

Correspondence.

DANIEL'S TRIAL AND VICTORY.

BY REV. E. E. ADAMS, D.D.

"Wherefore King Darius signed the writing and the decree, that whosoever in the kingdom shall ask a petition of any God or man for thirty days, save of the king himself, he shall be cast into the den of lions."

Now is an immortal soul brought to its severest test. Now is it to be decided whether this captive Hebrew, Daniel, is really great and good. To himself is the proof to be given, either of grandest triumph or of saddest failure. He is to ascertain, with perfect assurance by actual trial, whether his faith is really in God, whether he is above or below circumstance, whether henceforth he shall go on in the development of a noble manhood, of a glorious religion, or take a desperate step downward over a precipice which he can never reascend. And to his accusers, his king, and to his distant nation, and to the kingdom whose power he had swayed—indeed, to all generations through which the current of his history shall run, is he to demonstrate either the strength or feebleness of his piety, and give an example that shall either shame or render illustrious the faith of the church? It is now to be decided whether there is in his soul a principle that misfortune cannot crush, that power cannot secure, that malignity cannot alarm, that all the forces of evil cannot wrench from steadfastness. Whether the heart of a poor mortal can hang upon heaven, and, like a sacred censor, send the impious of its faith to God, from the tempests and the whirlwinds that sweep through this poisoned air.

"I suppose that hours are often passing over us, my readers, in which, though there is no terrible demonstration of trial, no stern decree coming athwart the path of duty, no gathering of the elements about us, no appliances of courtly terrors, no force of public sentiment to drive us from the right, we nevertheless, feel the power of conflicting motives, and in the silence of our chambers, or the deeper silence of our hearts, go through the process which decides either for or against our piety, our virtue, our happiness, our salvation. In the wise, but inscrutable ordering of Providence, even now may the heaviest weight of your probation rest on your character! Even now may some one of you be balancing in your conscience the influence which shall land you in hell, or leave you high and far upon the shores of heaven! And so the decision of Daniel, his resolution, his courage, his achievement of right, may come in to turn the scale of your life for eternity!"

Now when Daniel knew that the writing was signed, he went into his house, and his window being open in his chamber toward Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees three times a day and prayed and gave thanks before his God as he did aforetime.

The piety of the prophet was not a sudden outburst; not the product of circumstances. It did not now, for the first time, blaze forth like a meteor whose light fades in a moment from the sky. But it is a permanent, a habitual thing. It is the daily life of the man founded in conviction and fed by clear, subduing views of God and duty. We find that in the outset of his life in the palace, he put himself under the most rigid moral discipline. He would not defile himself by partaking of the food provided for him by the king, because it was connected with idolatry. He cast himself upon the care of his God for health, and for existence. And all through his course to this hour of his great trial, he was sustained by singleness of purpose in the service of his Creator. He had learned how to trust, how to pray, how to live. Skilled indeed in wisdom and in science, and superior even in his youth to those about him in all that gives distinction and position, in all that qualifies one for secular duties, he was more distinguished for his piety. When, therefore, this great hour of his affliction came, it did not overtake him too suddenly or too powerfully for his resistance. And it is only in harmony with his whole life that we find him hale, erect, strong, confident, knowing whither to turn, what to do, how to meet the stupendous emergency. And his experience teaches us that it is only by habitual use of our weapons that we can parry and smite down the adversary. It is by previous surveys and knowledge of the ground that we are at home on it, when the great battle is waged.

Daniel, when he knew that the decree was signed, pursued the same daily course of piety as before. Had he not known it, his habitual devotion had occasioned no remark. But he did know it, and knew all that it signified; knew how the matter would terminate; knew that the decree would be put in force; knew that his enemies would succeed; that the king must yield against his convictions, against his affection for and confidence in him, his honored subject; and knowing all this, foreseeing his immediate and certain exposure to the hunger and rage of lions, he moved on in the same path of duty, without ostentation, without change of manner, without fear. His way was above. The force of his religion, his faith in God, bore him to and through the ordeal. Like a deep, clear, majestic current, the purpose of his soul flowed on, little heeding the obstruction that had fallen into it, scarcely deigning even a ripple in token of resistance. He went into his

house, and repaired to his chamber, where he was wont to pray and praise, and with his windows as they were before, open toward Jerusalem, whither his eye and his heart turned in his exile, did he kneel down in affectionate, humble worship.

Although primate of a mighty realm, his house he consecrated to God. He opened not his doors to political schemers, nor did he invite to his mansion crowds of flatterers, nor fill his halls with the fascinations of beauty and art, nor consecrate his domestic life to wine and lust; but he had a chamber for devotion, whither he found time, because he had a heart, often to repair for communion with heaven, for devout meditation and holy thought. How many are there now, who, under such a pressure of duties to the State, with such cares and claims on their time, and such throngs of applicants for favor or for service, with lines of interest and responsibility running through a mighty empire, and reaching to distant courts, would think themselves able, or in any way obliged thus to remember their moral obligations? How many would spend one season of devotion in the secret chamber? How many would not altogether abandon both public and private worship, and excuse themselves on the ground of other claims, which could not be set aside?

The trial is now heavy on the servant of God. How easy might it seem to suspend his usual petition for thirty days, that the king, who really loved him, and desired to favor him, might not be obliged to execute the decree! Did he not owe this sacrifice to his patron and friend? Ought he not to so far sympathize with the royal heart in the dilemma into which the wily presidents had brought him? Moreover, can he not pray with the same acceptance in silence, and without the outward formality? Will not God accept the pious breathings of his heart? Whatever questions we may imagine for him, there is no evidence that they entered his thoughts. He had a principle. He worshipped God according to his own conviction and the Divine appointment. That was his law, and by which every power of his nature gravitated heavenward. And he would as soon have expected to see the earth break from the solar attraction, as to have allowed himself to turn aside from duty because a human law interposed. Not that he despised governments—he was loyal to the person and the authority of the king. He recognized all the statutes of the realm as, in their governmental relations, appointed of God; he respected the immutability of the decrees which went forth with the royal seal upon them, and he would have been the last man in the realm to question, or convert, or disobey an edict of Darius.

But there was another King to whom he owed supreme allegiance—the law of his God was his first and last dependence and appeal. And Darius knew it. He also knew that Daniel was not by his piety, his devotion to the God of Abraham, violating any of his rights, nor invading any interest of his realm. Daniel knew that the king did not expect him to surrender his religion; did not feel that he did wrong by continuing his habitual prayer, even after the promulgation of the decree.

His allegiance, therefore, to the mortal king was not impaired, but rendered more valuable by that loftier devotion to the immortal. His mind had not been, it could not be perverted and warped by questions of policy and expediency. He felt the majesty of the higher law, and every sentiment of his heart, every conviction of his reason, every affection of his nature, went forth powerfully, in obedience thereto.

He could say, I love my king. I love the nation over which he has set me. They shall have the service of my talents, of my life. But I love my God supremely; and then the more for his sake, so much that for their ultimate happiness, as well for my own conscience, I shall obey the Ruler of the heavens, and, if it must be so, fall beneath the cruel, the extorted decree of my sovereign.

And so he was true to his faith—and they doomed him to the lions—and he spent the dreary night in their den; and the envious officers exulted, and the king was wretched and tearful; and God watched over his faithful saint; and in the early morn the king came to the den and called for Daniel, and answer came back, "O king, live forever!" And they rejoiced together, and blessed the God of salvation; and the prophet was taken from the den unharmed; and his accusers were plunged into it and perished, and Daniel was exalted yet more,—while the king, convinced of the majesty and glory of Jehovah, made another decree, and wrote to all people of every tongue and language in his broad empire, saying, "Peace be multiplied unto you." I make a decree, that in every dominion of my kingdom men tremble and fear before the God of Daniel: for He is the living God and steadfast forever, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed, and His dominion shall be even unto the end. He delivereth and rescueth, and He worketh signs and wonders in heaven and in earth, who hath delivered Daniel from the power of the lions.

"So this Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius and in the reign of Cyrus the Persian."

It is best for a man to be upright in all things. Often, in these days of wicked gain, we hear men say,—"It is impossible to live honestly." Such is the complication of business, such the state of politics, that a man must be utterly cast

aside or do as others do. Now this plea is not only unchristian, it is unmanly. It is the very thing that helps to perpetuate the evil. Stand forth and be a Daniel! Suffer for your upright-ness, if need be, and you shall not only gain the approbation of your own conscience, but you shall begin a process of reformation, and see your accusers and oppressors beneath your feet. The world needs at this hour just that stern integrity which would die rather than do wrong; which tosses all gains and distinctions to the winds when they come in the way of duty; which presses down pride and passion, and marches on in the sublime path of the godly.

Many organizations exist in these days. Men form societies and associations for almost every branch of moral and secular enterprise—and this is well enough, provided those who enter them do not lose their individual sense of duty, and their personal action in the mass—and so all waste their time and talents in mere organism, and discuss when they ought to act, enjoy their socialities when they ought to be abroad in their mission of love. But if any organization is needed just now, it is one composed of upright men and women, for the purpose of putting a stop to theft and plunder in high life! To form a society which would banish every member found to have embezzled from the public treasury, or from private employers, from banks or corporations. Let those men of style and pretension, whose extravagance is fed by robbery, by violation of confidence, by frowned from society! Let their *carte de visites* be answered by "Otherwise engaged." Let them be dropped from politics. If the law cannot put them in prison, let public sentiment take charge of them, and be sure to place them where they shall not corrupt our children nor have occasion to congratulate themselves that they have not lost their respectability!

If we can't correct them, let us banish them from our dwellings and our hearts. We are growing too lenient towards crime in this age and country. We are pushing our tolerance to such unwise degrees that the national life itself is in danger.

If a man would become permanently great and influential, he must be much with God. Daniel did not have to gather an army to resist the king and revolutionize the realm. He did not have to assemble the wise men to take counsel, to devise plans, to work skillfully upon the mind of king and people. He was in the right way before. There was need of no change in policy or principle. He remained with God, and went to his daily work! How sublime is such a character, such an attribute!

Calm as a summer morning, stern as the brow of Carmel, and constant as the courses of the planets, he had within him the might and the majesty of God! All Assyria could not crush him. He was God's hero, to conquer by suffering—type of him who descended into the den of evil and waged war with fierce lions, with principalities and powers—and made a show of them openly, nailing them to the cross! Go ye and serve God as Daniel served him. Put on strength in the chamber of prayer. Get Divine thoughts into your mind, and Divine love into your heart—then meet, and win, and conquer the world. There must first be sorrow, then joy; first war with sin, then victory in holiness; first the weight of agony, then the weight of glory; first the church militant, then the church millennial; first the crown of thorns, then the royalty of Paradise!

MR. WARNER'S LETTERS ON RECONSTRUCTION.

NO. IV.

REV. AND DEAR SIR:—As everybody knows, the Federal Constitution guarantees to each State of the Union "A republican form of government."

Of course, in passing upon the new organizations of the South, the President (if the jurisdiction of review be his) will take care that they be of this character: He has indeed advised the freedmen that their admission to full citizenship depends upon the justice of the States they live in; but he has not told them, and I trust is not prepared to tell them, that he will not do what he lawfully may, to bring that "justice" to a right decision.

"A republican form of government," then, what is it? The problem has been a good deal agitated of late, but as far as I have seen, without result. It seems only to remind us of the old proverb, that men are apt to know least of what they are most familiar with; so "hard is it to turn the eye home upon itself."

The term *republic* has, I think, two meanings in combination:—one ancient, general, etymological; the other, technical and modern. Let us ponder them.

The ancient meaning of the term is simply that of its etymon, *res publica*, which may be rendered *public concern*—that is, *concern of the people at large*; in contradistinction from monarchy or one-man government; from oligarchy, or government of a few; from aristocracy, or government of a large but yet limited portion of society, under the notion of their being *aristoi*, the best of the people, and entitled, consequently, to lord it over them. Our English word, *commonwealth*, is a very fair equivalent; for common means *public*, and the original Saxon for wealth is *weal*, which signifies *well-being*. Nor is it strange that a polity sacred to the well-being of an entire community, should have derived a name from the benevolence of its object. By an easy metonymy, frequent in all

languages, the notorious object of a thing is often taken for the thing itself—the end for the means.

Well, sir, the name *republic*, thus appropriated to denote a free, popular, common-wealth government, became at once historical; and it passed from age to age, through twenty centuries or more, without the slightest change of sense, down even to our "Declaration of Independence," which was essentially an adoption of the principles it stood for. The general nature of the thing was universally understood. Everybody knew, at least, that it meant a government established for the people at large, one and all, as equals.

The early examples of this polity were democratic; that is, they were administered by the people in person. Agents were employed, but not *political* agents. The great secret of dividing the sovereignty into parts, and delegating one part for administrative purposes, while the rest is held in electoral and visitatorial supremacy by the general mass of citizens, was not for Greek or Roman to discover. They were doomed to struggle on in democratic confusion, striving after the benefits of republican polity by means that could only give them glimpses of the good they sought, and with a certainty of crushed hopes in the end.

It remained for our American fathers to devise a working system suited adequately to the design. They thought a scheme of administration by *representative agents*, under due popular supervision and control, would answer better than democracy. Experience has shown that they were right. Our governments, general and particular, all attest the happy wisdom of the conception. Like other great discoveries, political representation, now that it is known, seems but a simple matter. I believe, however, that in importance to the welfare of mankind, the proudest triumphs of science do not surpass it.

And this, sir, is our modern technical addition to the long established general import of the term *republic*. It takes the place of the old technical democracy, and is now the grand distinction of our system. The two methods (such I may call them) are alike popular and free; both regard all men as of equal rank; but in details of working machinery for accomplishing their aim, they differ exceedingly. American citizens do not conduct their public affairs by direct vote, as the men of Athens once did, but by the agency of representative functionaries, who do the business for them upon trust.

I conclude, therefore, that whereas an Athenian would have understood the phrase "*republican form of government*" to mean a government of and for the people at large, personally administered by themselves; on the other hand, in our day and to us the meaning is, a government of and for the people at large, administered by agents popularly chosen for the purpose. And just as he would have added to the general notion of a government for all, the special one of a democratic administration, so must we add to that notion, not his miserable quill of mob-management, but instead of it our own masterpiece of technical polity, the representative system. In a word, "a form of government," to be "republican" within the polity-pledge of the Constitution, must be a people's government representing all, and administered for all by popularly chosen agents.

Will it be doubted whether the first part of this definition is matter of form, as well as of principle?

A government is an organization. A State government is an organization of the people of a State. Can the form be separated from its subject matter? Does not oligarchy differ in form from aristocracy? And yet the difference lies solely in the proportions of the people comprehended in them respectively.

Moreover, the guaranty of the Constitution is given to the people, and of course to the whole of them, assuring to them all a republican organization; and how can such an assurance be made good by an organization that shall leave half of them out?

I say the guaranty is given to the people, because the people are the parties to the charter compact, as its own terms declare; and because it would be absurd to suppose a form of government assured to forms of government already existing.

But even if this absurdity were enacted, the people personally would still be the ultimate objects of the pledge given; since the managers of the respective State governments must be deemed incapable of receiving it otherwise than for the masses represented by them.

In every point of view, therefore, the people are the donees of the pledge; the people at large and indiscriminately.

Were slaves an exception in their time? If so, it was because they were slaves, and not because they were colored men. As slaves (though not under that name) they were indeed the subjects of a special arrangement of compromise. But that arrangement was itself exceptional, and against the general policy of the Constitution. Of course it must be taken strictly, and cannot be enlarged by construction, to the prejudice of freemen. Colored freemen, even then, were quite beyond its reach. And as all are now free, the special arrangement as to slaves has become obsolete.

The better opinion is, however, that the old thraldoms of the South were never such in fair political account. The Constitution did not recognize them. It knew of "persons held to service," but not of human chattels, as they might be called. So that slaves, as between

them and the general Government, were always citizens.

But whether so or not, they are citizens now; let this suffice. They belong now unmistakably to what is called the people—that great body of political commons whom it is the province of republican institutions to care for in a policy of universal justice and equality. Their rights are the same precisely as those of their late masters. They owe the same allegiance, are amenable to the same laws, bear public burdens by the same rule of apportionment, and have an infinitely better record of past conduct. Who can think of reviving, under any modification, the wrongs they have heretofore suffered?

My friend, one thing is certain: let us lay it to heart: NO PLAN OF GOVERNMENT FOR THE LATELY REBELLIOUS STATES CAN BE REPUBLICAN THAT IS FOR WHITES ONLY. And I want the President to understand this. Should he demur, I want Congress to instruct him on the subject. In the last resort, I want the patriotic masses everywhere to take up the proposition, and to proclaim it in a voice which none but the dead shall fail to hear and respect.

What, sir! are we to measure out political estates by rules of moonshine discrimination? by accidental differences of skin-tint, or of blood-lineage? Suppose Louisiana were to frame an organization, making over all power to the French-division of her people, leaving Yankees, Spaniards, negroes, under political disfranchisement; could it be regarded as *republican*?—and not rather an aristocracy?

Suppose Georgia were to say, "we want the franchise of election (and of course the offices of Government,) confined to our men of red hair and blue eyes;" although but a fraction of the whole community; would that be nearer to the mark, or farther off? I know not how fertile their climate is in red hair and blue eyes; but I suppose it could hardly muster enough for an aristocracy, and not too many for an oligarchy.

Suppose, in fine, that in South Carolina, where the blacks and whites are about equal, the latter should resolve to compensate their late loss of civil lordship by assuming a lordship of political supremacy to the exclusion and relative prostration of the other moiety of the citizens; the usurpation being founded, not upon any reason of intellectual, moral, or educational superiority, but just upon *accidental grounds*—a little less of solar light absorbed, a little more reflected.

Well, sir, allowing the modesty of this (and modesty abounds in South Carolina,) the question again comes up, would it answer the notion of a *commonwealth* government?—a government of and for the people at large?—a *republic*?

Sir, if it could be deemed anything better than aristocracy—rank, racial aristocracy—I see not wherein. Republicanism never exalts one class of citizens above another. Even when negroes were slaves, it was not republicanism, but aristocracy under that name, that kept them down by keeping their masters up and dominant.

I repeat, therefore, and implore the good sense and right feeling of the country to consider what I say, that no class-prefering organization is or can be lawful under the polity-pledge of the great charter.

So long as the colored men were in civil bondage, political rights were of course denied them. Political rights are mainly for the protection of rights that are civil. But now that civil bondage is at an end, the freedmen ought surely to be clothed with the legitimate armor of their new condition. To want it is to be exposed to all manner of wrongs and indignities from the preferred and ruling order, that is the whites. They will be mercilessly domineered over. No man can doubt it. Let us provide against the evil. In ancient Rome, proud as she was, a formally manumitted slave took ground at once among the people in full citizenship; met with them in the comital assemblies, voted with them there, and was a political equal among them to all possible intents. Why should we grudge what Rome so fully conceded?

The right of suffrage is all we have occasion to claim for the liberated negro; for it is the only right (a host, however, in itself) that continues to be withheld from them. They are free to bear arms, to reside and go where they please, to sue out their habeas corpus if need be, to demand the services of magistrates and courts, to petition for redress of grievances, to speak, write, publish whatever white men may. And yet they are gravely told, they must not vote—that is, must have no *practical share in the government of the country*.

And the pretended reason is, they are too ignorant, some of them, too vicious. There would be force in this if it were urged consistently. But facts show that it is not so. Observe the eagerness with which we rush to make citizens of foreigners, before they have learnt the first letter of our institutional alphabet, and while their characters are utterly unknown: In this manner the poor-houses, the prisons, the penitentiaries of Europe are yearly robbed of their proper inhabitants to make voters of in free America! Yes, to make voters of—precisely and specifically that. And yet it is attempted here, in free America, to keep four millions of colored natives, as I may say, *unnaturalized*—in other words, only *half-citizens*, and beneath the voting privilege; because, forsooth, some of them are not as virtuous, and none as knowing, as they might be.

The city of New York is now gov-

erned by foreign voters, of whom a large majority are unlettered papists, from everybody knows where. Alas, the doomed city! I believe the Protestant negroes of Virginia could detail for her a voting population more intelligent, more virtuous, every way superior.

But, sir, I waive all this. There is another answer to the objection it combats. The danger, whatever it be, of opening the polls to colored voters at the South, may be readily obviated by putting the suffrage under prudent limitations, as was universally done there in the early State constitutions. Take what test you will—ability to read and write, or a modicum of property; only let it be applied to all colors and races, so that this system shall be truly republican. This will sift the voting throng; and if the blacks have more chaff among them than the whites, be it so: throw out the chaff wherever you find it; but do this by a just, a uniform rule. And so the bugbear of this objection vanishes.

May God inspire the President with wisdom for the duties of his great office. People say he is pardoning all the rebels, and will never cross their purpose of renewed injustice towards the colored race. I cannot, will not believe it. If their views of government forms are *anti-republican*, President Johnson is not the man to shrink from saying so at the proper time. It must be said, and said decisively.

Very truly yours,
H. W. WARNER.

THE YEAR-DAY THEORY.

MR. EDITOR:—Having observed in your paper, a few weeks since, a statement that a certain reviewer was laboring to overthrow the "year-day theory" of prophecy, as it is called, and a hope expressed that that "baseless theory would be exploded," I was led to examine that point a little, and should like it, if you will allow me, to state the result of my inquiries.

I find that the time appointed for the prosperity of Antichristian powers is designated in three ways: "time, times, and a half," (or three years and a half,) "forty and two months," and "a thousand two hundred and sixty days;" these all, reckoning in the Jewish way, thirty days to a month, come to the same number of days. Now these days either mean literal days, or some other period: But they certainly cannot mean literal days, as they are used by Daniel and John to measure the duration of that persecuting power into whose hands the saints should be delivered. To interpret them as literal days, would violate the truth of history, as well as the symbolical character of the prophecy; for the saints were actually persecuted by the "Papal" "horn" for a much longer period than 1260 days. Moreover, the woman representing the Church was "nourished in the wilderness" during the same period of 1260 days; but this could have no counterpart in history, if we take these as literal days. The same remark may be made respecting the "two witnesses" who prophesy in sackcloth during the same period, probably representing the true Church. Hence, neither the facts of history, nor the nature of the prophecy, will allow us to interpret them as literal days.

What periods, then, do they represent? Our only way is to go to the Scriptures, and let them interpret themselves. Now we know that on one occasion, the Prophet Ezekiel was ordered by Divine direction to represent, in certain symbolical actions, by a certain number of days, the same number of years during which God would send certain chastisements on the Jews. Here we find that God has actually chosen to represent a year by a day, and therefore we may reasonably infer that, David has done just this thing in another part of his prophecy. "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people," etc. Were these literal weeks or days? No one pretends it. But more distinctly still, "Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, unto Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks and threescore and two weeks." Here we are compelled by the facts to understand these as weeks of years; but a week is seven days, and therefore each day in these weeks represents a year.

The same thing is seen in another part of Revelation; for, in the ninth chapter, the Turkish angels are said to be prepared to slay the third part of men during "an hour and a day and a month and a year." Now reckon this as a day for a year, and it was verified in the history of that power, as may be seen in Bishop Newton and other writers on the prophecies; but, take it literally, and it becomes absurd.

I think, therefore, that there is a strong scriptural basis for interpreting the 1260, 1290, and 1335 days as representing so many years; that while following the prophets themselves we stand on impregnable ground; and that consistently with Scripture style, they can be interpreted in no other way. W. F. A. Des Moines, Iowa, Sept. 20, 1865.

AN ERROR:—The most common error of men and women is that of looking for happiness somewhere outside of useful work. It has never yet been found, when thus sought; and never will be, while the world stands; and the sooner this truth is learned, the better for every one. If you doubt the proposition, glance around among your friends and acquaintances, and mark those who appear to have the most enjoyment in life. Are they idlers; and pleasure-seekers, or earnest workers? We know what your answer will be.