

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER 1849.

No. IV.

ART. I.—*The Family of Arnauld, as connected with Jansenism and Port-Royal.*

IT was said by Royer-Collard, that not to know Port-Royal and its fortunes, is not to know the history of humanity. The most cursory student of church-annals, and of the Augustan age of France, is familiar with the names of Arnauld, Pascal, Nicole, St. Cyran, Lancelot, Tillemont, Quesnel, De Sacy, Boileau and Racine; all connected in some degree with the houses of Port-Royal. This celebrated retreat was six miles from Paris and three from Versailles, at the left of the great road by Rambouillet to Chartres. The convent lay in so low a valley that it seemed to hide itself from the neighbouring places: the inmates used, however, somewhat to exaggerate the wildness of the scene, in order to a closer parallel with the Thebaid. It is important to be observed, that in addition to the abbey just mentioned, there was one of later date, under the same auspices, in the metropolis, called Port-Royal de Paris. Of the former, or Port-Royal des Champs, the traveller from Versailles to Chevreuse will find no remnant but a solitary Gothic arch; but he will recognise the hollow vale crossing the flats, and marked by

in the temple of the material world, does this book stand like one of the apartments in the temple on Mount Zion, small indeed, but exquisitely finished, the walls and ceiling of something richer than cedar, richer than bright ivory overlaid with sapphires, and filled with specimens of truth brought down from heaven by the Holy Spirit and here deposited for the comfort and delight of those who love the habitation of God's house and the place where his glory dwelleth. As the man skilled in geology will take a bone of fossil remains from a by-gone world, and from this alone restore the whole fabric of the creature to which it belonged, with a knowledge of its nature and instincts, so may we take the germs of truth, the heavenly fossils laid up for us with such care in the spiritual treasury of this Song, and taught by the Holy Spirit, our souls may develop the system of heavenly love, the mutual affection of Jesus and his saints, a love not native to our earth in its present fallen state, but existing in all the vigour and fulness of an immortal life in yonder heavenly world.

ART. III.—1. *The Constitution of Man*, by George Combe—on Secretiveness. See index.

2. *The Covenant and Official Organ of the Grand Lodge of the United States*. Vol. I. 1842. p. 97, on "The Secret Principle."

3. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 7th Ed. Art. Mysteries.

Our present object will be to discuss the principle of secrecy in its relations to man's moral and religious obligations. This inquiry is rendered necessary by the rapid extension and multiplication of secret societies of every kind, and the efforts which have been made to justify them upon the ground of philosophy and religion.

The love of secrecy it is said "is an element in the constitution of mind" and "must therefore, in some mode or other, find its appropriate and lawful exercise."* "Secrecy is a virtue," says another, "a thing never yet denied."†

Now to begin with the beginning of our subject, we deny

* *The Covenant*, p. 97.

† *Freemason's Monitor*.

both of these axiomatic and fundamental data. Secrecy is neither an element of mind nor is it a virtue. Secrecy is a quality of an action, or a state and condition. It is a state of separation, concealment or of being hid from view.* "It is," says Dr. Johnson, "a state of privacy, solitude, retirement. A thing set apart, removed, withdrawn out of sight or view, hidden, concealed, private, is secret."†

Now the love of such a state of isolated separation is not a part of man's nature. It is, on the contrary, opposed to that nature, and painful to it. "It is not good for man to be alone,"‡ and hence the social principle, developing itself in love and friendship, in the family and in society, is the chief and characteristic distinction of human nature. It is only "use," as Shakspeare says, that "doth breed the habit in any man"

"The shadowy desert, unfrequented woods,
To better brook, than flourishing peopled towns."

'This a man may do to "tune his distresses and record his woes," but the truth still remains, that

"In solitude
What happiness who can enjoy alone,
Or if enjoying, what contentment find."‡

Nay, another great poet has said that solitude is but a slight relief from pain, and that

"The vacant bosom's wilderness,
Might thank the pang that made it less,
E'en bliss 'twere alone to bear."

Man is not then naturally disposed to be secret in any sense. He is on the contrary naturally social, free, open, unreserved, communicative and candid. These, beyond controversy, are the universal, unvaried, and proverbial qualities of natural and unsophisticated childhood. For a child to love solitude is unnatural, and to be secret and reserved impossible. An ability to endure retirement, to exercise reserve and to maintain secrecy, is a power which man attains with great difficulty, after long experience of the selfishness and evil of his fellow-men,—after much training and indoctrination,—and, after all, in a very feeble and imperfect degree. This is proven by the universal complaints respecting the faithlessness of men. Dr. Johnson

* Webster.

† Richardson's Dictionary.

‡ Milton.

doubted therefore whether the quality of retention be generally bestowed, and supposed that commonly secrets were unnatural and incapable of retention.* Chesterfield thought able men alone could exercise secrecy and that mystery was the only secrecy of weak and cunning ones, that is, of the great mass, and he advises therefore that neither fools, knaves, nor young men should be entrusted with them. The use of the word secrecy to express inviolate fidelity to any trust, is the very latest meaning to which it has been appropriated.† This use of the word is derivative, secondary, and figurative, and it indicates, not the primitive and natural condition of society, but that which is most advanced in civilization and philosophy.

Secrecy therefore is not a virtue nor an element of mind and it is perfectly gratuitous to affirm that it is so. No philosopher or divine has ever laid down such a proposition. Until phrenologists undertook to make out every state and exercise of the human mind, and to provide for them a "local habitation and a name" among the cerebral functions, in what system of mental or moral science, ancient or modern, is secrecy enrolled among the principles or the virtues of the mind? It cannot be: because it is a state not an act—a means not an end. No man conceals himself for the mere purpose of being secret, but he is secret because he has a purpose in being so, to accomplish which this is necessary. The truth is, that as the quality of an action or a state of mind, secrecy is neither virtuous nor vicious. The principles on which it rests, and the motives by which it is maintained, give to secrecy the azure hue of virtue, the blackness of vice, or the perfectly colourless atmosphere of indeterminate moral character. Mr. Combe manufactures a faculty of secretiveness out of those of judgment, prudence and will, by which it is that a man is capable of self-restraint and of doing or not doing, speaking or not speaking, according to his view of duty and advantage. With him, however, the principle is supremely selfish,‡ or has in it no moral character whatever.||

* See Rambler, No. 13.

† See Johnson, &c., as above.

‡ As "a moral sentiment" it is repressed as aiming at the suppression of all that might injure us with others, and at getting hold of every secret by which we may increase our influence and power. But "in itself it does not in any respect desire the benefit of others." p. 62.

|| "In reference to external objects it is the power of restraining the internal activities of our powers." p. 76.

The love of secrecy implies a state of moral evil, probation and defect. It is only here "we see in part and know in part," and that a veil is drawn around every human heart. It was not so in Paradise. It is not so in heaven, and it will not be so in the Paradise regained. The love of secrecy is in itself considered, an evil and an imperfection. It is a necessity imposed by the introduction and prevalence of sin and all its viperous brood of selfish, unbrotherly and vindictive passions. It was only when man became by sin the enemy of man, that he became afraid of him and therefore reserved, cautious, and secret. In proportion as wickedness prevails men "love darkness rather than light," and wrap themselves around with the garment of concealment. Secrecy is therefore the shield of weakness, the refuge of the oppressed, the altar of the assailed, and the resistance of the enslaved. Where purity dwells it is unnecessary. Where there is peace it is a stranger. Where there is mutual love and confidence, and honorable preference of each other it is needless. And in proportion as the heavenly spirit and principles of religion prevail, and peace, purity, integrity, generosity, disinterested benevolence, and philanthropy shall become personally and universally, the characteristics of mankind, the existence and operation of secrecy will be limited to pure and benign purposes. We now hide much in our bosoms only because there is much which we ought to conceal, and dare not unveil. And secrecy is now a wide-spread principle in business, in politics, in arts and commerce, because it is found to be absolutely essential against the craft, the cunning, the circumvention and the unprincipled selfishness and rapaciousness of human nature.

The origin of secrecy as a quality of human conduct is therefore truly, though suicidally, stated in the organ of the Odd Fellows, when it is said that "it was manifested in the bowers of Eden, where its undue operation, "brought death into the world and all our woes."* (See Gen. iii. 5, 6.) The Freemason's Guide also traces this principle to the very beginning of time,† and very curiously admits that the order certainly included Cain; received its first name from the builders of Babel, and was zealously promoted by Nimrod or Belus in founding

* The Covenant.

†

his empire.* The author, however, was certainly unphilosophical in assigning the origin of the order to God as the first "Grand Architect,"† since all his dealings were then open and unreserved, and since a grand architect had actually found his unnoticed way into the garden of Eden, and under the garb of secrecy had seduced our first parents into apostacy, and thus given origin to the principle and practice of secrecy. These writers cannot therefore be contradicted when they teach that from that time to this the love of secrecy has characterized fallen, guilty, fearful, artful, cunning, deceitful and wicked man, in all ages, in all countries, and under all forms of government and religion; and for this reason, that these evils came by sin, and as all men have sinned, all are partakers of them.

Secrecy is to the nature of man what darkness is to the natural world. It is a negation, a privation. It is the absence and inactivity of its regular functions and operations. It limits and restrains. Like darkness it is doubtless made conducive to good ends. It is adapted to cover up what, if left exposed, might prutify and breed corruption; to allay and put to rest stormy winds of passion that might agitate and convulse; to disarm malice of its sting, envy of its hatred, jealousy of its revenge, wealth of its ostentation and poverty of its curse. It is to human nature what drapery is to a dilapidated room, or costume to a very homely person. It veils what would disgust, and reveals only what may please. It hides deformity and exposes what is becoming. It covers the shame and the nakedness of humanity, obscures what is "earthly, sensual and devilish" in our nature, and throws over our defects the mantle of charity.

To every man individually secrecy may be made a means of defence and of self-preservation. It enables us also to "make the worse appear the better," the bad tolerable, and the good attractive. We can thus think the kindlier of ourselves because we are esteemed by others. It is sometimes also a shield of defence. It parries many a hard thrust, and turns aside many a deadly weapon. By avoiding the occasion of offence, it prevents the thirst for revenge. But on the other hand secrecy is as potent for evil as it is for good. If it is pal-

* *The Freemason's Monitor*, p. 17, 18.

† *Do.* p. 17.

liative and protective it is not less pernicious. It puts the dagger into the assassin's hands, envelopes him in darkness, and thus gives him the opportunity of unerring aim and of unredressed wickedness. It enables a man to plot mischief upon his bed, to harbour traitorous and even murderous passions, to support within him all manner of evil purposes, and crafty, tricky, mean and overreaching plans, and to make his heart like a den of thieves, or a cage of unclean birds, or like the house of those wicked spirits whose name is legion, and thus to appear outwardly as fair as the whited sepulchre, while all within is rottenness.

To society at large, as to individuals, secrecy is available for much both of good and evil; it is a wholesome check and preventive of vice, and at the same time an incentive and patron of its utmost excess of riot. It gives to law and justice the hundred eyes of Argus, and yet puts into the hands of law-breakers the hundred hands of Briareus. It is the club of Hercules by whosoever hands it is wielded. Without it society could not be defended, and with it that society can be grievously wounded and bruised. It is, in short, a two-edged sword, powerful for evil as well as good. Thus is it evident as we have said, that secrecy has in itself no moral character, and is a state or condition which becomes virtuous or vicious according to the motive and end for which it is employed.

From what we have said it may be inferred that the proper field for the exercise of secrecy is where the true and rightful interests of man, individually and socially, are involved. As it regards man individually it may be remarked that what is not necessary to be revealed for the good of others and what may prove injurious to ourselves, we ought to leave in undisturbed secrecy. What the good of others however demands we ought not to conceal from them. This is the only limit to personal secrecy, the law of truth, honour, probity, justice, and humanity. But it is, we apprehend, different in society. Society is constituted with a reference to the common good of each other and of all. It is one body of which there are many members, and in which the common health and vigour is maintained by that which every limb and joint and muscle supplieth. If any member of the body is necessary to perform requisite, but at the same time private and homely offices it is on that very account

uncomely and shameful." Secrecy in the conduct of social affairs is a necessity not a choice, an indispensable instrument but not an ornament, like the drains of a city which are covered from public view. No part of the social body is designedly, and for its own sake, secret. Secrecy is the exception to the rule, "a needs be"—which the moral maladies of the body to some extent renders unavoidable. It is only lawful and proper, therefore, where it is a means to the one end of all society, that is, to the common good of all. The propriety of secrecy in a community "hath this extent, no more." Beyond this, it is the badge of despotism and of inquisitorial power. And hence secrecy may be regarded as no bad standard of the character of any government. In arbitrary governments it is the rule, but in free countries it is the exception and the last resort of prudential necessity. In a free republic like ours everything is and ought to be open, public, and revealed. All participate in the government; all share equally in its benefits and its burdens; are labourers in the common vineyard; and all are under obligations to devote themselves to the common interests of the whole body. Local, sectional, and party association for the special benefit of some to the neglect of others and under the covering of secrecy, is contrary to the genius of our constitution, to the spirit of our laws, and to the ethereal temper of our institutions. It is without excuse, unnecessary, and injurious. There is but one "order" in a republic—one "fraternity." "All we are brethren." Our equality of right relates not merely to person, to property, and to the pursuit of happiness, but also to the right of knowing the truth as it regards the nature, rules, and order of every society amongst us. This right, if not jural, is moral. It is necessary to that fraternity, and equality, and to that confidence, trust, and heartfelt sympathy, which are essential to the good will and harmony of the social family. While therefore it may be legal it is certainly not morally expedient or desirable that any part of the social family, dwelling in the same homestead, and having common interests at stake, should separate themselves for their own benefit, and under a veil of absolute secrecy "hide themselves from their own flesh," their own kindred.

It is very certain that as what is allowable in one party is allowable in all, and what is proper for one purpose is equally so for others, that in this way the social family may be divided

into cliques, each occupying a separate chamber, and pursuing separate ends for selfish advantages, under rules of absolute and complete seclusion. And how, we ask, could a family thus separated by secret vows, for private benefit and pleasure, live in peace, harmony and happiness, and how could a kingdom thus torn and divided within itself possibly endure?

But secrecy is not less injurious to friendship than it is to social equality and fraternity. Cicero long ago remarked that secrecy is the ruin of friendship, and an effectual barrier to its foundation. And as in a family there should exist the most tender friendship, there must also exist the most perfect freedom. Secrecy openly avowed would at once erect a wall of separation, and thus chill and freeze the warm current of mutual affection. And so it is in the social as well as in the domestic family. Here all are friends and secrecy is a crime against humanity and the very life of all society.

But secrecy is a still greater violation of the rights of love. For if friendship thus knits society into one body, how much more does love identify the interests of those who are its objects. The very bond of such an union is a community of interest, of happiness and of purpose. The manifest good of others, can alone warrant an infringement of this covenant. The creation therefore of conventional associations which exalt their claims above this supremacy of love, and without absolute and imperative necessity, erect between its objects, an open and avowed wall of separation and of secrecy, is, we apprehend a serious, a fatal, and an unjustifiable interference with the claims of true and whole-hearted love; with the duties of man and the rights of woman; with all the sanctity of that holy relation which requires a man to "leave father and mother and cleave unto his wife," and which "out of twain makes them one flesh." The authority of God and the real interests of others which might lie jeopardized by disclosure will even in such a case undoubtedly justify and even require the withholdment of certain facts; but nothing can justify the subjection of that heart which has been given in covenant devotion and in supreme and entire appropriation to a heart equally and entirely consecrated to it, to the usurped dominion of a self constituted society.

Secrecy is not therefore a virtue, or in itself considered, proper and commendable. If the object aimed at in any social

combination is praiseworthy then the veil of secrecy is unnecessary, and if that end is evil or liable to corruption then it is criminal.* “We should never,” says Cicero,† “do any thing out of the hope or expectation of secrecy.” “There is,” he says, “such a thing as a mutual relation and society amongst all men.” . . . “It is true not to tell a thing, is not properly to conceal it; but not to tell that, which people are concerned to know, merely for the sake of some advantage to yourself, I think is: and there is nobody but knows what concealing this is, and who they are that make a custom of it: I am sure not your plain, sincere, ingenuous, honest, and good sort of people; but rather your shifting, sly, cunning, deceitful, roguish, crafty, foxish, juggling kind of fellows. And must it not necessarily be unprofitable for any man to lie under this, and a much longer catalogue, of such black and most odious names of vices?”

Secrecy instead of being in itself a virtue is we contend burdensome and a temptation both to the giver and the receiver; both to the holder and to the recipient. It subjects them to many dangerous equivocations. It cultivates a jesuitical double-dealing with the truth. It cherishes the positive wrong of denying to another his moral right to know the truth. It accustoms a man to convey a false impression, and thus to violate the principle of truth without openly lying. It teaches a man how to use language which conveys one meaning to the hearer while he attributes to it another. It gives to a private and conventional society the authority and power to limit, qualify and restrain promises made previously, made absolutely, made to God and to man. It justifies open or implied falsehood, falsehood by direct misstatement or falsehood by equivocation, and all this in order to preserve a conventional secrecy; and thus it habituates a man to do evil that good may come, and to tarnish his soul with a moral stain at the expense of sacred truth and inviolable love and friendship.‡

Secrecy therefore where it is not made imperative for the good of others, or for our own benefit, and where the interests of others are not at stake, is at war with the very principles of

* See Wollaston's *Religion of Nature*, p. 265.

† *De officiis*, B III., ch. 8 to 13.

‡ See Whewell's *Morals*, Vol. I, p. 222, 272, 280-282, and Bp. Hall's *Wks.*, vol. 6, p. 32, Johnson's *Rambler*, No. 13.

society; is destructive of the equality, fraternity and social rights of a free republic, is suicidal to the claims of friendship, and of love; and is seriously detrimental to the moral character of those who are under its yoke. Absolute and unqualified, and unconditional secrecy is in its very nature and under all circumstances immoral, unchristian, anti-social and subversive of every interest of truth, of justice, and of righteousness.* “The love of our country,” says Cicero, “must swallow up all other loves whatever;”† and no vow or promise or oath or secrecy can justify the withholdment of that which the interests of truth, or justice, or common good require to be made known.‡ This right of society is acknowledged and not denied. “It is,” says Mr. Porter,§ “a right of self-protection, a right inherent in all society to know the principles and aims of any association which may be organized in its midst.” But where the whole interior, economy, order and proceedings of such a society are veiled under inviolable secrecy, this right is manifestly denied. The secret doings may for aught the public can tell, contravene all published statements, and in many, very many, cases have done so. The character of any society is determined not by its rules but by its members, and hence the noblest ends under the wisest constitutions may be and often have been, employed as the cover for the most immoral, injurious and iniquitous proceedings. But of secret societies, it is our entention to speak in another article.

ART. IV.—*The Apostleship a Temporary Office.*

IN a former article we endeavoured to show that the Apostolic office was not meant to be perpetual; first, because the continuance of the office is nowhere explicitly asserted; secondly, because the name Apostle, in its strict and proper sense, is not applied in the New Testament to any who were not of the original thirteen; thirdly, because the qualifications for the

* See Baxter's Wks., vol. 6, p. 418.

† Offices, B. i., ch. 17.

‡ Baxter, vol. 6, p. 413.

§ Oration before the Order of O. F., Charleston, 1844, p. 21.