

[From the Richmond Enquirer.]

The Bible and Slavery.

"Does the Bible sanction American slavery," is the title of a volume lately published by the now somewhat notorious Professor of Oxford, Mr. Goldwin Smith; and this volume is reviewed in the "Church and State Review." The reviewer first puts aside the question of recognition, which he advocates on its own merits, as a right of the Confederacy by the law of nations, and then proceeds to discuss the question raised in Mr. Goldwin Smith's work. Mr. Smith answers in the negative the question upon his title page, and the reviewer completely approves of the views set forth by the author. The "Saturday Review" has been arguing on the opposite side, and demonstrating that American slavery is fully sanctioned by the Bible. An extract from the review in the "Church and State," will show the state of the controversy, and will show, at the same time, a strange unacquaintance with the Scriptures in some ecclesiastical writers of England:

The identity of the existing system with the slavery of the Jews is an immediate question of fact. If it be admitted, then, with Mr. Smith, we may say that "the character of the Bible is threatened, and so is that of the English law and nation." That the plea is utterly and miserably untrue, every Englishman may with ease convince himself by comparing the acknowledged facts of American slavery with the legislation and the known facts, facts respecting bondage among the Jews. They who wish for a complete comparison of the two will find it drawn with remarkable force and calmness in the pages of Mr. Goldwin Smith. They will there learn, at the least, some of the facts and principles which will enable them to refute the sophisms of the "Saturday Review."

This journal, which sometimes speaks a language strangely like that of Mr. Goldwin Smith, speaks more often in a fashion from which the Professor of Modern History must turn with a very profound aversion. In a recent criticism of Mrs. Kemble's Journal in Georgia, it favors us with the novel and instructive discovery that "involuntary servitude for life, as it is called, is but an extreme form of that subjection of the individual to the dominant social power which prevails more or less in every nation." The reviewer cannot be unaware that differences of degree pass after certain limits into differences of kind; but we deny this fact. American slavery is in some most essential points utterly different from slavery even among Turks; to identify it with the bondage of the Jews is a monstrous insult to truth.

The Mosaic legislation recognized a common bond of interest between master and bondman; it threw over the latter the sacred protection of law; it made no distinction between his testimony and that of the freeman, it sanctioned his marriage; it recognized his family; above all, it united the slave with the master in every act of religious worship, it upheld the honorable character of labor, and enjoined it alike on the master and the slave. And accordingly the history of the Jews brings before us a condition of things in which this legislation was to a great extent carried out. The picture of Boaz among his reapers is in no essential feature unlike that of Abraham's servant, when he stood by the well-side with Rebekah. The American slave system cannot exist without a fugitive slave-law; the Mosaic legislation bids the Jews run the risk even of war rather than give up the runaway slave. In short, as we have already said, there is not a single point of likeness between the slavery of the Mosaic code and the fearful system; &c.

In the whole of this, Mr. Smith and the "Reviewer" either grossly mistake or willfully confound two different things. Every one of those provisions which these writers say were made by the Mosaic legislation, was in favor only of those few temporary slaves, who were Hebrews, and who had fallen into slavery through poverty. For the great mass of the slaves of the Jews who were made captive in war, or purchased from "the heathen round about," not a single one of these stipulations was ever made. There was less of the

sacred protection of law thrown around those for eign slaves than there is around our negroes. The Mosaic law did not sanction their marriage, nor recognize their family, nor give the slave a right to bear testimony, nor "unite the slave with the master in every [nor in any] act of religious worship." On the contrary, it excluded them from the Jewish religion, and from the benefit of the jubilee; but we admit that the Jews were commanded not to work their slaves, nor their horses, nor their asses, on the Sabbath. The Mosaic law did not "uphold the honorable character of labor." Labor in the eyes of the Jews was not honorable at all, but was a consequence and punishment of sin. Further, the command to the Jews not to restore a fugitive slave, means that a slave who fled into the hand of the Hebrews from a foreign country was not to be delivered up. The writers must know this if they read the Bible at all; and they must know also that a fugitive slave flying from one tribe of Jews into another was to be delivered up, as much as an escaped horse. The attempt to contrast the two systems upon this ground is excessively distinguished.

As to Boaz and his reapers, we can perceive in that scene nothing one whit more patriarchal than any planter and his cotton pickers. The British public has got a great deal to do yet before it "clears its mind of cant."

THE BIBLE AND SLAVERY.

To the Editor of the Richmond Whig:

I see by the newspapers that Yankeeedom and England are yet stumbling over slavery. I propose to set down some of the places in the Bible where slavery is spoken of, and making some remarks on the first and last quotations. I presume every man has a Bible and can read for himself, and knows what the old Federal Constitution is on the subject.

I will here say that the word "slave" occurs only twice in the English translation of the Bible, and there is no word in the original to require it:

Genesis, 9th chapter, verses 25, 26, 27. The 25th verse reads thus: "Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren." In the Arabic version of this verse it is: "Ham, the father of C." Ham, if Hebrew scholars be right, means Black, and the word Negro in its root means Black, and the word *be* (underlined) should not be there, because there is nothing in the original to authorize it, and it weakens the sense, consequently the verse may be correctly translated thus: "Cursed negro the father of Canaan; a slave of slaves shall he be to his brethren." Chap. 14, verses 14; 15; chap. 16, verses 1 to 14; chap. 20, verse 17; Exodus, chap. 20, verses 10, 17, (slave here also); Ezekiel, chap. 23, verse 20, describes a negro's flesh as that of ass's. Matthew, chapter 23, verses 6, 9, 10 (four Canurions are spoken of in the New Testament with commendation). Mark, chap. 13, verse 34; Luke, chap. 7, verses 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10; chap. 13, verses 37, 43, 45, 46, 47; John, chap. 4, verse 51; chap. 8, verse 34 (slave of sin), 35; Acts, chap. 13, verse 1 (niger, black, see Dr. Adam Clark on this word); Romans, chap. 1, verse 1; chap. 16, verse 14; 1st Corinthians, chap. 7, verses 21, 22, 23; chap. 9, verse 19; 2d Corinthians, chap. 4, verse 6; Ephesians, chap. 6, verses 5, 6; Philemon 16 (read the whole); 1 Timothy, chap. 6, verses 1 to 6. Here is a requirement of the Apostle to withdraw from all who oppose slavery.

What is the situation of Germany and New England? Are they not two nations of infidels? Will not Old England shortly be in the same category unless they change?

I could say much more, but here I choose to stop. ALBEMARLE.

[We have had the pleasure of looking over a very able paper on the subject of slavery, prepared by A. Jackson Crane, Esq., of this city, at the request of an English gentleman now in this city, for publication in England. The argument is drawn mainly from nature and the Bible, and is a model of compactness, vigor and scholarship. It cannot fail to produce a strong impression even on the prejudiced mind of England. We hope to see it republished in this country.—Whig.]