

THE NEW PRINCETON REVIEW.

63d Year.

JANUARY, 1888.

No. 1.

RACE THEORIES AND EUROPEAN POLITICS.

THE discovery of Sanscrit and the further discovery to which it led, that the languages now variously known as Aryan, Aryanic, Indo-European, Indo-Germanic, Indo-Celtic, and Japhetic are closely akin to one another, spread a spell over the world of thought which cannot be said to have yet wholly passed away. It was hastily argued from the kinship of their languages to the kinship of the nations that spoke them; the student of comparative philology, or, as we may more briefly call him, the glottologist, projected a common parent-speech, from which the individual Aryan languages known to history were treated as derived. This, though beset with difficulties, was legitimate; but not so much can be said of the pendant to it in the supposed existence in primeval times of a tribe of which the Aryan nations, so-called, were to be regarded as the historical branches. The question then arises as to the home of the *holethnos*, or parent tribe, before its dispersion and during the pro-ethnic period, at a time when as yet there was neither Greek nor Hindoo, neither Celt nor Teuton, but only an undifferentiated Aryan. Of course, the answer at first was—where could it have been but in the East? And at length the glottologist found it necessary to shift the cradle of the Aryan race to the neighborhood of the Oxus and the Jaxartes, so as to place it somewhere between the Caspian Sea and the Himalayas. Then Doctor Latham boldly raised his voice against the Asiatic theory altogether, and stated that he regarded the attempt to deduce the Aryans from Asia as resembling an attempt to derive the reptiles of this country from those of Ireland. Afterwards Benfey

OUR AMERICAN LIFE.

THE heading of this article is chosen "for cause," as say the lawyers. If it stood as "our life," the reviewer might expect a professional disquisition on its shortness or uncertainty, or possibly a demonstration that it is "worth living." If it stood "American life," the writer might be supposed to take the stand-point of an outsider. But that would be against the facts. To live among a people twenty years, to lecture them and be lectured, to vote on every possible occasion, to have one's life, aims, and interests identified with the land and its people, and to be as proud of its position as is consistent with Christian humility—these things surely entitle me to say "Our American Life." And it is in full sympathy with it as a whole that a few pages are devoted to some of its elements, with the view to fixing attention on the good that is to be strengthened and on the evil that is to be eliminated.

The composition of the population of the United States has to be remembered by any one who would think wisely and justly of our life. For a long time English ways, transmitted by the Puritans whom Providence sent to America, were in a good degree maintained, modified, of course, by environments. Pork and beans have a transatlantic history, but maple-sugar and tomatoes are our own, and are now going across the ocean. New England people do not always realize how much they inherit. There are parts of old England where Queen Victoria has a small "r," not for Regina, but a provincial addition, to her name. She is "Victoriar." One who is new to eastern States will hear the same thing there. Even well-educated men will sometimes speak of the "lawr." They are not aware of it. An Amherst student, teaching an Irish-born pupil his Latin grammar, said: "Now, decline mensar." The pupil repeated his pronunciation. The tutor detected in him the annex which he did not notice in himself. A good foreign missionary was heard with pleasure by the present writer some years ago. He had been most of his life on the foreign field, and his subject seemed to lay traps for him as he spoke of *Asiar*, *Burmahr*, *Calcuttar*, and so onward. These are trifles in themselves, but they show for how long

the characteristics of a people will survive. The New Englanders—whose fathers, happily, did not know of Iowa and Minnesota, or poor New England's hard soil would not have been subdued—now cover these tempting plains and set up on them the institutions they inherited, and with a vigor which has survived through the very conflict with difficulties on the eastern hillsides.

More toward the centre of the present States come the Scotch-Irish. They had been settled in Ulster, after 1688, on lands rented at say half a dollar an acre, on thirty-one-year leases. They drained, fenced, manured the land, and put up houses. The result was that the landlords said, at the end of thirty-one years: "These lands are now worth two dollars an acre rent, and we shall charge you at that rate." "Two dollars an acre! Why, gentlemen, it is we who made them worth that, and you make us pay for our own labor! No; we'll go to America." And they did, in such numbers as to give a good deal of additional backbone to the population here, and to alarm the landlords. Two results followed. When the Boston people planned independence these Scotch-Irish were ready with their sympathy; and in the province they quitted there grew up a conceded tenant's right to his improvements, which at length had to be framed into law. Add to these elements an infusion of Dutch diligence and of Huguenot fervor, and you have a good central force for the subjugation of a difficult land and the making of a vigorous nation. It may be added, parenthetically, that he is not loyal to memories and associations, nor just to the lessons of history, who belittles these people, or tries to eliminate their characteristics from our national life.

Difficulties in reaching America diminished and new elements entered it, Irish, without the "Scotch" in their name, and Germans, being followed later by ordinary French, and later still by Scandinavians and Italians. Of our Hebrew fellow-citizens, so energetic and industrious, something may be said later. If it be alleged, as it might naturally be, that the original peoples make the strength of the nation, it might be replied: "Yes, they have been longest here; wait until the new-comers have had a century or two of the country, and then you can judge." Whatever may be thought on this subject, all will admit the desirableness of bringing the people together in sympathy, in general convictions, and even in habits. Union, in these things, is strength. It is undesirable that there should be in a given city groups of people ignorant to a great degree of one an-

other's home-language, habits, tastes, and general ideas. In schools, in politics, in city affairs, it is undesirable that a German, having the ear of his countrymen, should be able to employ them as a unit for his own ends. The same is true of any other class. A Hungarian in a town happening to have in leading-strings a body of Hungarian voters, may obstruct, to the damage of the town, even of his supporters, till he is bought off; when such sordid trickery would be impossible, if the Hungarians were in communication and sympathy with the rest of the people. It would be easy to extend the illustration; but it is needless. The common school has been looked to as a great means of securing this unification. Ought not Americans who feel this to face such questions as these: What proportion of our children have we actually studying in the schools? To what extent are they sectionalized—German schools for German, Irish for Irish? How far are they doing the full work of educating? Are they so leaving out anything—the training of the hands, for example, or, more important still, the education of the conscience—as to warrant disregard and disuse of them, and thus weaken this assimilating power? Where government is “for the people and by the people,” where there is no autocrat guarding the local interest for the benefit of the whole, nothing is beneath notice that tends to intelligent and cordial coöperation.

On this account one cannot look with any favor on the occasional segregation of “the Jews” among us. Persecuted for centuries, shut out from holding land and from the professions, they were shut up to limited forms of business; but they feel and prove, in their industry, intelligence, pure domestic life, in their small contribution to the pauperism and the crime of the country, and their immense influence in France, Germany, and even Russia, how much their inspired Old Testament has told upon them for good; and it is a great infelicity when fastidious Americans treat them in any way unfavorable to their complete identification with our land and our national life.

The commercial life of our country—without the necessity to discuss protection or free trade—well deserves careful study. The area which we control is wide, the outside regions with which we have to do constantly become nearer and more numerous. The ingenuity and inventiveness called into play and developed by the necessities of Europeans settling in quite new conditions of earth and air—and which have shown themselves in our multitudinous contrivances,

“patents,” and ingenious combinations—are elements of power, of a certain kind, in trade. They are also capable of being elements of weakness. Able men have done so many unexpected things that a prospectus of a new and fortune-making effort must be very utopian indeed if it does not find some believers. Let the numerous holes in the sides of “the Rockies,” into which more money went than ever came out, bear witness. Let the devices of smart scoundrels among ourselves, “organizers,” and deceivers of fairly intelligent people, bear witness. A proportion of these come to the eye through the police and the bankruptcy courts. Another proportion sinks into obscurity; for dupes do not always wish to exhibit their silliness, and even shameful “frauds” have sometimes well-to-do friends and relatives. The breadth of our country is a temptation to such. A commercial blackguard in Belgium is known all over the kingdom. A commercial plunderer shown up in London need not go to Liverpool or Bradford; the island is small. But Oregon is a long way from New York. Even Denver or Sacramento give a man a chance of improving on the experience he has gained in the East. It follows that our commercial life calls for caution, conservative methods, and, possibly, some revision of the standard of success. Are we not getting into the bad habit of counting only the man who makes a “pile” a success, and the man who simply holds his ground, brings up and starts a family honorably in life, and dies as he lived, of no great account? But in fact, and in all the real interests of life, the latter may be the success, and the former the failure.

Another fact in this connection is worth notice before we pass from the subject. The great, brilliant successes are, as a rule, in our cities. They attract notice. All men hear of the man who rolled up a fortune in a few years. Only a few hear of the twenty that failed on the same lines. “What is hit is history; what is missed is mystery.” One consequence is that the movement is from the country to the town. Young Thatcher is not going to plod along year after year on the farm, when he might with less toil make his thousands in the city, as a politician or a man of business. “Why, there is Baker—I’m just as smart as he is—and he is near the top of the wheel; they say he will soon be an alderman.” So the tide is town-ward. Now it is true that one may find the best people in the towns, for mind quickens mind; but you may also find the worst; and in this world evil works at a tremendous advantage. No

better population for morals and trustworthiness is found in any Christian country than those who live by the tilling of the soil. We do not ignore the value of cities, but

“God made the country, and man made the town,”

and without building on any forced exegesis of this passage, we cannot be blind to the fact that city life multiplies and complicates the problems with which Christian civilization has to deal. No five millions of country people in England present so much that is discouraging as you find among the same number crowded together in London.

The social life of our American people cannot be passed over in any attempt to look seriously at the points that need to be watched. We approach it timidly. We have seen more than one book of the “Élite” of a city. Society papers have grown up in the midst of our “republican simplicity.” Many have obtained the wealth which is supposed to secure foremost social places. If there is fair home-training, with moral culture, especially religious principle, their children, or their children’s children, will have the social powers for these high places. In the meantime they are imitators, and, as a general thing, the imitators imitate the worst, not the best, of their ideals. Many a youth has copied the nervous, dislocated style of Carlyle, who did not appreciate his thought. Doctor Candlish, of Edinburgh, was a powerful reasoner and a forcible teacher in the pulpit. He had a curious way of jerking his body and shrugging his shoulders. The shrugging was imitated by some who fell far below the didactic model. So it is in our social life. The ways of Paris and other such places are, to some extent, our ideal. We do not take the best of them. To be true to the truth of things; to be sincere, like honey without wax in it; to be pure; to magnify, to conserve, and consecrate the home—these ought to be the aims of the best people. Are they so among us? Is the family keeping its sacred character? Did you, gentle reader, ever hear of any talk in London like this, from the lips of second-rate caterers to social pleasure: “Let us go over to America: those Yankees have got lots of money, and they don’t know much”? Have you read much about the divorce court? Have you heard of a society in New England to war against its frightful patronage? It is of no use to tell me that in France, Spain, Italy, they have no divorce courts, and yet have immorality, illegitimacy, and kindred evils to a frightful degree.

We are not now discussing these lands and their ways, but the features of our own Christian, Protestant, American life. You can quote to us the well-known generalization about the decay of men where wealth grows. The wealth is growing among us, and is likely to grow. The question is, Are we to accept this generalization as we accept gravitation? or are we to fight against it, to quarantine permanently, if we can, the moral contagion, and to keep away from young men and maidens, from mothers and little children, the germs of disease that, developed, prove fatal to individual life, to domestic joy, and to the welfare of the community?

One serious word we venture to insert here. Unless the explorers of the earth and its inhabitants have misled us, no race or tribe of men has ever civilized itself. The force has come from outside, more or less rapidly, more or less definitely. And it is not too much to say that what is called "society" will never purify itself. It has no gospel, no decalogue, no divine power, no holy comforter within itself. Who can find these in the favorite haunts of the so-called "social world"? They are an outside thing to it. Their entrance into it would be an embarrassing intrusion. But there is a society in which these beneficent forces work. Their presence is its glory. That society is the Church of God, with the Saviour of men at its head, and the Blessed Spirit in its heart. The Church of Christ has to be the force outside "society," purifying the atmosphere, defining and shaming away the low and the unholy, lifting up the pure, and magnifying the good. Fidelity to her trust on the part of this other and better society is the one hope for our social life.

But we must not pass over the political element in our American life; yet we are not to be construed as pronouncing here upon, or in favor of, the Republican, the Democratic, the euphonious "Mugwump," or any other party. That men are born "free and equal," and that this involves a great deal, has been vividly set forth in the last issue of this REVIEW. But even the most lucid monosyllable, like "free," sometimes requires explanation and definition. It is easy to widen the meaning to the shutting-out not only of unjust human authority, but of all authority, human and divine. "One is our Master." "The powers that be are ordained of God." Parents are to be obeyed; so are magistrates. So they were to be, even when the people did not elect them by ballot. It follows that pains must be taken to teach those things that must needs enter into the political life of a free people. Take a single illustration. A self-

ordained prophet of the people harangues against the "greedy capitalists," and—without saying it in words—suggests that an *auto-da-fé* of them would be a pleasant and profitable spectacle. How many of his hearers think of well-known men, whom you could count on your fingers, as being the detestable capitalists? How many pause to think that Mrs. Smith, who saved money enough by dressmaking to set up a little store, is a capitalist to Miss Jones, who shows her wares and gets as good a salary as, by common consent in the town, can be given to this form of labor? The elements and the terms of political economy, then, should be taught in our schools. And so along fitting lines—if all men have a share in the making of laws and lawgivers—there should run some influences that would guide them and keep them from dangerous mistakes.

Among these influences we put the words, the works, the example of the intelligent and the well-to-do who "have no axe to grind" and no office to seek, for themselves or for their protégés. Is there not in many places practical indifference here? Is there not an inactivity that is not masterly, but that is feeble and craven, and that gives the mastery to the unworthy and the unprincipled? If the "primary" be allowed to issue its orders from the congenial atmosphere of a saloon, and the "caucus" comprehend the tramps and venal *habitués* of the corners; if the comfortable, intelligent, responsible citizens shrug their shoulders and say "What can we do?" and allow these "free and equal" gentlemen to rule, are they not, we respectfully ask, in a very unpatriotic manner bringing into contempt before the nations that which we rejoice in as our matchless heritage? Are they not turning our glory into shame?

There are difficulties, no doubt, in the way. But are they insuperable? If so, should we retain the system? If not, should we not face them? To conquer independence has been held to be a feat for which the fathers of the nation cannot be too highly praised. Will it be laudable in their sons to let that independence be so abused that on-lookers will say, with an air of classical contempt, "Better one tyrant than thirty"?

Now we come to the last element in our American life to be noticed here, namely, the religious. That religion has made progress among us will appear from the following comparison of the six most numerous Protestant bodies in 1776, with the same bodies in 1876. We give—to save our readers from bewilderment—only the ministers. The Baptists, in 1776, had 722 ministers. In 1876 they had

13,779. The Methodists, in 1776, had 24 ministers. In 1876 they had 20,453. The Presbyterians had 177 ministers in 1776. In 1876 they had 4,744. The Congregationalists, in 1776, had 575 ministers. In 1876 they had 3,333. In 1776 the Episcopalians had 150 ministers. In 1876 they had 3,216. The Lutherans had, in 1776, but 25 ministers. In 1876 they had 2,662. We do not stay to compare this growth with the growth of the population. Nor has this advance been checked by the events or movements of the last decade. According to an article in the *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia*, from the pen of Doctor Schaff himself—and there are few more exact—the order of these denominations as to churches (and the ministers are in proportion) was as follows, in 1884:

Methodists,	41,271.
Baptists,	37,156.
Presbyterians,	11,783.
Lutherans,	6,130.
Congregationalists,	3,936.
Protestant Episcopalians,	3,109.

Unitarians and Universalists together have 1,081 congregations. Incidentally we may mention that the Roman Catholics are in the same year and return credited with 6,241 churches, thus coming in as fourth of the denominations. That they count all their people "members" (while other denominations only describe communicants so), and call them 6,832,954 (nearly double the communicants in the Baptist and Methodist churches) is not always noted, and many are misled in this way. It may modify such solicitude to remember that their own estimate of their numbers makes them only one-ninth of the population of the States. Including other and smaller denominations the nation had, in 1884, 115,610 congregations of professing Christians.

The proportion of living, spiritual Christians, among these great bodies, it is not wrong to presume, is as large as in other sections of Christendom. But ought that circumstance to satisfy us? We have no state control in any way impeding freedom of action and bringing the Church into the category of the earthly "powers that be." We have freedom of action in a more remarkable degree than is, probably, enjoyed by any other nation. We have remarkable elasticity of organization, so that in the most of these bodies exchange of pulpits and coöperation in good works encounter no serious obstacle. For all this we should be profoundly thankful.

But the greater our opportunities the heavier our responsibilities, and are there not weak points in our Church life? An eminent English ecclesiastic, who has had experience of both the Anglican and the Roman Church, is quoted as saying that ornamental books of devotion, theatrical music, and eloquent sermons have been, in his judgment, the great hinderances to piety. There may be a measure of colloquial playfulness in the remark. Have we erred in any of these ways? Have "eloquent sermons," for example, in the sense of rhetorical, philosophical, poetical, metaphysical discourses, superseded the lifting-up of the truth of the Bible in such sense that the messenger is little noticed in comparison with the message and the Sender of it? We have no "Established Church," to which it is in "good form" to belong; but have we no "climbers," who value the congregation by the number of steps it includes up the social ladder? Are there not too many whose verdict in an "experience meeting" on service, minister, and all, would be "perfectly lovely," and who would make little account of the sincerity, the solemnity of conscious dealing with Divinity, in fact, of the "spirit and truth" in which the INFINITE SPIRIT is to be learned from and adored?

The number and variety of our denominations are sometimes dwelt upon with strong deprecating language, as an immeasurable evil, and a necessary negation of the Saviour's prayer, "that they all may be one." Is there not some risk of over-statement here? The States and Territories of our nation are now all one. A godly man might well have prayed that "they all might be one"—States or people—in the dark days of twenty-five years ago. He might, five years later, have given thanks, he might to-day give God thanks, that "they are again one," notwithstanding different names of States and Territories, different conditions and forms of internal machinery, and difference of State laws. A child, indeed, might say: "But the churches should have one head, as the States have one President." The analogy is strained. When we come together in an Evangelical Alliance, we, too, have presidents chosen by the members, whose duty it is to nominate officers, and promote the order and efficiency of the whole. But in the deeper sense we have one Head, real, living, loving, and present with us, according to his word—"always, even unto the end." He is the Lord Jesus, the Chief Shepherd and Bishop of souls. He is so real and so near that he has no alternate, substitute, or visible representative. His people walk by faith, en-

ture as seeing him who is invisible, and are one in this that they have the one Lord, the one faith, and the one baptism.

In an earnest and well-intentioned article in the last issue of this REVIEW, there is a careful restatement of a recent movement made by one of the denominations—the smallest, as it happens, of those named above—to get rid of this evil of diverse organization, by a “reunion” process, the details of which are described and urged on all readers. It is of little account, of course, a mere matter of words, but the desired amalgamation would not be exactly a “reunion.” These bodies are not the broken fragments of an organization which once included them all. When were Presbyterians a part of the Anglican Church? How could there be reunion? The Lutherans might put the same question. So might that estimable body, the Reformed Dutch Church. One must not take up the notion, from such loose phraseology as is often used, that the Anglican Church came out at the Reformation as the body including all Protestants, and that the other denominations are broken segments from her, which she would now, if allowed, kindly, and in the new spirit of concession, reunite. She was one of several churches—that of Holland, that of Switzerland, that of Scotland, with independent organization and distinctive characteristics, the ordination and standing of whose ministers she acknowledged in her earlier days. How the influence of Laud and of other kindred forces changed her attitude toward them it is not necessary here to show.

But, returning to the proposed terms of “reunion,” they are four in number. First, all are to take the Scriptures as the word of God. Those who like to attach an “equal or kindred authority” to the Apocrypha can do so. So can they who regard “Catholic tradition as of equal value with Scripture.” Secondly, all must accept the Nicene Creed, retaining or procuring as many catechisms, articles, or confessions as they wish, that do not contradict it. The third term is the use of the two sacraments, Baptism and the Lord’s Supper. If any church desires to count confirmation or marriage a sacrament, why, let it, only not foregoing these two; and if it wishes to hold and teach the “real presence,” or baptismal regeneration, there will be no difficulty. In this connection, and in relation to the sacraments, the writer makes a statement which is not, we think, exact as to most of the other churches: “the widest differences of view in regard to them obtain, even among the members of the same communion.” Some hold the elements to be bread

and wine all through, and the benefits to be dependent "not on anything in them or in him that administers them." The "widest" divergence from this scriptural view is to make the elements something that should be worshipped, and the efficacy of the sacrament to depend on the minister. We do not believe that any such "wide difference" exists in any one of the churches invited.

The terms of reunion ask for no liturgy of any kind. To put concisely what is there put at length, the Episcopal Church, hitherto the "greatest stickler for these things," declares by "her highest officers" that she will no longer keep up "this wall of division, as she has no right to insist on any non-essential." She will, in fact, allow the various churches she desires to draw in, that prefer their present plan, to hold to it.

Then comes the fourth term, which, divested of all diplomatic language, is that all the ministers of the other churches should come to her bishops and receive ordination, which they would make as simple as possible. To make this step as easy to the sixty or seventy thousand non-episcopal ministers as it can be, the writer modifies his language, and says this would not be "the absorption of other bodies into one of those already existing," but "the formation of a new body." When the authorities of the Protestant Episcopal Church agree to a statement of that kind; when the genial writer, who bears so good a name, can bring his brethren to endorse that view—that the Anglican Church drop her distinctions, melt into the mass of ordinary Christians, and come out as a part of the new whole, only with an "historic episcopate" (chosen or secured, we do not quite see how), then we shall consider the matter seriously. Is not the unbroken continuity of the succession now a vital element with many? The writer deems the "historic episcopate" essential to "reunion." It is sometimes pleasant to get a nice phrase, if nobody will pry into the meaning of it. "Episcopate" means, in the overture and in this article, a body of ministers superior to the rest, by whom the rest would be ordained. What is "historic"? It means pertaining to, contained in, representing, history. It is employed, we presume, as conveying the idea that this episcopate has been in history all the time. Well, suppose it has. Is there not a historic monarchy? Are not Cæsar and Herod both in the New Testament? Are there not duties to Cæsar? But we have parted with the historic monarchy. Did we sin therein? The Apocrypha has been there quite as long. Why let go the "historic" Apocrypha? Why

insist on keeping this episcopate because it is so long in history, and reject other things just as long there? There is no evidence, according to Dean Stanley, Bishop Lightfoot, and others, to sustain the belief in such an episcopate in the apostolic church. It came in the sub-apostolic church. This is the only sense in which it is "historic." But on the same ground we have the historic "priest," the historic "absolution," the historic "penance," the historic "monk," the historic "fathers" and "traditions," taken "by many as of equal value with Scripture," as the writer tells. Nay, we have (it is only a difference in degree, not in kind) the historic Pope, and the historic claim to universal supremacy, and the historic anathema against all—including the Protestant Episcopal Church—who do not submit to it. Are we to take for ourselves, or allow among our brethren in the same diocese, or Presbytery, or association, these "historic" matters? Should we be any more one than now, if we did? We have a reasonable amount of order now; then we should have chaos.

No; we stand up for the scriptural episcopate, the episcopate of New Testament history; and if there be brethren beloved, holding fast the truth, the evangelical truth, though they do not constitute presbyteries as we do, we shall work with them, pray with them, exchange pulpits with them, administer and partake of the sacraments with them, be in "Evangelical Alliance" with them, all of them, Methodists, Baptists, Lutherans, Congregationalists—and Episcopalians too, if they will only recognize our historic presbytery, such as laid its hands on Timothy. And on this line we solemnly believe will better thrive our American religious life than on the foregoing, or on any such, plan of "reunion."

We have given to this Church question what some may deem a disproportionate space. But is not the Church bound by her nature and charter to be the strongest formative force in the life of the nation? Is she not to tell upon educational progress, upon commercial aims and methods, upon social influences, and upon politics? Is it not her mission to elevate teaching, to inculcate honesty, to purify society, and to infuse high motive into the men who choose rulers, and into the rulers chosen, for whom she lifts up her voice in prayer? What affects her, therefore, tells on the nation, and every intelligent patriot must desire the growth of her purity and of her power.

JOHN HALL.