

2. A lawyer ought not to lie. He may defend a criminal whom he knows to be guilty, but he may not say to the jury that he believes this criminal to be innocent. He may not in any way intentionally convey to the jury the impression that he believes the man to be innocent. He may not, in his plea, pervert or distort the evidence so as to weaken the force or conceal the meaning of it. He is a sworn officer of the court, and his oath should bind him to the strictest veracity. It would be quixotic to expect him to assist his adversary, but his obligation to speak the truth outranks every obligation that he owes to his client. It is notorious that some lawyers who would think it scandalous to tell a falsehood out of court, in any business transaction, lie shamelessly in court in behalf of their clients, and seem to think it part of their professional duty. That bar of justice before which, by their professional obligations, they are bound to the most stringent truthfulness, is the very place where they seem to consider themselves absolved from the common law of veracity. So long as the legal mind is infected with this deadly heresy, we need not wonder that our courts of justice often become the instruments of unrighteousness.

3. A lawyer ought not to sell his services for the promotion of injustice and knavery. Swindlers of all types are aided by lawyers in their depredations upon society. The mock broker who operates in Wall street, and strips green country speculators of their hard-earned gains by the most nefarious roguery, always has an able lawyer as his accomplice. The gentleman by whose agency a nest of these rascals was lately broken up says: "The great difficulty in stopping swindles of this class is that the rascals make enough money to be able to employ the best of legal advice, and are, moreover, careful to do nothing which will render them liable to arrest." This is the testimony of a lawyer, Mr. Ralph Oakley, of New York. "The best of legal advice" can be had, then, in New York city for such purposes. It would be more difficult to believe this if its truth were not so often illustrated in the stupendous frauds and piracies of great corporations, all of which are carefully engineered by eminent lawyers. Our modern "buccaneers"—our brave railroad wreckers—are in constant consultation with distinguished lawyers. They undeniably have "the best of legal advice" in planning and executing their bold iniquities.

In the discussion which followed the reading of Mr. Bacon's paper at Saratoga, the suggestion was made that a better legal education would tend to correct disreputable practices at the bar, whereupon a clergyman put this troublesome question: "I desire to ask, for information, whether it is not the case that in many instances the most highly educated attorneys prove the most facile and unscrupulous instruments, as the advocates of large corporations and monopolists?" The question was not answered. Evidently it was not for the want of facts on which to base an intelligent answer.

So long as lawyers can engage in operations of this nature without losing caste in their profession, it will be needful to continue the discussion of professional ethics. And it would seem that the legal profession ought to lose no time in purging itself of those who are guilty of such practices. In the words of the late Lewis L. Delafield, Esq., of the New York bar, spoken in the discussion to which we have referred:

"There are many lawyers—and they are not exclusively confined to our large cities—who should be disbarred without delay for dishonest and corrupt practices; and until some serious and successful attempt is made in this direction, the legal profession must expect, and will deserve, to decline in popular esteem."

In all callings there are disreputable men; the presence of such men in the legal profession brings no necessary discredit upon that profession if it be evident that the professional standards of conduct are high and that lawyers in general are disposed to adhere to them, and to enforce them. This discussion simply raises the question whether the lawyer's ethics is not often confused by unnecessary casuistry, and whether the bar in general is not greatly at fault in neglecting to enforce its own rules against disreputable members. On these points it will be observed that the severest judgments of this article are pronounced by good lawyers. It may be added that the standard here raised is not an impossible ideal; many lawyers in active practice carefully conform to it.

The Bible in the Sunday-school.

THE calling of the Sunday-school teacher is becoming more and more difficult. It was never a sinecure to those who rightly conceived of its duties and responsibilities; but the progress of years, and the movements of thought, render its problems increasingly serious. Indeed, it begins to be evident that the business of teaching, in all departments, is one requiring great skill and wisdom; that it is not well done by those who make it the mere incident of a career devoted to other pursuits; that it requires the most careful study of the human mind, and the most patient adjustment of means to ends. Pedagogy is taking the rank that belongs to it as one of the nobler sciences.

While the work of teaching in general is receiving so much attention, the work of Sunday-school teaching has not been neglected. Sunday-school institutes and Sunday-school assemblies in all parts of the country are discussing methods and criticising theories with diligence and enthusiasm.

The burning question for the Sunday-school teacher is not, however, so much a question of method as of subject-matter. To learn how to teach is easier than to determine what to teach. Doubtless there are thousands of teachers to whom this difficulty has never presented itself; but to the most intelligent and thoughtful among them it is a serious question.

The Unitarian Sunday-school Society has proposed an answer to this question which is likely to awaken discussion. A little book entitled "The Citizen and the Neighbor" has been prepared by a clergyman of that denomination as a manual of instruction in Sunday-schools. This book treats of "men's rights and duties as they live together in the state and in society," and these rights and duties are classified under four heads, as political, economical, social, and international. Each chapter consists of a series of simple elementary statements, followed by well-framed questions, serving not only to draw forth the doctrines taught in the text, but to prompt independent thought. An admirable little manual it is; and in the hands of a judicious teacher it could be made extremely useful. The pastor who should organize the young people of his con-

gregation into a class for the study of this manual on a week-day evening might render them a great service. But most Sunday-school teachers will, we suppose, refuse to entertain the idea of introducing this book into their Sunday classes. The Sunday-school is the Bible-school. That is the name by which it is now frequently called; that is the character which, in the thoughts and sentiments of the great majority of Sunday-school teachers, belongs to it; and it will be a long time before any other book than the Bible is generally adopted as a manual of instruction in the Sunday-school. This conservatism is not irrational. Religion, rather than ethics or sociology, is the concern of the Sunday-school; and the Bible is the book of religion. Even the Dutch critics insist on this; the new theology, as well as the old, holds fast to the Bible as the book of religion.

It is exactly at this point, however, that the difficulty of the honest and intelligent Sunday-school teacher begins. That the Bible is the book of religion he firmly believes; but it is not so in the sense in which it was once believed to be; and the question respecting the character of the Bible—the view that he is to take of it in his teaching; the manner in which he is to use it; the extent to which he is to recognize the clear results of the higher criticism—is a question of great perplexity for every serious teacher. The fact that the Bible occupies a somewhat different place in the thoughts of well-instructed Christians from that which it held twenty-five or fifty years ago is a fact that cannot be denied. Such a book as that of Professor Briggs makes this entirely plain. In the most conservative theological circles it is conceded that the higher criticism has some just claims upon our attention, and that it has reached certain substantial results. It may be true that many of the conclusions of critics like Wellhausen and Robertson Smith are rash and unwarranted; but after their work has been thoroughly sifted and their questionable theories have been thrown out, there remains a residuum of solid truth, in the presence of which the old ideas of the structure, the growth, and the character of the Sacred Scriptures must be considerably modified. A thoroughly cautious and moderate statement was that made not long ago by Professor Harris, of the Andover Theological Seminary, in which he said:

“The doctrine of Sacred Scripture is at present in a state of flux. . . . Certain general statements may be made concerning the inspiration and authority of the Bible, and other statements may be rejected. . . . We hold no theory of the Bible which would be demolished if an erroneous statement is found concerning some matter of detail, or if we find that the writers shared the imperfect knowledge of their times concerning matters which only modern research clearly understands. No man has a right to impose a theory of the Bible which depends for its integrity on the scrupulous accuracy of every statement. We cannot consent that the Holy Book shall be put in such peril.”

Now, the simple fact is, that the theory of the Bible which Professor Harris says that no man has a right to impose, is the theory which has been imposed, until quite recently, by almost all Protestant teachers, upon those under their instruction. It is the theory which underlies almost all our Sunday-school teaching. Professor Harris asserts that the Bible is put in

peril by the promulgation of such a theory. Every man knows that overstatements are dangerous; that many a precious thing has been rejected because of the reaction produced by an exaggeration of its value. We may well believe that the Bible is the most precious of books, and that its value will be enhanced, and not diminished, by the thorough criticism which is now applied to it; but it is necessary to learn to speak of it with discrimination, to make no claims for the book that it does not make for itself, and to find out, if we can, wherein resides the authority with which it addresses us.

The learning of this lesson is hardly begun as yet by the average Sunday-school teacher. The traditional theory of the absolute historical and scientific infallibility of the Bible is the only one that he has ever permitted himself to entertain. His maxim is, that the extremest views on this subject are the safest; that the admission of a historical error in the book would be fatal to its authority. The notions that he is sedulously imparting to his pupils are sure to be exploded as soon as they become acquainted with the results of modern scholarship. He is helping thus to train a generation of skeptics.

Among the young men of this time there is a vast amount of superficial skepticism. Those who come in contact with it, and are able to estimate its causes, soon discover that it is largely the result of a reaction against extravagant theories of inspiration. These young men have discovered many facts about the Bible that cannot be reconciled with the theory of the Bible that was imposed on them in the Sunday-school, and they have rejected it altogether. It is high time that the Sunday-school should cease to be an active propagator of skepticism.

There are Sunday-school teachers, and their number is growing, who are aware of their responsibility to present the Bible to their pupils in such a way that it shall win and hold their confidence. That its true character may appear as the bright record of a revelation made in the historical progress of a people providentially led from barbarism up to civilization,—that the steadily brightening path of the divine purpose may be followed across the centuries to its culmination in Him whose Life was the Light of men. This is the great problem which many a conscientious teacher is trying to solve. To such teachers it may be useful to make a few practical suggestions.

1. Endeavor to obtain some rational and consistent theory of the Sacred Scriptures. Professor Fisher's essay on “The Christian Religion” is one of the most judicious statements now accessible, and it ought to be carefully read by every Sunday-school teacher.

2. Avoid all language which involves the absolute inerrancy of the Bible.

3. Distinctly recognize the fact that some portions of the book are of far greater value than others.

4. Make the pupils understand that much of the Old Testament legislation was accommodated to the understanding and the moral condition of the people to whom it was given, and is wholly superseded by the law of Christ.

5. Show them that the Scriptures are the record of a development of doctrine and of morals; that the successive stages of such a development must indicate incompleteness of view and moral imperfection;

that this development culminates in Jesus Christ, who, as Christians believe, is the Word of God, and in the light of whose doctrine and life the whole Bible must be studied.

Bribery in Politics.

THE practice of bribing voters has reached a development in this country that calls for thoughtful attention on the part of patriotic men. It has always, no doubt, been carried on to a certain extent, but never on so large a scale as in recent years, and there is reason to fear that it is on the increase. The bribery we speak of is that by means of money, to which the poorest and most ignorant portions of the people are most liable. But, in addition to this, there is the method of bribery by the promise of office, which has been so widely commented on, but which, it is to be hoped, will soon be largely removed by a better system of appointment. Bribery by money, however, cannot be thus removed, although it may be checked; and unless some other remedy can be found the corruption of our politics by that means will go on. The immense number of ignorant voters in the country, the vast interests involved in our national elections, and the large sums now at the disposal of party managers, render it well-nigh certain that until effectual means are taken to counteract it, the evil will continue to grow.

Nor is the bribery of voters the only form of the evil with which we have to contend; some of our legislators and other public men are quite as ready to sell their votes as the most ignorant of the masses are. This purchasing of legislators is notorious; and though it is not always effected by the payment of money, but in some less open way, it is none the less a form of bribery. We are all familiar with the mode of purchasing legislators by means of corporation shares and bonds, distributed by interested parties "where they will do the most good." Even some of the judges are not above suspicion, so that justice is liable to be polluted at its very source; though in most cases the purity of the courts is in refreshing contrast to the corruption prevailing elsewhere.

Such is the evil with which we have to contend, and it is not easy to find a remedy. With corrupt leaders, and corrupt followers, too, the problem of purifying politics is by no means a simple one. The difficulty is increased by the venality of some of the newspapers, by whose influence the people are misled as to the real character of candidates and the conduct of public affairs.

The punishment of both the giver and the taker of bribes would of course remove the evil, if the criminals could be detected and the punishment applied. But experience proves that bribery is one of the most difficult of all crimes to prove; while at the same time the powerful interests involved in most cases of political bribery render it extremely difficult to secure the punishment of the criminals, even when their guilt is undoubted. If candidates that had been elected by purchased votes could always be deprived of their seats in consequence, an effective check would be given to the bribing of voters; but this remedy is rarely available in this country, owing to the partisan character of our legislative bodies. It is notorious that contested election cases are apt to be decided in the interest of the

dominant party, with little regard to the justice of the case; and so long as this shameful practice continues no effectual check to bribery can be looked for in this quarter. The reform of the civil service will remove the temptation of the offices, but will not affect the other forms of bribery. It is true that when all officers are secure in their positions they will not be disposed, as many are now, to swell the corruption fund of their party; but there will be no lack of funds for all that. There are so many corporations and other interested parties seeking government favor, and so many rich men seeking office with little regard to the way they get it, that there will never be any lack of means for the purchase of voters and legislators.

It is evident that the only effectual remedy is the improvement of public sentiment and the enlightenment of the public mind as to the evils that bribery produces.

The improvement of public sentiment on this subject must necessarily be a work of time, and it cannot begin too soon. We may say, indeed, that it has already begun with the discussions of this year's canvass; but much more must be done in order to produce the desired effect on the public mind. It is especially incumbent on those who profess to lead and counsel the people on political subjects, whether in official station, in the press, or elsewhere, to lead the public aright in this matter. By exposing cases of bribery that may come to their knowledge, by showing what evils result from it, by denouncing it *especially in their own party*, by setting an example of perfect honesty in their own public life, and, above all, by scorning to use public station to advance their own private and pecuniary interests, they may do much to check the abuse even now, and perhaps remove it almost entirely at some future day.

The trouble is that men who would not themselves descend to bribery are criminally complaisant with regard to the use of foul means, when these are to advance their own interests and those of their own party. They are severe on the subject of buying votes only when the purchases are made in the interest of the other side. Their standard of political morality is high, as applied to candidates whom they are trying to defeat!

False Issues.

IN every political campaign large numbers of voters are moved in their political action by a consideration of side issues, questions not yet fully before the country, and some of which never will be. At times these side issues are legitimate enough, and sometimes serious changes in party politics are due to them; they may be, indeed, the means of originating new and influential parties, and of changing entirely the political history of a nation.

But, in addition to these side issues, there are very apt to be introduced into the canvass questions which are not only aside from the main points at issue, but which may be called absolutely false issues,—issues which are selfish, interested, personal,—which have to do with matters that do not concern voters purely as citizens,—which may even lead to action opposed to the general good of the country. At a time when leading parties imitate each other, instead of opposing each other, in their official declarations of principles, such side issues and false issues especially abound,