

in thee ; that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

Here indeed all depends on the mind and spirit with which church history is studied ; for like the Bible itself it may be, and often has been, scandalously abused in the service of bad ends, as may be sufficiently inferred from the foregoing history of this science.

ARTICLE IV.

REVIEW OF TALVJ ON THE COLONIZATION OF NEW ENGLAND.

By Prof. C. E. Stowe, D. D., Cincinnati.

Geschichte der Colonisation von New England, von den ersten Niederlassungen daselbst im Jahre 1607, bis zur Einführung der Provinzialverfassung von Massachusetts im Jahre 1692. Nach den Quellen bearbeitet von Talvj. Nebst einer Karte von New England im Jahre 1674. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus. 1847.

History of the Colonization of New England, from the first Settlements there in the year 1607 to the Introduction of the Provincial Government of Massachusetts in the year 1692. Investigated from the Original Sources by Talvj. With a Map of New England in the year 1674. Leipsic: F. A. Brockhaus. 1847.

"*Perversi difficile corriguntur et stultorum infinitus est numerus,*" says the wise Preacher, according to the Vulgate, Eccl. 1: 15. Every day we have occasion to notice the justness of this remark, and in nothing more strikingly than in what is said and written respecting the Puritans.

Should some typographer of our day examine the printing apparatus of Guttenberg and Faust, notice how unwieldy and clumsy it was, how very slowly and imperfectly it executed its work, and on comparing it with the more perfect machinery of these times, should pour contempt on the inventors of the art, pronounce them entirely unworthy the gratitude of posterity, and hold them up to ridicule as mere bunglers and impudent pretenders, what should we think but *Perversi difficile corriguntur*?

If some little dapper fellow should climb upon the Kentucky giant, and placing one foot on each shoulder should stand upright, and with

the most innocent simplicity, exclaim: "How tall I am — what a dwarf is this famous Kentucky giant compared with me — see! the top of his head reaches only to my knees" — what better could we say than *stultorum infinitus est numerus*?

Some verdant arithmetical genius might take Newton's Principia, examine it carefully, find in it nothing which is not now regarded as elementary, familiar to every student, and set forth far more comprehensively and clearly — and wonder why it is that Newton has so great a name for an amount of knowledge scarcely up to the level of what are now ordinary attainments, and with no small self-gratulation and self-conceit, publish his wonderment abroad, and put down the world-renowned Sir Isaac Newton as quite below the average stature of scientific men.

Some bustling mechanician might hunt up the ghost of Robert Fulton's first steam-boat, that with great noise and puffing and infinite pulling and tugging, was able to move some four or six miles an hour, when wind and tide were favorable, and compare that with the noiseless, swift-working, faultless machinery of our speedy steamers, and gravely conclude that Fulton was a senseless blunderer, wholly undeserving the credit which had been awarded him. This would be the more noticeable if the fellow were himself a descendant of Fulton, and took pride and pleasure in tearing to pieces the well-earned reputation of his ancestor, and endeavoring on all occasions to hold him up to ridicule and contempt.

If any should venture on such a course in regard to Sir Isaac Newton or Robert Fulton, they would be treated by the whole community of mathematicians and mechanicians with the utmost contempt; they would be too much despised to be able to excite even a respectable feeling of indignation; and the unscientific public would regard them as lunatics or idiots.

It is well known and should be well considered, that the beginning of a new idea is the difficult part of it — that in its first launching into the world it is necessarily feeble and imperfect; and yet precisely here is the great labor and the great merit; and that when it is once fairly afloat, the subsequent developments and improvements are comparatively easy and the work of far inferior minds. Who despises the infant because it is not a full grown man, or says contemptuously to the rejoicing mother, *what hast thou brought forth*, because the product of her throes and pangs is but a small and helpless child? who but a fool, of whom the number is infinite, as the wise man said?

Now this is precisely the way in which many judge and speak of the Puritans, and yet pass for decent, intelligent men; — many even of

the descendants of the Puritans, who still hold up their heads in society without being ashamed of themselves.

To venerate one's ancestors is as natural to the generous mind as to honor one's own immediate parents; and he who takes pleasure in ridiculing his forefathers, is quite as mean as he who strikes his mother.

It is the instinct of all noble minded men, however faulty their ancestors, to veil their defects as much as may be, and dwell with pleasure on what is praiseworthy. Who is most to be respected, Ham and Canaan, who gloated over their father's nakedness, or Shem and Japheth, who modestly covered their unconscious and dishonored parent? In exalting our ancestors, we do honor to ourselves — we show an honorable feeling — a heart susceptible of generous emotion. The Romans in their best days — how proud were they of their sires — how glowingly they speak of them, and how readily and justly we honor them for the feelings they show in this respect; yet, when we examine the matter closely, a sad set of rogues those founders of the Roman State must have been. Never was there a more honorable, upright, intelligent race of men than the Puritans. Never were the beginnings of a commonwealth more praiseworthy than theirs, or results more glorious. Never did ancestors exist of whom their posterity had better reason to be proud. Yet, while all other races honor their ancestry and delight in its glories, it is strange that the Puritan race alone should produce so many who take pleasure in decrying their progenitors. The fathers were noble, but they certainly have been cursed with some very mean children; and some of those mean children are still alive, the foulest blot the memory of their fathers has ever been tarnished with.

It is not difficult to account for this. The Puritans broke away from the public sentiment of their times and struck out for themselves a new path, the path of truth, usefulness and honor. By this they mortally offended the leaders of what was then the established order of things and brought upon themselves the hatred and contempt of the existing magnates. This has been handed down from generation to generation as a precious heir-loom, and the expressions of it continue to be repeated from many of these high places of power and influence. There are some who never have either ideas or feelings of their own, but just take such as are ready made to their hand. These readily take what they see current in certain quarters; and thus they learn to think and speak ill of those to whom they owe their existence and all its enjoyments. They blind and befool themselves with the prejudices of an age and race to which they do not belong. Again, there are some even among the descendants of the Puritans, who hate the simple gospel and popular freedom more than they love family honor, and who never

can forgive their ancestors for being evangelical in faith and republican in policy. They are like some parents, who are forbearing and tolerant and tender to their children while they are only dissipated and worthless; but who storm with rage and disinherit them if they become worthy and respectable by becoming pious and joining an evangelical church. Happily the number of such members of the Puritan family is rapidly diminishing and bids fair for utter extinction.

Is it a real love of truth, is it a pure sense of justice, that leads any of the children of the Puritans to dishonor the graves of their ancestors? No, never. Truth and justice, so far as the Puritans are concerned, can never lead in that direction. In this case, truth and justice can never lead to contempt and ridicule — nor in any case, to misrepresentation and one-sided interpretation. Men can be impartial without being scornful, can expose a fault without sarcastic triumph, can rejoice in an improvement which time has made, without pouring contempt on the glories of an honorable though imperfect beginning. Truth and justice in this case would be calm and respectful, even where they criticise and condemn. The Puritans were the introducers of a new era in civilization, the beginners of a new and improved development of society, a development which has already become predominant in more than half the civilized world, and in which all nations will yet participate. They were the *beginners*, and that is glory enough; they were *but beginners*, and that is no disgrace: it is no discredit to them, nor will it be imputed to them as such by any honorable mind.

It is by no means necessary, in order to do honor to the Puritans, that we should claim perfection either for their theories or their practices, or that we should close our eyes to the improvements which have naturally grown from what they gloriously but imperfectly begun. Do we honor Guttenberg by condemning all modern improvement in printing, by claiming that his wooden types and clumsy press, and slow, tedious and costly manipulations were the very perfections of the typographical art, and that all the inventions of recent date are to be regretted and mourned over as the heresy of the times and proof of progressive degeneracy? Should we see a company of antiquated travellers on board a modern steamer going, sorely against their will, twenty miles an hour, without noise, or jarring, or scarcely the perception of motion — expressing their admiration of Fulton by lauding the excellence of his noisy, jarring, plodding boat, and mourning over the grievous innovations of the recent facilities in the line of steam travelling, — what could we think of but our old text again, *Perversi difficile corriguntur, et stultorum infinitus est numerus*? No, that is not the way in which we would honor the Puritans. They in their day were the men of pro-

gress — that is the thing for which we honor them ; and we would show the legitimacy of our descent from them ; we would prove ourselves to be not unworthy children of our parents, by being in our day the men of progress too. They begun a new era, gloriously begun it, in religion, in politics, in social life — most gloriously did they begin it, amid many obstacles and imperfections — and we would carry it on still more gloriously with fewer obstacles and fewer imperfections ; and, with the great advantages which we owe to their virtue, and labors, and sufferings, we will do better than they did — for they did better than any who went before them, and we are their sons ; at least this shall be our aim and object, and endeavor — or we are bastards and not sons. They were no models of perfection either in theology, or policy, or social life, nor did they ever claim to be. They labored to make improvements in all those things ; and improvements, very great improvements they did make, and this is their glory, and in this they have *left us an example that we should follow their steps.*

Most men, at least most descendants of the Puritans, readily admit both the possibility and the desirableness of improvement in social life and in civil government, who yet may be startled at the idea of improvement in theology. “What (say they) have we not the Bible, and is not the theology of the Bible perfect? And can we improve on perfection?” Doubtless the theology of the Bible is perfect, but the difficulty is to get a perfect understanding of it in all its parts. Who yet has attained to this? Have we? Had our Puritan fathers? A faultless interpretation of the Bible faultlessly combined with a faultless mental philosophy makes a faultless theology ; and when this faultless combination has proceeded so far as to exhaust all that is knowable on the subject ; then theology becomes perfect and fixed. Have we reached this point? Did our Puritan fathers reach it? No indeed, neither they nor we. They left us something to do in this matter ; and when we have done all we can, we shall leave enough for our posterity to do after us.

The fundamental principles of the Puritans, their great leading outline thoughts, their germinating, fructifying ideas, as regards theology, civil government, and social organization, were in the main correct, and far in advance of the public sentiment of their age, but they were not yet by any means wrought out perfectly into the clear. If I may so express myself, the process of incubation had but just terminated ; and though the ideas were living, active, progressive, many fragments of the old shell were still hanging to them, and some of the pieces were pretty large, some quite cumbrous and impedimentally. The virtues of the Puritans, great as they were, were mainly their own — in respect to

these they stood on independent ground and were their own masters — while their faults were mostly the faults of the times in which they lived — were derived to them from the company which they had been compelled to keep — and these very faults existed in tenfold greater strength in the class which reproach than among the Puritans who are reproached. Moreover, the Puritans early saw their errors, repented of them, and gradually shook them off as fast as they could; while their persecutors and revilers never repented, reformed but very little, and for the most part obstinately retain the like errors and faults to this very hour.

Let us try to look at this matter a little impartially, and see if this be not really the case.

It is said, the Puritans persecuted some for their religious opinions. It is true, there were a few instances of persecution, for a short time and under circumstances of peculiar provocation and aggravation. All the churches they were acquainted with, all the civil governments which then existed with scarcely an exception, were habitual persecutors, had taught and practised persecution as a sacred duty — and why are the Puritans required to escape all contamination from example and precept in their time so universal and habitual? Their glory is that they were so far in advance of all the rest of their age on this very point — that they persecuted so little while others persecuted so much — that they did it with reluctance, with relentings, with speedy cessation, while others went into it heart and soul, without reluctance, relentings or cessation — that they and they alone established the principles which very early broke up all persecution among themselves, and which have gradually forced their way through the world till now, after a lapse of two centuries or more. Protestants and even papists, wherever the Puritan influence has penetrated, are ashamed openly to persecute, or very loudly to avow the principle of persecution.

But they hung the witches. True, there was one brief, dark, sad, transient storm on this subject, and only one. For the space of a year or less, they were involved practically in the universal error of their age; but they speedily saw the error, bitterly repented of it, and amended their statute book accordingly; while the rest of the world murdered witches ten times more, did not see their error, did not repent, did not amend their statutes; and in many, especially of the Roman Catholic countries, these superstitions and sanguinary laws continue unamended unrepealed even to this day. During the witchcraft delusion, twenty persons lost their lives in New-England; but a little before this more than sixty had been executed for the same imaginary offence in a single county in England; some twenty years after this, eighty-five witches

including twenty children were burnt at one time in Sweden. In Scotland — in Switzerland, it was equally bad — and in the Roman Catholic countries of Europe infinitely worse. How is it that the Puritans alone are to be blamed? Is it because they were so much less guilty than others?

It is said they were stern and severe in their families and in the government of their households. So they were; and so were all the rest of the world at that time, at least all the civilized and cultivated part of the world. The highest of the nobility of the age, the most chivalrous of the cavaliers, were as strenuous in their demands of respect and obedience from their families as were the sternest of the Puritans; and far more unrelenting and cruel in their punishment for disobedience. Examine the history of the times and all the romances founded on chivalry, and see everywhere the proof of this. And perhaps the Puritans were not so far wrong.

The Puritans made very long prayers. Very likely; they loved to pray, and an exercise which men like they are quite apt to protract. But even in this they were not far from the mark of the old churches to which only they had to look for example, and whose liturgies and litanies were never made shorter than a Puritan prayer; and these same old liturgies and litanies still retain even in our time, very much of their original tedious longitude, while the Puritan devotions, in accommodation to the spirit of the age, are growing shorter and shorter every year, till now, the comparison, as to shortness, never very much in favor, is loud and long against those who make the complaint.

But the Puritans whined and drawled in their worship. Probably they did, but certainly they could never go far beyond the whining and drawling of the cathedral worship of their persecutors. And while the Puritan drawling, devotional tone has entirely died away, so that scarce an echo of it can now anywhere be heard, the papal and prelatial recitative on the same key and in the same notes, is still toned out in all its pristine vigor in every cathedral of the old world, and something very like it is heard in similar places in the new. Let any one in an English cathedral listen for once to the ecclesiastical twang of the sentence in the prayer book — “*Give peace in our time, because there is none other that fighteth for us but only thou O Lord,*” — and if he be a man of any bowels he will forever after hold his peace about the Puritan whine and drawl.

Again it is said the Puritans were very strict and rigid in their religion, and scrupulously severe in their morals. Here I see not but we must plead guilty in their behalf, and acknowledge that in both

these respects they were very different from their opponents both in former and later times.

We cheerfully admit that the Puritans were neither perfect nor infallible. Neither they nor their defenders have any of the responsibilities or the inconveniences of infallibility. They were men, men only, and real men. They have done a great work in this imperfect, staggering, progressive world of ours. And what is this work which they have done? They have broken the chains of superstition, persecution, and tyranny; when before there were only the rights of orders, they have established the rights of persons; they have developed the individual man and taught his worth; they have colonised a new world and given to its population a freedom, a life, an energy, a standing which no population of anything like equal extent and numbers ever had before; they have introduced a new civilization into the human family, infinitely higher and more beneficent than any which has preceded it, and absorbing all antecedent civilisations, as the serpent rod of the Hebrew sage swallowed all the serpents of the Egyptian magicians. They have conquered their persecutors and led captivity captive. The ideas for which they suffered and which their enemies fondly thought they had crushed, are now the world over the prominent conquering ideas, and even those who now revile them find no repose except under the shadow of their wing.

In a world like this such miracles of good are not to be obtained without some incidental evils; but to dwell on these evils and forget the good shows the mind of the Anglian exquisite, who learns with terror that all our dining tables are not furnished with finger glasses, and is struck with dismay to find that some of our far west steam-boats have not the convenience of a butter knife, and in the indignation with which he contemplates these enormities, quite forgets that Irish laborers and English manufacturers are by millions unfed, untought, overtasked, living lives and dying deaths too bad for brutes, in order that their wealthy superiors may be furnished with the means of living in luxury, dissipation and idleness.

We have scarcely alluded to the hardships and dangers and difficulties amid which the Puritans accomplished their great work — hardships which might well make the stoutest shrink — dangers enough to appal the most fearless, and difficulties that would have crushed the strongest, who did not feel assured that *underneath them were the everlasting arms*. The magnitude and difficulty of the work which the Puritans accomplished may in some degree be estimated by this one fact, namely, *that of all the nations which dwell, or have dwelt, on the face of the whole earth, not one has yet been found capable of a happy*

self-government, except the one which the Puritans taught and fitted for the enjoyment of freedom.

We have read no work which on the whole appears to us to give so accurate a picture of the Puritan character as that of Talvj, whose title we have written at the head of this article. It is just and discriminating, disposed to commend and not fearing to censure. The author is in a good position to develop the subject according to its real merit. Born and educated in Germany, and becoming well versed in the learning of that most learned of nations, residing for many years in Russia and Eastern Europe, and becoming familiar with institutions and people the most diverse from ours, the uniting her destinies with those of the descendants of the Puritans, and investigating their history and character under the most advantageous circumstances for discovering the truth, having religious and political principles and an intellectual culture excellently adapted to the task which she has undertaken, she has produced a work of great and permanent interest, which "posterity will not willingly let die." She stands in the attitude of a spectator, yet with enough of interest in the scene and of sympathy with it to give a lively and glowing picture of it.

A tolerably correct idea of the general tone and spirit, of the style and sentiment of the work may be formed from the first two paragraphs, which we have translated for the benefit of our readers.

"No State in the world can boast of a basis so purely moral as can the North American free States which are comprehended under the general name of New England. The love of dominion, the love of fame, a noble desire of independence, have founded empires — ambition and avarice have discovered and conquered new regions — but none of these motives, however great the achievements they have in other cases called forth, had any influence on the resolve of that handful of noble men, who exchanged their native land for a wilderness for the purpose of building to the Lord a temple in which, as they believed, they could worship him according to their conscience, and in forms which alone they supposed would be well pleasing to the Most High. Closely interwoven as was, in their convictions, the temporal and the eternal of the Christian, this temple became at the same time the ground-work of their political existence; and an edifice arose under their creative hands, in the circuit of whose strong walls there arose the *rights of men* instead of the *right of orders*, freedom in the place of privileges, equality in the place of dominion and servitude. *Out of small beginnings great things have been produced*, (well says their earlier historian,) *and as one small candle may light a thousand, so the light here kindled hath shone to many.*" The political principles on which the earliest settlers of New

England built, have gradually spread themselves over the world; and although the refreshing west wind, when it first touched Europe, broke out into a desolating storm, which tore down many a venerable edifice, yet it also permanently purified the air from the pestilential vapor of those eternal diseases, which have dragged themselves through centuries under the name of 'ancient rights and hereditary privileges.' The history of these beginnings, therefore, must be of the highest interest even to Europeans." (p. 42.)

We know not how the real character and influence of the early planters of New England could be more exactly, happily, and justly expressed than they are in those few lines. Two other paragraphs, pertaining to the first settlement of Connecticut, and to the condition and character of the people of that colony after they were settled, are equally worthy of translation as specimens of the manner and spirit of the writer.

"In the following spring (1636), almost the entire congregation, numbering about one hundred persons, broke up from Newtown, with Hooker their celebrated preacher at their head. Many individual features of this wearisome emigration have come down to our times. They were surrounded by a dense forest, which was inhabited by small beasts of prey of every kind, wolves, foxes, wild-cats, and the like, but especially by moose, and various species of snakes; and the grass, as at present on the Western prairies, stood to the height of a man. Their road was an Indian foot-path, the compass their only guide. Hooker's wife was carried in a litter. Most of the others travelled on foot, with their little bundles under their arm. For fourteen nights the open heavens were their roof, and the stones in the way their pillows. One hundred and sixty head of cattle were driven along with them, and the milk of the cows was the principal nourishment of the wanderers. As they painfully and slowly toiled along, they sung psalms and hymns, and at every halt they uttered aloud their prayers to Heaven. The Indians, whose huts they passed, stared upon them in mute astonishment; for Connecticut had not, like the Eastern shores of New England, been depopulated by a desolating pestilence. It was densely inhabited and by the most warlike tribes of the land. But they offered to the wanderers no resistance; and these went fearlessly on their way, for they knew in whom they trusted, and had besides a good conscience, for they would not take possession of a foot of land which they had not acquired by an honorable purchase."

"The Constitution of Connecticut so entirely satisfied the needs and the wishes of its inhabitants, that though for nearly seventy years they have had full liberty to make alterations in it, it has in all essential

particulars continued unchanged to the present day. Freedom of conscience to a certain extent, that is the toleration of churches not Congregational, such as Baptists, Quakers, Presbyterians, and even Episcopalians, if they chose to settle there, fully answered the wants of the times. A productive soil, free trade, unrestricted manufacturing activity, carefully sustained common schools whose basis was the Bible; a government whose officers were selected by themselves and whose annual cost after fifty years amounted to not more than 300 pounds sterling, and which could easily be defrayed by a very light tax; an administration of justice which by the simplicity of its forms was intelligible, and by its cheapness was accessible to the poorest; all these combined made Connecticut one of the happiest spots on earth, and nourished a proud contentment among its citizens. There were few rich, and poor there were none; to a community of farmers a small trade limited mostly to New York and the New England colonies gave little prospect of amassing wealth. At the time of the union of the two colonies (that is of New Haven and Connecticut in 1665) they numbered nineteen flourishing towns scattered over the surface of the country, and inhabited by 11,000 souls. After fifteen years the towns numbered six and twenty, of which the most had churches and every church its learned pastor, and the population had increased to 15,000. Every town transacted its own business under the simplest forms, without any fear of interference from the government; and the citizen whom the voice of the people called to be the leader of the community, was trained by the administration of the smaller affairs of the town to administer the greater affairs of the State." (p. 267, 68, and 485, 86).!

A beginning how simple and godlike! A result how glorious and beneficent! What a lesson of wisdom and utility to the emigrating and colonizing spirit of a generation like ours, equally enterprising but far less simple-hearted and religious!

Talvj's view of the Quaker affair is singularly judicious and discriminating, and well worth the serious attention of all who have regard for historical truth and justice. She says, "Among all the instances of religious intolerance and persecution, the government of Massachusetts have been most severely censured by after generations and by foreigners for their conduct towards the Quakers, and yet it is precisely here that in consequence of the extreme aggravations of the case occasioned by the intolerably contemptuous bearing of the obstinate victims of their severity, they deserve some apology. Never was there punishment threatened where there was less inclination to inflict it. The Quakers on their first appearance were not the peacefully industrious, actively benevolent people, 'wise as serpents and harmless as doves,' which a

quarter of a century of judicious toleration afterwards made them. Their public conduct was such that the government of no country could or ought to endure it. Full of spiritual arrogance, they were loud against their teachers, openly declaring the deepest contempt for their laws and ordinances, preaching in the open streets with screaming voices against all that was established, and denouncing woes against all the rulers, spiritual and temporal, for leading the people astray. From the windows of their prisons they showered insulting words upon the governor and magistrates as they were passing by. Before the courts no authority, no warnings, no punishments could bring them to submit to the established orders. The questions of the judges they answered by long speeches full of reproaches and denunciations; or what seemed still worse, by obstinate silence, with their heads covered. Men and women showed an equal longing for martyrdom. When one of them was brought before the magistrate, three or four others, apparently by mutual understanding, would break in upon the proceedings with reproaches against the authority claimed by the judges or with prophesying of evil which amazed the by-standers."

"They cherished a fanatical hatred particularly against the clergy, which, it must be confessed, was by them fully reciprocated. To them the ministers were nothing but hirelings, priests of Baal, deceivers of the people, the seed of the serpent. During the Sunday worship, they rushed into the churches; one of them, Thomas Newhouse by name, with two glass bottles in his hand, which he dashed jingling to the ground, with the warning, *thus will the Lord dash you in pieces*. Others again came with no weapons but their tongues, and interrupted the preacher with the cry that *his words were an abomination to the Lord*, etc. A certain Brewster once entered a meeting-house, having blackened himself all over with coal, to give in his testimony against their blackness. In Cambridge a woman, and in Boston a man, ran howling through the streets, proclaiming that the Lord was coming with fire and sword. In Salem a Quakeress by the name of Deborah Wilson, suddenly appeared in the public streets, as naked as nature had made her. A brother of the faith remarked in her defence: "When the Lord stirs up one of his daughters to be a sign of your nakedness, *it must indeed to a modest lady be a heavy cross*, but the Lord will have obedience." Another appealed to the command of God to the prophet Isaiah, Chapter 20, verse 2. Perhaps no sect was ever carried farther by the insanity of fanaticism." (p. 457 — 459).

"When at last the lawgivers of Massachusetts fixed the penalty of death upon the return of a banished Quaker, they did not once think that the law would ever have to be enforced. Their object was to de-

ter, not to punish. "We would a thousand times rather that they should live being absent than die being present," was the observation of the legislators. The clergyman Norton, the least of the persecutors, said, in vindication of the measures of the government — "For the security of the flock we must corner the wolf; but we will leave him an open door to escape if he pleases." (p. 460).

The persecution of the Quakers was indeed ill judged and wrong. They should rather have been guarded and cared for as insane persons when they were outrageous, and let alone when they were peaceable. But the world had not yet learned this. The same people were persecuted in Old England and Virginia worse than they were in New England. The Puritans with all their intolerance, were more tolerant than their contemporaries. The laws against the Quakers were never acceptable to the great body of the people even of Massachusetts, the most high church and aristocratic of all the colonies; and the public sentiment at last became so strong that the magistrates were obliged to write in their own defence; and all those laws were soon repealed. What other government at that period, what other people showed any thing like the same tolerance or patience in circumstances of so much provocation? In any other country the gag and the thumb-screw, the rack and the faggot would have been unscrupulously resorted to for the suppression of these unhappy fanatics. But those persecutions were wrong. The Puritans soon learned that they were wrong (sooner did they learn it than any other men of their times), and like noble and Christian men as they were, they confessed and forsook the wrong as soon as their eyes were open to see it. Even Cotton Mather, usually represented as the fiercest of the persecutors, says in regard to the Quaker persecution, "If any man will appear in vindication of it, let him do as he pleases; for my part I will not" — "nor do I look upon hereticide as an [evangelical way for extinguishing heresies." "A Bethlehem seems to have been fitter for them (the Quakers) than a gallows." (Mag. II. 453).

Winthrop when called upon in his old days to sign an act for the banishment of a dissident, declined, saying, "I fear I have during my life already done too much of this." (Talvj, 385). Who that has any right feeling can avoid being deeply moved at the humiliation and sorrow of Judge Sewall for the part he sincerely took in the affair of the Salem witches? How deeply he mourned over it in his private journal! For example, entry Dec. 1696: "Heard Sam. recite in Latin Matt. xii. from 6th verse to the end of the 12th. The 9th verse did awfully bring to my mind the Salem Trajedie." The government of the colony proclaimed a public fast for humiliation and supplications of

pardon on account of their error, and on the fast day Judge Sewall with unfeigned humility procured the public reading of his confession from the pulpit of the Old South, himself standing in the presence of the congregation while it was read by the pastor, Rev. Mr. Willard (*Holmes' Annals*, I. 440, *Talvj*, 708); and this was not a solitary instance, (see *Talvj*). Where in all the history of persecutions will you find another instance of this kind?

The case of Judge Sewall is the more remarkable as his pastor Mr. Willard had always been opposed to these proceedings, and had openly differed with the Judge on the subject at the time. Where do we find any thing of this kind in the biographies of a Laud or a Torquemada, whose little finger all their lives long was thicker than all the loins of all the Puritans together? who shed more blood in the service of intolerance and superstition in a single day, and inflicted more pain in a single hour, than the whole nation of the Puritans during the entire period of their national existence! Why this exhibition of Christian penitence and humility on the one part and the entire absence of it on the other? It is because the Puritans were Christians, really and heartily so; while none of the stamp of Torquemada and Laud had anything of Christianity but the name: and it is men of this stamp who reproach the Puritans for intolerance and persecution.

We recommend to the particular attention of the reader *Talvj's* whole account of the witchcraft delusion, (p. 680 — 709) and regret we have not room to translate it here. Though *Talvj* is evidently inclined to do justice to the Puritans and cherishes no prejudice against them; yet she does not hesitate occasionally to censure them, and sometimes severely where in our judgment censure is little deserved, for example in reference to their religious persecutions she says, "That even Luther in his passionate anguish at seeing the gospel dishonored would have the Anabaptists annihilated with the sword, that Melancthon approved Calvin's bloody participation in the sacrifice of Servetus and all their great contemporaries sympathized with them — this certainly can neither justify nor excuse the severe measures of the Puritans in the seventeenth century. Those admirable men were but just emerging from a long night which had buried in slumber all free thought on the relation of men to God. And it would have been a miracle indeed if they, the only light-bringing stars, should at once have turned the night to day. But the Puritan legislators of Massachusetts lived a whole century later, a century during which the doctrines and the natural consequences of Protestantism had variously developed themselves. Still only a few of them had yet come to those clear views of the freedom of conscience which in our day have gained in all Protestant and in most Catholic countries a

preponderance so decided that no legislators can any more act contrary to them." (p. 325, 6).

If there be any justice in this censure, it must rest in the idea that the Puritans were behind the men of their own age, were less enlightened on the subject of religious liberty than the other legislators of the 17th century — which certainly is not true — but the very reverse of it is true, as is perfectly manifest from the history so ably and so interestingly written by Talvj herself. What in all conscience was there during the reigns of Elizabeth and the Jameses and the Charleses to teach the Puritans the true doctrine of religious liberty? They were obliged to feel their way along in the midst of the deepest darkness on this subject; and it is glory enough for them that some among them did see clearly, and most of them saw something where the rest of the world were still as blind as bats; it is glory enough for them that they set in motion those ideas which have since banished religious persecution from almost all Protestant, and even from some Papal countries.

So our author censures the colonial government for the death of Miantonomoh, as it seems without very good reason. Miantonomoh was a savage chief engaged in war with another savage chief; and according to the rules of savage warfare, which he well understood before he commenced the conflict, in being taken prisoner he was to be put to death by prolonged torture; the colonial government did rescue him from the torture, but not from death. Why should they, unless they were bound to adopt the Quaker principle in regard to all war and all capital punishment? There are a few other instances of censure which we feel somewhat disposed to criticise, but we let them pass.

Talvj brings prominently to view the difference between the original planters of the Plymouth and those of the Massachusetts Colony. The difference is important, and must not be lost sight of by any who would gain a right idea of the elements from which New England and the United States have developed themselves. The Plymouth colonists for the most part were poor, simple hearted, fully democratic and tolerant. The planters of Massachusetts, on the other hand, were many of them comparatively rich, aristocratic in feeling, republican but not democratic in their political principles, and with few exceptions very considerably high church in their ecclesiastical notions.

Connecticut was rather a mollifying combination of the Massachusetts with the Plymouth element; while Rhode Island was a sort of drainage, a receptacle of all the uncombining ultraisms, the radical democracies, the red republicanisms, the through and through *comes osteris* of that day. In the subsequent growth of the nation the Ply-

mouth and the Rhode Island development have increased much faster than the Massachusetts; and will in the end most probably give character to the whole. At least such is the present tendency of things, and so it has been ever since the close of the revolutionary war. At present nothing seems likely to arrest it, unless it be the vast immigration from the continent of Europe. The literature, the ideas, the habits which those immigrants bring with them, though the immigrants are mostly receptive rather than productive, acted upon rather than acting, will in the end exert a powerfully modifying influence on our national character.

Roger Williams, the conscientious and able leader of the democracy of these times, the most formidable and the most estimable of the opponents of the Puritans, deserves a special notice. Roger Williams was the prototype of the best sort of ultra reformers. There are many of his class at the present day, though but few as good and as amiable as he. It is a race that always will exist in every age of advancement and reform, and it is a *kind that goeth not out except by prayer and fasting*. Denunciation, persecution, blind conservatism, do not the least good. The reforms which are needed must be conscientiously, faithfully, and with all possible dispatch, accomplished, and thus the exciting, sustaining cause of the ultraism be taken out of the way. You must cure ultraisms in society as you cure delirium tremens in the individual, by abstaining from all that intoxicates. If this be not practicable, why, then the disease must ever and anon make its appearance.

Williams was an honest, earnest, good man, at heart a Christian, benevolent towards all, forbearing and forgiving to his enemies. In his controversies he was severe and bitter as any of his contemporaries; and no man ever said harder or more cutting things against the Quakers than he. But it is to his credit, and posterity ought ever to bear it in mind to his honor and with never ceasing gratitude to his memory, that he utterly repudiated physical pains and penalties and the burden of civil disabilities for mere matters of opinion.

The great duty of religious toleration he saw clearly, and practised consistently; and in this he was greatly in advance of most of the men of his age. The Puritans generally had begun to see something of this truth; though like the blind man in the gospel whose eyes had just begun to receive the light, they saw men as trees walking. Cromwell, Milton, Vane, and a few others, understood the matter clearly; but they were exceptions to the general rule; and for nothing was Cromwell more severely blamed by that great and good man, Richard Baxter, than for his principles of entire religious toleration. This may show what the age was in that respect. We honor Williams for contending in behalf of this great principle, we honor him for his consist-

ent practice in regard to it, and we cheerfully acknowledge the debt of gratitude which we owe him for it. Nor was he ultra on this point. He well understood and very happily pointed out the limitations of religious tolerance. He compared the members of a commonwealth to a ship's crew and passengers on the ocean, including men of every sort. The shipmaster is at liberty to establish daily worship, but not to compel others to attend it; nor are those who do not attend at liberty to disturb those who do. All are bound to submit to the rules of the ship in whatever pertains to the safety and comfort of the voyage, to bear their part of the expenses, to respect and obey the officers; and if any should refuse to do this, should any under pretext that all are equal in Christ, preach or write that there ought to be no officers or rules or punishments, *I have never denied* (said he) *that such transgressors ought to be judged, restrained, compelled and punished, if they deserve.* (Talvj p. 390, 91.)

Williams had an ardent, impatient mind; an idea burnt in him with such heat and flame that he could not stop to see its connection with other ideas, or its adaptedness to existing circumstances. While the iron was hot he hammered away with all his might, regardless of the shape he was giving to it, or of the use that was afterwards to be made of it. Hence many of his blows and much of his toil and sweat were thrown away. As soon as he got a thought he must work it out, must make everything else consistent with it through and through, whatever inconsistencies and incongruities might grow out of this one string of consistencies. It is pleasant to see the two boots of a pair perfectly matched; but if the feet on which they are to be worn are unlike, such perfect mates make a very bad fit. He changed his opinions many times during his life, and knew perfectly well that the process of conviction in his own mind was not instantaneous, but progressive. Yet he could not wait for other minds to go through a like process. They must change when he did, or rather they *must be changed when he was changed*, no sooner and no later, or he must excommunicate them; he could not conscientiously do otherwise. Williams gave the Puritans much trouble, and there was fault on both sides. In some parts of his career he was much like the refractory men on ship board, whom he himself affirmed *ought to be judged, restrained, compelled and punished as they deserve.* No commonwealth, especially in times of feebleness and danger, could without self-annihilation tolerate such a course as he sometimes took in regard to the government of the colonies. Yet in all these disputes and the consequent measures of violence, it is interesting to see that not a few of the colonists loved and respected Williams as a good man, though mistaken; and that this affection and es-

teem was on his part fully reciprocated. Here is a striking difference between those who are really Christians, and those who are Christians in name only.

The Puritans, though like other human beings imperfect, were Christians, gospel men, good men, full of the Holy Ghost and of faith; and a great and good work it was theirs to do, a work of which we and all the world are now reaping the benefit, and blessings be on their memory and peace to their ashes; and let their revilers and the violators of their graves meet everywhere the contempt they deserve.

ARTICLE V.

CLASSICAL EDUCATION IN THE GERMAN GYMNASIA.

By Dr. Hermann Wimmer, late Professor in the Blochmann College, Dresden, Saxony.

THE political reformation of Germany, for a long time sought by philosophers and politicians, and fostered by the general desire of union, though its progress is now apparently stopped through the failure of the late revolution, is not likely to stand still until it has effected its object. The happy accomplishment of the revolution may indeed fall to the lot of a more fortunate posterity, but the passions of a revolutionary age will not cease to disturb the peace of the living generation, and to impress their stamp on the entire face of society. Changes are brought about to be changed again after the sun of freedom has risen; but these are now unavoidable, as the shadows of night precede the morning light. Professors have been writing in newspapers or speaking in parliaments; students fighting on barricades or haranguing the people in clubs; some are prisoners; others fugitive. In "the country of thoughtfulness and learning," a political pamphlet is preferred to a scientific book, and the speech of a noisy partisan to the lecture of a learned professor. All the institutions of learning, gymnasia or universities, will suffer from the vehement shock, and the vulgar reproach often brought against classical learning as not being practical enough, will now overwhelm the reasoning of its adherents, while on the opposite side the victorious governments do not feel bound to look graciously down on institutions which brought out that pernicious spirit of freedom and union. And whatever may be the state of