



SCRIBNER'S MONTHLY.

VOL. XXI.

APRIL, 1881.

No. 6.

MARINE FORMS AS APPLICABLE TO DECORATION.



PARALLELISM IN FLIGHT OF BIRDS AND SWIMMING OF FISH.

VOL. XXI.—59.

[Copyright, 1881, by Scribner & Co. All rights reserved.]

that he has given us so good a record of what he has done, and made so perfect a justification of his mission and himself.

After all, we can but feel, in looking over a book like this, that the morality of the swindlers is hardly lower than that of their dupes. The swindler goes to work, with all the cunning and skill at his command, to get money without giving any adequate equivalent for it. That is precisely the motive of his dupes. The motive that actuates him is one that he understands, and knows how to appeal to, and the wretched men and women who respond in such numbers to his temptations can take to themselves all the curses they heap upon the man who has deceived and plundered them. They have tried to get money without paying for it its equivalent. They have been fools, of course; but they have been more than willing to obtain from others what they pay no legitimate price for. And when we go as far as this, what is there to hinder our going further? The spirit of speculation, the world over, is the spirit of the swindler and his dupe. The speculator adds nothing, and proposes to add nothing, to the general stock of wealth. He only proposes to add to his own possessions in a legal way without giving an equivalent. There are a thousand Wall-street schemes possessing no more essential morality than those pursued by the swindlers whom Mr. Comstock exposes. The bearing, the bullying, the working up of "corners," the use of exclusive or "inside" information—all these may be, and often are, just as immoral as stealing.

This one spirit of greed—this one disposition to get something for nothing—is abroad all over the country. It poisons the blood of the people. It lowers the tone of the popular morality. Here and there, as in the case of the swindlers to whom Mr. Comstock has been such a terror, the bad blood rises into an ulcer, which the knife of the law is called upon to extirpate. But the swindlers are not sinners above all Galileans. A bad woman remains bad because she finds bad men to prey upon; and a swindler is a swindler because he finds a great multitude of people in the country who share in the leading motives of his life, even if they do not sympathize with his methods.

All this may justly be said without justifying the

swindler or apologizing for him, and all this may be said while asserting that there is no class in the community which will defend the swindler. Even his dupes claim to be a great deal more virtuous than he. What shall we say, then, when we come to a class of crimes against the law which are openly defended by those who regard themselves as respectable people? One of Mr. Comstock's special tasks has been the suppression of vile literature, here, where it is manufactured, and the obstruction of its passage through the mails. Voked with this work has been that of destroying the schemes of the infamous wretches who have undertaken to debauch the imaginations and the bodies of the youth of the land, of both sexes, in indescribable ways. He has done these things with great faithfulness, and deserves the thanks of all good people for his beneficent work. For this he has been persecuted, not only by the men and women whose business he has disturbed or destroyed, but by a large class of people who call themselves "liberals." "Liberalism," as the word is used by those who profess it, is another name for infidelity, and if infidelity naturally sympathizes with dirt, it is well that we all know it. At any rate, "liberals" are the only professed and open defenders of dirt, as it is represented by the men who are interested in pushing impure literature through the mails, and distributing the means of debauching the children of the country through the same channels. They are the only people who have labored for the repeal of what are called "the Comstock laws"—laws which form the only barriers between a set of unclean scoundrels and the youthful innocence of the land. No class in society defends the swindler; a large class defends the dispenser of moral filth, and raves about his right to make of the United States mails a gutter through which to pour his abominations upon the youth of the country. They are all as bad as the man they defend. They are not only sympathetic with his foul spirit, but they do their best to defend and help him. Christianity can afford this exhibition of the spirit and tendency of infidelity; can "liberalism"? If giving up Christianity means taking on dirt, among "long-haired men and short-haired women," then it strikes us that "liberalism" has not a very brilliant prospect in America.

COMMUNICATIONS.

"The Bible Society and the New Revision."

IN DEFENSE OF DR. BRECKINRIDGE.

WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
ALLEGHENY, PA., Feb. 5th, 1881.

TO THE EDITOR OF SCRIBNER'S MONTHLY.

DEAR SIR: My attention has been called to what I must esteem the very unfortunate paper on "The Bible Society and the New Revision," in the January number of your magazine. That paper, in needlessly reviving old and out-worn controversies,

and, worse than that, in reviving with them the long well-forgotten bitternesses which grew out of them, cannot help bringing pain to all right-thinking minds. One statement, at least, out of the many rashly hazarded in the course of the article I feel bound to ask your leave to correct; and I feel sure that you will, not only in the interests of common fairness, but also in the interests which arise out of your own desire to see that the character of one of the country's noblemen is not untruly blotted in your pages, wish, with me, to give the correction as

wide a circulation as that given the statement itself. I refer to the following sentences, taken from page 453, bottom of first column :

"Dr. Breckinridge collapsed rather suddenly; for he found he had as much on his hands as he could attend to at the moment, in repelling the awkward charge of plagiarism which some theologians were pressing: he had published a volume of divinity, and they said he pilfered the best part of it from Stapfer."

I would hesitate greatly to impute any unworthy motives to Dr. Robinson, the author of this statement. He is not only a minister of God's word, but has a reputation for a kindly heart. But the statement itself cannot but leave a very false impression on the mind of any reader, and that in its every particular. 1. It leaves the impression on the mind that Dr. Breckinridge rushed warmly into the controversy over the alterations in the standard version of the Scriptures which the Bible Society had introduced. This was not the fact. He warmly opposed the irresponsible action of the Society on the floor of the church courts when it was his duty to oppose it; but that was all. One brief pamphlet printed in October, 1857, was his one printed contribution to that controversy. 2. It leaves the impression on the mind that his pronounced opposition to those changes was brought to an end, so far as the public expression of them was concerned, by his finding that he had his hands full elsewhere. This was not true. It was not he that collapsed, but the effort to alter the standard Bible by unauthorized hands. Dr. Breckinridge was heard as fully on the question at the meeting of the Assembly which followed the collapse as at that which preceded it. 3. It leaves the impression on the mind that Dr. Breckinridge found himself forced to address himself vigorously to repelling the charge of plagiarism which was brought against him. This was not true. He declined to make any defense against that charge: one brief letter to Dr. Hill and another to Dr. McKinney, the composition of both of which together could not have occupied over an hour or so, was absolutely all he wrote on the subject. 4. It leaves the impression on the mind of the unwary reader, finally, that the charge of plagiarism

from Stapfer was of such a character as to render it an awkward one to have to repel. Nothing could be more untrue than such an impression. The charge comprehended only certain details found in two chapters in a book including thirty-four. Those details bore such a relation to the abstract scientific character of the book as the facts of an arithmetic or a dictionary bear to an account or translation; so that there was no more reason why Stapfer's name should have been quoted than there is why every accountant should continually quote Ray's multiplication table on each step of his calculation, or the translator, the lexicon used in his work. Those details, moreover, were not peculiarly Stapfer's, but rather of such kind as constituted the common property of the science of theology. And, to crown all, the charge of plagiarism was peculiarly unfortunate, in such matters of detail, in the face of Dr. Breckinridge's frank avowal, in the preface of the attacked volume, of full dependence on the whole past—an avowal closing with these certainly sufficiently plain words :

"The details which have been wrought out by learned, godly, and able men in all ages, of many creeds and in many tongues, have been freely wrought into the staple of this work, when they suited the place and the purpose, and turned precisely to my thought." ("Knowledge of God; Objectively Considered," page x.)

In the face of the facts, it is an unceasing matter of wonder how "some theologians" could have ventured to urge this ridiculous charge, even in those days of heated battle and bitter feeling. And it is very certain that nothing can excuse the reiteration of that charge—manifestly false in itself and as manifestly the child of the time of spite—in these cooler days, when the heat of conflict is over and the man against whom the bolt was fulminated has lain nine years in an honored grave. If the charge fell dead even in the midst of the contest a quarter of a century ago, why should it be refulminated now?

Asking your insertion of the above defense of a name, honored alike in the nation and church, now unjustly and needlessly assaulted, I remain,

Yours very sincerely,
BENJ. BRECKINRIDGE WARFIELD.

HOME AND SOCIETY.

A Novel Entertainment from "Punch."

[A RECENT series of tableaux, or rather scenes, based upon drawings in the London "Punch," were so successfully presented by a party of ladies and gentlemen in a suburb of New York that, in the belief that the idea will be popular and feasible elsewhere, we have requested one of the ladies to give the readers of this department an account of the ways and means there adopted. The growing fame of Mr. du Maurier's wholesome ridicule of

the fashionable follies in certain London circles gives seasonableness to the happy thought which has suggested this new social resource for winter evenings.—ED.]

This entertainment should be spoken of as "scenes," rather than "tableaux," from the fact that in the pictures, which were presented with faithfulness in every detail, the persons not only acted but spoke their parts. All that is printed in brackets under the cartoon in "Punch" was read by