

hand and foot in India, the placing the forehead on the Koran in Constantinople, and the breaking of a saucer in China, are all mere forms surrounding the great substance "so help you God." But our cousins on the other side of the Atlantic seem to be wandering away from what we may call the imprecatory sanction of the oath, for their books say that witnesses are not allowed to be questioned as to their religious belief—not because it tends to disgrace them, but because it would be a personal scrutiny into the state of their faith and conscience foreign to the spirit of free institutions, which oblige no man to avow his belief.\* With them the curious anomaly could not have happened, which was made patent to the British public a few years since, in a case brought by a man called Maden, in an English County Court.† His only witness was his wife, who, on being examined on the *voir-dire*, stated that she did not believe in a God or in a future state of rewards and punishments. Her evidence was rejected because she dared to speak the truth; had she lied and professed the necessary belief, her testimony must have been received. The Judge had no sympathy with the witness, but, assuming to be an authority in religion as well as law, he told her that she must take the consequences of her disbelief in the loss of her property, the subject-matter of the suit.‡ Happily, Atheists are rare; were they however more numerous, the interests of justice must long since have demanded the admission of their evidence. Truth is what a court of justice desires; the exclusion of the honest infidel will not secure it, and the dishonest will not hesitate to profess the necessary qualifications for giving evidence.

Having taken this hasty glance at the history and nature of oaths, let us for convenience divide them into the same classes as those adopted by the five dissentient Commissioners whom I have already named. We have then:—

1. Oaths to the breaking of which no penalties are attached by law, and
2. Oaths to the breaking of which the law does attach a penalty.

1. Of the first class are (1.) oaths of allegiance, and (2.) oaths of fidelity in the discharge of duties.

(1.) As to the oaths of allegiance the dissentients with significant brevity state, that—

"In peaceful and prosperous times they are not needed; in times of difficulty and danger they are not observed. Contemporary history affords abundant proof of the inefficiency of political oaths, whether taken by the people to their rulers or by the rulers to the people."

It is the duty of all subjects to bear allegiance to their rulers, and the anomaly is a curious one, discoverable no doubt in all societies, of requiring a man to swear to perform that duty, which he not only ought to be presumed,

but which the very fact of his being a subject compels him, to observe to his Sovereign. Somewhat similar is the peculiarity remarked by a surprised Frenchman of certain of our Irish brethren joining together and agreeing to be loyal; agreeing to be what they ought to be, agreeing to do their duty, and therefore considering themselves worthy of all praise, as faithful observers of political morality. Ordinary civilians are not called on to take the oath of allegiance, yet it behoves them to be equally as loyal as the soldiers who swear an oath, which even when they hear they hardly understand.

(2.) Then as to the oaths of fidelity in the discharge of public duties, they have never stopped the unworthy at the threshold, and the worthy did not require them to quicken their sense of duty. Such oaths seem to be in the nature of contracts, which might be entered into in a manner much more satisfactory than by embodying them in their present form. With a writer of the year 1834, quoted by the Commissioners, it is only common sense to hold that—

"No man should ever be called on to promise to do what he is bound by the duties of his office to perform, on the contrary, it should, in every way, be declared that every man has already promised to do his duty by the very act of accepting office."\*

There are two motives, or, to use a perhaps more correct phrase, two sanctions for the observance of the class of oaths we are now considering, namely, the sanction of interest and the sanction of religion. Now, if an enlightened self interest does not impel to honesty in the discharge of a duty, it is very questionable whether the religious sanction will secure faithfulness in the office. The oath will not generate a conscience, and, where this is wanting, happiness here or hereafter ceases to persuade, and Hell offers no terrors. Even a tendency to superstition, which we too often shamelessly encourage, can have no place in one devoid of the moral sense. Worldly gain, present or prospective, is the sure reward of faithfulness. But, it may be said, a little wrong, scarcely possible of detection, may be done with advantage to the wrong-doer, and in such case self-interest inclines to the doing of it. The proposition may be questioned; but admitting the force contended for, the moral sense of right and wrong should be potent to resist the temptation, and, if it be not so, an oath cannot strengthen the weak conscience. As to the sanctity of the oath (a phrase which is scarcely intelligible) in what does it consist, since the practice is recognized of taking the oath as a matter of form, and disregarding its whole spirit? Oaths and declarations taken by officers of the army against the payment of money for commissions may be mentioned; these, however, common decency abolished some years ago, and the Report points out some other oaths which were, and are, taken not to be observed. Examined from whatever

\* Greenleaf Ev. § 370.

† Rochdale Co. Ct., Feb. 1861.

‡ Her mother was the defendant; she had neglected the religious instruction of her daughter, and thus took advantage of her own wrong.

\* J. Endell Tyler, "Oaths," p. 68.