounds, encouraging a wild spirit of speculation, paralysing industry, and carrying disappointment, poverty, and sorrow into many habitations." The Minutes of 1830, (about which time the gambling mania had attained its height), represent the As-

*It does not lie within the scope of this paper to apply this fundamental principle of Christian ethics to the liquor trade in all its branches. But it is needless to say how important such an application must be at the hands of every one who receives Jesus Christ as Law-giver and as Judge—and equally so, whether he proposes to deal by the dram or by the cask.

†In these strong expressions the reader will recognise allusion to the lottery-mania which brought ruin to so many families during the first third of the present century.

sembly as enjoining the Presbyteries to require Sessions to proceed to discipline members who took part in gambling and thus to save religion from reproach.

2. Having thus shown the irreconcilable repugnance between gambling, and the law of love to our neighbor, which is the essence of duty as between man and man, the inquiry remains, whether we can proceed a step further, by signalling the precise point at which it traverses the Decalogue. It is always well to be able to present such important subjects in as many points of view as we can.

Most of us are aware that many of our ablest casuists, of whom Dr. John M. Mason is a representative, hold that all "games of chance," so-called, are liable to the charge of profaneness, and thus fall into the list of sins forbidden in the Third Commandment. They hold that the drawing of lots is of the nature of an appeal to God's direct intervention. The Lot is thus a mode of divine revelation, and is grouped under the comprehensive term, "the *name* of the Lord thy God." According to this view, while gambling, *i. e.*, drawing lots for money, may aggravate the sin of a profane appeal to God, yet the sin is shared to an alarming degree by games of chance which are only played for amusement. Let the view be stated in the words of an able advocate, who has expressed it briefly and forcibly, referring us to Dr. Mason for the arguments:

"1. I am very clear," he writes, "that the relation of the Lot to the providence of God lies in the nature of things, and consequently is always the same. Whatever has been at any time a lawful or unlawful use of it, is a lawful or unlawful use of it now.

"2. I believe this relation to be the same as that of the oath. The difference lies only in the aspect in which God is regarded. In the Lot, God is considered as 'Providence,' as the Disposer of events; in the oath, as the Judge and Avenger. Both are to be used on occasions only of great solemnity and importance, when a decision must be had, and can be obtained in no other way than by a direct appeal to the Searcher of hearts, and the Sovereign Disposer of events. Both are to be used in

the spirit of worship, and any other use is profane, that is, is taking God's name in vain.

"3. I am obliged, therefore, to believe that the use of the Lot in games of chance is a profane use of it. The player may not *mean* so, but neither does the profane swearer mean so. The very core of the sin in both cases is that God is *not* thought of; his name is taken lightly or 'in vain.'

"4. In playing for money (in gambling) the sinful excitement is increased, and in the case of professional gamblers is still further exasperated by the greed for gain, but the sinful excitement originates in the appeal to the providence of God, in an unlawful way. The stake aggravates the sin, but it is by no means the whole of it."

So say other friends, from whose opinions we have not ventured to differ without patient and protracted reflection. This view, so far as we know, found its first advocate in Dr. John M. Mason, who discusses the matter elaborately. (See Works, Vol. III., pp. 265-316). But it seems to us to labor under two defects—*first*, in overlooking the change in the functions of the Lot since the cessation of oracular communications; and, *secondly*, in failing to see that what this theory of "direct appeal to God" really implies is, not that simple providential control which leaves it on the same level as other natural operations and human actions, but a peculiar and exceptional one, which, indeed, puts it into a similar position to that of the "Urim and Thummim" of the high priest's breast-plate—an instrument for supernatural revelations.

These misconceptions appear again and again throughout Dr. Mason's discussions. As when he defines the Lot to be "an action intended to decide a point without the aid of human skill or *power*," and having assumed that the act is "without the aid of human skill or *power*," he proceeds to try several alternative suppositions, as "other creatures," "or chance;" upon rejecting these suppositions properly enough he reaches, *suo modo*, the direct agency of God. And in the conduct of this argument he unhesitatingly employs arguments drawn from ordinary providential control, on the one hand, and from the ancient use of

the Lot as recorded in Scripture, on the other, to confirm his position, as if the ancient use were only in the course of ordinary providence. But the double misconception appears when we put parallel cases. If the relation of the Lot to God's power be only of that general kind, termed providential, in virtue of which "God preserves and governs all his creatures and all their actions," then what is true of one is true also of the other; if the use of the Lot, in virtue of this relation, is *profane*, except upon "occasions of solemnity and importance only," then it is equally profane to perform other acts except under the same circumstances. To illustrate, we use the example of target-practice for amusement. To fire the loaded needle-gun produces results as far beyond "human power" in some respects as casting dice. Am I authorised to amuse myself by target-shooting? Not, according to Dr. Mason, if the relation of this act to God's power be the same as that of casting lots. His argument from that providence which "lies in the nature of things" is an "ignoratio eleuchi." We see no escape from the dilemma which would rigidly prohibit all amusement or the abandonment of Dr. Mason's position of a relation "*in rerum natura*." Is the *present* relation of the Lot to providence diverse from that of other natural operations and human actions? Let him prove it that can. The parallel between drawing lots (as by casting dice, say,) and firing the rifle is complete so far as our argument requires it. Both result in consequences beyond our control. Both are *human power acting through machinery*, more or less complex. And they are examples of a wide class of human actions whose results, when once they are performed, lie beyond our control. In fact, of what action is it not true?

And this statement relieves our view of all embarrassment from the difficulty suggested by a learned friend in conversation: "You introduce the hypothesis of infidel science; certain 'laws of nature' which carry out effects beyond human agency." Well, there *are* certain "powers of nature," distinct, on the one hand, from man's will, and, on the other, from God's will. These *natural powers*, whose action and reaction, constitute the

“laws of nature,” (*i. e.*, “the ordinances of the heaven and the earth”), originated in, and are controlled by, the will of the Personal God. The “Kosmos” implies: (1), creation of elements endowed with power so act thus and so; and (2), the orderly disposal of these elements in definite positions in space, so that the various actions and reactions may produce pre-determined results. These seem to be the acts of God as the Originator of elements, and as the Architect of the Kosmos. But this is not atheism. It does not imply self-origination (if that be not a *self*-evident absurdity), or self-existence, or self-control. It is entirely consistent, as Professor McCosh, among others, has shown, with the inspired truths, “for in him we live, and move, and have our being . . . doing his pleasure among the armies of heaven and the inhabitants of the earth. . . . By him all things consist.” In the case of the needle-gun or the dice-box, the human will uses, besides its own more complex and wonderful body, a piece of machinery which exercises more or less influence on the result. This is all. There is no “*tertium quid*” arbitrarily brought in, or ignorantly implied. —The action is *human*. But, of course, human under relations to God’s power; and relations of infinite moment. Not such as make one or the other an oracular response from Jehovah; but such as constitute both, elements in that mighty web upon which God is weaving patterns of his own designing;—only we on earth see, for the most part, the *wrong side* of the glorious picture, which throughout eternity we are to study and to admire, *rectis oculis!* O beatific vision! “*What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter.*” But in this tapestry of Providence, all actions human and all operations natural are alike. Casting lots does not differ from target-practice—a world in combustion from the fall of a sparrow.

This drives us to the second and kindred source of confusion in Dr. Mason’s argument, *viz.*, the fact of a special use of the Lot in cases recorded in Scripture, in virtue of which it was the instrument of oracular responses from God, *infallibly* assuring men of his decisive voice in matters of doubt. The instances are too familiar to require mention: the division of Canaan

among the tribes, the choice of Saul to be king, the detection of Achan's theft, and of the heroic Jonathan's disobedience in tasting the honey, etc., etc. The last of these historic instances is the casting of lots to determine who should succeed to the vacant "bishopric" of Judas Iscariot.* It is not, of course, our purpose to attempt the impossible by undertaking to show wherein precisely lay this peculiar relation of the Lot, in its oracular function, to God's providence. Who shall draw the dividing line between natural operations and the Divine will? And as for the out-goings of God's power, the one answer made to Nicodemus suffices for all—"The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth; so"——. In our present state, and for aught we know to the contrary, to all eternity, it is enough for us to apprehend with some clearness the *facts* of God's agency; the explanations we must adjourn to a more convenient season, for now we see through a glass darkly. But the fact of this peculiar use of the Lot is, we think, clearly implied, in the results produced, to which no parallel is, so far as we can learn, now attempted. The division of the Promised Land was of the nature of an infallible oracle, indicating to the several families of Israel the bounds of their habitation. Of this the evidence was at hand in the venerable prophecy of the dying patriarch, Jacob. And in the case of Saul's election the same proof was furnished in Samuel's previous knowledge. The detection of Achan and of Jonathan by lot was, of course, attested by the facts. And as to the question of a special appointment of the Lot to this extraordinary function, the evidence furnished by Lev. xvi. 8, and Num. xxvi. 55, is, at least, as clear, as that for the divine appointment of sacrifices. The discontinuance of this extraordinary use of the Lot is made clear by a cessation of the extraordinary results. Besides this, we have a

*Most are aware, of course, that the propriety of this proceeding on the part of the apostles has been questioned—gratuitously, as we believe. But for some judicious remarks upon the Apostolate of Matthias we must refer to Professor Alexander's excellent Commentary on Acts i.

general inference which commends itself as an indisputable maxim of Protestant theology, that with the completion of the canon of Scripture terminate all extraordinary phenomena, whose office it was to supplement and to confirm the forthcoming Rule of our faith and practice. The sun having arisen in his full-orbed majesty the stars retire. If pressed to explain such Scriptures as Prov. xvi. 33, xviii. 18, we cheerfully comply by stating our conviction of their double application. As applied to one set of phenomena, viz., the oracular function of the Lot, they allude to transient effects, which have ceased forever. But in their allusion to the general truth of God's providential agency in and control over all contingent events—if this allusion be understood—they state facts equally true of all time and of all things. And in this respect a notable parallel is found in one context, (Prov. xvi. 1): "The preparations of the heart in man, and the answer of the tongue, is of the Lord." But perhaps a more complete parallel is found in such texts as Matt. x. 19, 20, where *supernatural inspiration* is promised to the apostles, and *divine illumination*; not inspiration, either in the Romish or in the Quaker sense of it, seems to be implied for their successors.*

*It has been suggested that our position with regard to the Lot, must interfere seriously with the significance of an oath. But we cannot see how it should. The *lawfulness* of oaths is clearly recognised in Scripture (*passim*.) We need no better authority than the example of Christ, (Matt. xxvi. 63, 64), and of Paul, (2 Cor. i. 23), where all the essentials of an oath are found, as administered by authorities, political or ecclesiastical. This sweeps away all foundation for the Quaker theory. As to the imaginary parallel between "appealing to God" through the Lot, and in an oath, we are persuaded that the comparison will not hold. For in the one case we call upon God to answer our implied question, by an extraordinary use of our bodies—we *ask an oracular response*, which is of the nature of a new revelation; in the other case, we simply *assert to men* our consciousness that the "Searcher of hearts" is now looking upon us, and taking note of what we utter, with the purpose of punishing us if we lie. The parallel would obtain, did the oath imply, which it does not and cannot, that God will, in any way, *assure our hearers of the truth or falsehood of what we speak*; at least before the solemn disclosures of that day when the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed.

We have enlarged somewhat upon this point, not only for the sake of its bearing upon the topic under immediate discussion, believing that this charge of profaneness is generally insisted on to the detriment of the more obvious and true objection to gambling; but also because it deserves examination from its relation to the guidance of Christian life; that is, *How can we utilise this most valuable agency to settle matters of fact and of opinion?* We cannot see the authority for rigidly confining its use, on their theory, to cases in which "a decision must be had, and can be obtained in no other way than by an appeal to the Searcher of hearts, and Sovereign Disposer of events." This is Dr. Mason's position. It seems at first sight to have been exemplified, as Dr. Mason intimates in *one* instance in Scripture, the selection of Matthias by lot. Here Peter, as spokesman of the apostles, lays down, as authoritative, the necessary qualifications of an apostle; and two having been found possessing these qualifications, they appeal to God to select by lot, as he did between the two goats, (Lev. xvi. 8). Now, was Peter inspired to say what he did, and were the apostles sure without this as to whom God had chosen? As to other cases, such as Saul's election to the throne, Achan's detection, and Jonathan's, of course no absolute impossibility of using other means can be proved amid the concurrent and overlapping phenomena of the "divers manners" (Heb. i. 1,) in which God's pleasure was sought and obtained. The only probable solution of this arbitrary selection between the various modes of revelation, is that suggested to account for the variation of the details observed by our Saviour in working his miracles, viz., to show that his power was tied to none. It has been suggested to us that the comparative uselessness of the Lot as a means of obtaining Divine arbitration, on the showing of Dr. Mason, makes against the claim. We do not hear of our brethren ever submitting an important matter to the decision of the Lot. This is very different from the practice of Joshua, Samuel, Saul, and the apostles. Nor do we see how it is to be accounted for, upon the supposition, that "whatever was a lawful or unlawful use of it, is a lawful or unlawful use of it now." Why not utilise this oracle which proved so helpful in other

days? And in this connection it deserves to be remarked, that the cases to which Dr. Mason limits the use of the Lot as an appeal to God's direct arbitration, can never yield evidence confirmatory of his theory. And in this respect they stand in strong contrast to the efficacy of prayer. For while we may not adopt arbitrary tests proposed by Professor Tyndall—tests which violate the fundamental conditions of Christian supplications—yet the normal exercise of prayer yields evidence of its value. We can say with the Psalmist, "I love the Lord because he *hath heard my prayer.*"

If the Lot can be used as a means of securing a response from God now, as it once was, wherein did Mr. Wesley err in appealing to the Lot to settle his doubts as to the opposing systems of Arminius and Calvin? We are not so sure that his use of it can be convicted of error on this theory.* The reply of course would be, that we have the Scriptures by which to decide such questions. Yes; but Mr. Wesley contended that

*We are indebted to a friend for the reference to Brown's "Inconsistencies of Arminianism," pp. 413-419; where a full discussion is given of Wesley's tossing the shilling, to determine whether he should preach Calvinism or Arminianism. The charge was originally brought in Toplady's "Letter to Rev. Mr. John Wesley," dated "Westminster, March 26th, 1770," in these words: "And why should you, of all people in the world, be so very angry with the doctrines of grace? Forget not the days and months that are past. Remember that it once depended upon the toss of a shilling, whether you yourself should be a Calvinist or an Arminian. Tails fell uppermost, and you resolved to be an Universalist," (*i. e.*, as to the design of God in making the atonement): "It was a happy throw which consigned you to the tents of Arminius," etc. See Toplady's Works, edition of J. Cornish & Sons, p. 721. It is not necessary to our purpose to establish the authenticity of this remarkable transaction, but Mr. Brown correctly observes that it is vouched for by this high contemporary authority, and was never denied by Wesley, or by his friends during his lifetime, though ample opportunity was given, and allusions were made to Toplady's officiousness in collecting and publishing anecdotes of Mr. Wesley. And moreover, it is in keeping with Wesley's well known habit of casting lots in various ways to determine difficult questions. See "Arminian Inconsistencies," as above, for references to the Biographies of Wesley and of Whitefield, to show this.

he *had* sought light, and with prayerful agony. Toplady's Letter mentions that Wesley had confessed his great anxieties and his inability to come to a satisfactory decision;—a confession, which does him credit. In his acknowledged inability, he went to God to obtain a decision. And not unlikely his confidence in the infallible accuracy of the Lot helps to account for his intemperate opposition to Calvinism ever afterwards. We cannot see that Wesley misapplied the Lot, on the theory of its continued lawfulness; for he claims to have sought information anxiously from Scripture, as elucidated in the leading Theologies. But in his case without a comfortable result. The decision seemed to be demanded of him; and he appealed to God, *as he thought*, but the result was error!

So much for the scriptural warrant for using the Lot as a mode of securing God's decision. Now as to the Confession of Faith, (see 2, 113th of Larger Catechism), it is our candid opinion that its language is perfectly in keeping with what we have written. "Sinful . . . lots" are set down among the violations of the third commandment. But when we seek to interpret the precise shade of meaning intended by the general term "sinful," the only proof-text cited is Haman's casting lots to determine the "lucky day" for his wholesale vengeance upon the Jewish people. If he appealed to the true God intentionally, the sinfulness of his act is like that of the murderer who should pray God to aid him in his fell purpose—it is blasphemy. If he sought guidance from the stars, as is probable, or from the "mysterious powers above us," his sin was identical with that of the profane gipsy, who tells fortunes with cards, a proceeding that tends to put contempt upon all religion. And while it is true that "games of chance," as an amusement, may not be sinful, yet a parallel for Haman's sin is found, as suggested by our correspondent, in the conduct of many gamblers, who look upon their games as being controlled by supernatural influences, in such a sense as that the player's conduct brings upon him the smiles or the frowns of "Fortune." In such cases of course the player's intention constitutes a sin where none of that kind is necessitated by the nature of the act. Some curious instances

of this grovelling superstition and profaneness are given in a cleverly written article copied by the *Eclectic*, for September, 1872, from the *Cornhill Magazine*. Rules for the player's guidance are cited from Houdin's "Trickeries des Grecs dévoilées," which is a sort of "gambler's handbook;" among these certain directions are given for the repression of the passions of anger and exultation, not upon the obvious grounds of their leading the player to hasty ventures beyond his means, but for the superstitious ones that "the demon of bad luck pursues the passional player," and that "Fortune does not like people to be over-joyed at her favors and prepares bitter deceptions for those intoxicated by success," etc., etc. And that such language is not resolvable into mere tropes the writer proves very clearly. The profane creatures actually consider their conduct at play to be under the surveillance of a Deity who rewards them for being consummate scoundrels! And we add, that the behaviour of gamblers at the German Kursaals upon the advent of a "star," and the language in vogue during the lottery excitement in this country forty years ago, cited by Tyson, testify to the same prevalence of superstition. But if our argument is sound, these profane conceits arise from the *person*, and not from the thing done. This opinion is based upon Paul's principle about "meat offered to idols," 1 Cor. viii. So that "games of chance" may be used without profanity. The use of lots in filling out a list of jurymen, in dividing inheritances, or in selecting examples from among a large class of criminals, are to be regarded, not as solemn appeals to God, but as convenient methods of so modifying human action as to eliminate, as far as possible, the possibility of fraud or partiality.

Having thus, as we think, cleared the ground of obstructions, we are now prepared to show that gambling necessarily contains in it an element of dishonesty, because as stated by the General Assembly, it is a mode of getting gain without giving an equivalent. We attach the more importance to this effort to get rid of Dr. Mason's theory, erroneous in our opinion, and of adhering rather to the wiser course marked out in the deliverances of our Assembly already quoted, from the observed failure in the effort.

to impress even the best classes of our congregations with any definite conception of the profaneness of games of chance, whether played in moderation for amusement, or as a means of gambling; and perhaps one cause of this difficulty lies in the undue importance, necessarily attributed by the theory, to the sinfulness of gambling by cards or by dice, over gambling in other ways, as by horse-racing, shooting-matches, cock-fighting, or prize-fights. Now experience does not seem to warrant such a wide discrimination as Dr. Mason and our correspondent call for. Dr. Mason lays all his stress upon gambling by the Lot, and hardly alludes, if at all, to other modes. If the *gravamen* of the charge against gambling by the Lot is its blasphemy, and "greed for gain" (theft, we say,) is only an aggravation of the main evil, why does not experience show it? We see no such marked difference, (unless it be in public lotteries, as above stated, and *this* is fully accounted for, we think, without Dr. Mason's theory); and experience seems to show that, while horse-racing takes rank next to lotteries in wastefulness and in leading large numbers of our better classes into temptation, perhaps the prize-ring and the cock-pit exceed all other forms of gambling in engendering low and filthy habits.

This ground, of charging theft or robbery upon gambling of all kinds, is taken by the Larger Catechism. See Question 142d. It has been of course strenuously denied; and among others it is interesting to observe that Paley (Political Philosophy, Chap. VIII.,) fails to realise the full extent of the moral evil, though what he has to say exposes such incidental frauds as we have alluded to in the management of "benevolent lotteries." Paley maintains that one player (in this case the managers) act dishonorably if they take any advantage in the game, which the other party does not concede. And in this case, of course, the ticket-holders, being hopelessly deceived by the delusive promises of agents and managers, which they cannot understand in their true sense. The withholding of the *qualifying facts*, as above remarked, with the knowledge that the purchaser is deceived, is a case of constructive fraud. The charge is as clearly made out as when the horse-trader sells me a diseased animal, knowing that I have

no means of detecting the disease and consequently buy him for sound. Of course, the maxim—"Every man must look out for himself," is, in such an application, simply monstrous.

It is inadmissible to plead in defence of this spoliation, that it is an act of self-defence, or that it is on a par with reprisals in war. The two pleas are quite different from each other, and would be inconsistent as alternatives offered by the same party in his own self-defence. But the appeal will not hold to a justifiable self-defence, (as when I kill an assailant to save my own life), because in this case the taking of my neighbor's money at play goes beyond the limits of self-defence. Suppose it should be clearly established in court that A. had steadfastly manœuvred to induce B. to attack and then should shoot him down in the act? This would certainly modify the verdict of "justifiable homicide," which he claims from the judge and the jury. And to the gambler we must say, your defence must be withdrawal from the hazard, and not spoliation of your neighbor to keep him from despoiling you. And so without stopping to question, as we very well might do, the parallel between reprisals in war by belligerents and reprisals by individuals who cannot levy war, we meet the plea, by saying that there is always a wrong in war. Either the party declaring war does it without sufficient ground and is responsible for the evil done, or else having good cause the other party is responsible for the wrong and its consequences. And in neither case can reprisals be justified except as they are necessary to end the war and thus to redress the wrong. While of course either party at play can stop the wrong, (B. trying to take A.'s money), by withdrawing from the game, which it is his duty to do.

Such studied concealments must, as Paley intimates, take rank with the tricks of the professional expert. It is of the same nature as a false deal of the cards, and the agent or manager, who, by the aid of delusive promises made in the advertisement, entices the ignorant and poor to pay in their pittance, is guilty of a cruel fraud. It is unlawful spoliation.

But we are prepared to go further than Paley, with his defective theory of the origin and extent of moral obligation, was

naturally prepared to go. Apart from these collateral frauds which fearfully aggravate the wrong of gambling, as usually carried on, we are prepared to assert that every such act is a violation of the law of property, as laid down in the eighth commandment. It is despoiling him of his goods without *lawful equivalent*. The difference between theft and robbery, both of which are condemned by this law, being that robbery implies usually a show of violence, while theft generally includes the thought of concealment. It is because of the danger to human life that robbery and burglary are punishable with death. But so far as the main point is concerned (property), theft and robbery are as one.

The rules or conditions of gambling make no pretence to the act of *giving* away one's money, whether from considerations of pity or of love. They manifestly claim to partake of the nature of a *contract*; and hence Paley very properly sets them down under the heading, "Contracts of Hazard." The question is, therefore, whether viewed as a *contract*, gaming can be pronounced a valid and lawful transfer of property, as seen from a scriptural stand-point. The two arguments urged by advocates of gaming to show the lawfulness of it, (all accessory cheating, whether in words or actions, being excluded), are: 1. The mutual consent of the parties to abide the issue of the game. 2. The equivalent given by the winner in the shape of equal chances at the stakes, and the entertaining excitement of play.

The reply is, that the *mere* fact of a "mutual consent" is not sufficient in the eyes of law, human or divine. Take the case of a child, or person "non compos mentis," who parts with his golden "eagle" for a tin-trumpet. Here the judge can clearly ascertain that the grounds of the consent, freely given, are insufficient. The "bargain" is therefore unhesitatingly annulled. That is, the law takes cognisance of the *grounds* of the consent of parties, and, when clearly seen to be unjust to one party, orders the cancelling of the contract. The extreme case illustrates the principle. Now just where human law stops short in its inquiry into motives, (not here in this case, however,) let us remember that the Searcher of hearts is bound by no human limitations. The province of *motive*, which is essential to moral

government in its perfection, is necessarily perilous ground for the human judge, then he must needs use the feeble instrument of logical inference to find out something of the "intents of the heart." But to the all-seeing eye of God this impalpable world of motive is as clear as the unclouded landscape to the eagle's piercing ken: "For all things are naked and open to him, with whom we have to do." He discovers our motives, not as we do one another's, by the slow and fallible process of deduction, but by the infallible act of a perfect intuition which comprehends in its unrelenting grasp the very "imagination of the thoughts" of men.

"O wondrous knowledge, deep and high!
Where can a creature hide?
Within thy circling arms I lie,
Enclosed on every side."

Christian ethics emphatically condemn the selfish and savage reasoning of Cain: "Am I my brother's keeper?" by substituting for it: "*Thy neighbor as thyself.*" In that view I am bound to consider the ground of my neighbor's consent to abide the issue of the game, as well as my own. And when I see that it is based, in either of us, upon unjustifiable grounds, I am bound by the law of Christ to save him, as well as myself, from the treacherous quicksand. The gamester's motive is either compounded of ignorance and greed after gain, or else it is simple avarice, an unholy coveting of my neighbor's property. The "contract," so called, is invalidated and annulled by this unholy motive. Every transaction in which gain is had (or sought after) without a fair equivalent, is *stealing* or robbery, in God's sight, let men call it by what name they will. "It is despoiling my neighbor unlawfully of his goods, and aiding him to attempt the same iniquity. O what a terrible overhauling of these "bargains" and contracts may we confidently expect in the last day! And what havoc would the steady application of this scriptural law, recognised, indeed, but, because of human weakness or sin, carried out most imperfectly here. Such as it is, however, in its human shape, it is the earthly analogon of the heavenly and divine reality. *Motives lie at the root of all actions*

and must be taken into the account, even of short-sighted human judges.

As to the second argument in justification of gambling in its essential form, *i. e.*, when "unfair dealing" is rigidly excluded, (which is rarely if ever the case), that "the winner gives an equivalent in the even chance to win, and in the entertainment of play;" the first "equivalent" is swept away by the consideration of unholy motives. Translated into plain terms it is: "I repay you for taking away your property unjustifiably by giving you the opportunity of taking mine on the same wicked terms." And as to the second plea that the "entertainment of play" fairly compensates the losing party, the reply is, that it adds to the injury done him and aggravates the wrong which it professes to heal. This "entertainment" arises from an excitement which is both unholy and unhealthful. Experience proves it to be a consuming fire, which once ignited burns up all that is "lovely and of good report" in human character. It disorders the nervous system, and awakens or else intensifies the craving for deadly stimulants. It irritates the combative propensities and thus leads to bloody affrays. It leads men into vile associations and low company of both sexes. It wins him away from the purifying pleasures and duties of home—in a word it implants disease, physical and moral, in every element of his being. And thus I repay him for the money I take from him in play! This is the natural tendency of things, and, therefore, these are consequences for which I am justly accountable. If, as sometimes happens, my companion in play resists to a greater or less extent the evil tendencies that I help him to exercise, of course, I am entitled to the same consideration as the incendiary who kindles the fire in his neighbor's house, with the known risk, at least, if not the intention, of burning him in it with his helpless family; but the fire is happily extinguished by a fall of rain, or else dies out of itself from the incombustibility of the house. It is a case of arson. We do not say that he will be punished to his full desert by poor, defective human law, administered by fallible men. But we can anxiously surmise what his chances for escape are at the hands of that true "*higher law,*" which proclaims

that rash and uncontrolled anger is constructive murder ; and unholy lust is adultery. *Væ victis!*

It had been our purpose to attempt some application of these principles of divine morality to some of the phases of commercial speculation, but, alas! the field is wide, duties press upon us—“*tempus fugit.*” We only add that we consider that new department of the banking business known as life insurance, which has shot up into sudden and growing importance fairly able to stand an appeal to the principles of morality. The contract of a life insurance policy may be considered to partake of a double nature. On the one hand it is a financial investment which is as much *self-supporting* as any other form of banking. Its revenues are adjusted by impartial application of the laws of mortality, (which are not of course to be understood in the absurd sense of atheistic entities, but as facts of observation springing from natural causes under the beneficent guidance and control of the God of providence). These revenues are invested, after deducting the necessary expenses of the machinery as in other banks, for the benefit of subscribers who are the stockholders. The man who applies for a life policy expects to pay for what he gets, if he reads honest statements freely circulated by various companies. The reasonable expectation of both parties is, that a sufficient subscription will be paid in to cover the whole amount of the claim at the expiration of the time.* If this time extends through “the term of natural life,” it is a *reasonable probability* based upon an induction of particulars. But besides this purely financial side, life insurance claims another element, viz., that of *benevolence*, like that feature so often embodied in other copartnerships, which provides that, in case a partner dies before the time set for the dissolution of the firm, his heirs shall receive a certain just proportion of the profits realised before that date. The policy-holders of insurance companies are in fact—and it is so explained—*copartners in a banking scheme*, which combines financial security with wisely regu-

*This is directly the reverse of the gambler's expectation, whether he holds lottery-tickets or cards. His hope and desire are to obtain what he does *not* pay for ; and that frame of mind is the sin of gambling.

lated humanity. There is, therefore, no occasion for the unfair comparisons sometimes heard, between gambling and life insurance. This of course presupposes that the contract is not invalidated by incidental fraud in the contracting parties as by concealment of disease, by insuring with intent to commit suicide; or by fraudulent application of investments. And the same general statement holds good of the kindred business of fire and marine insurance, *mutatis mutandis*.

We conclude this discussion by reiterating with an emphasis that comes from a painful observation of the accruing evil, that the Church must keep her garments unspotted if she does not wish to incur the contempt of men, and the righteous wrath of God. Her policy is, Touch not the unclean thing. "Can a man take fire in his bosom and not be burned? Can one go upon hot coals, and his feet not be burned?" It is impossible. Let the watchmen on the walls take the alarm and lift up their voice like a trumpet, if they would be found without the blood of souls in their skirts. And if neither the press nor the pulpit will do their duty in keeping back the tide from us which brought poverty, sorrow, and heart-burnings, into so many homes in this country forty years ago; if we are to be threatened through the mistake, or the pretence of ignorant or of designing men, with scenes such as those that marked the dismal night of the great Government lottery in London, when *fifty* wretched suicides testified in mute eloquence to the depraving influences of gambling in this form; then let faithful magistrates take it in hand and prosecute the first citizen, man or woman, who in flagrant violation of public law offers for sale tickets for a "church raffle."