WASHINGTON, D. C.

For the National Era.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE MOSAIC LAWS OF SERVITUDE.

BY WILLIAM JAY.

[CONTINUED.]

MASTERS NOT AUTHORIZED TO HIRE OUT OR SELL THEIR DOMESTICS.

There is not a text that hints at the power of a master to dispose of his servant's term of service to another. The very nature of the service was inconsistent with the existence of such a power. The servant chose his master and his choice was of course influenced by the residence and character of the master, and the number and reputation of his family. A poor man might rejoice to become the inmate of one family, and abhor the idea of living in another. He might be very willing to enter the service of a neighbor, while he might refuse to live with a stranger, at a distance from his own friends and kindred. But if, the day after he had made a contract for six years' service with the master he had chosen, he might be sold to another, his freedom of choice would of course be only nominal.

That no master did sell his domestic, may also be inferred from the fact, that there is no mention of such a sale to be found in the Pentateuch. The law moreover takes it for granted, and, in so doing, virtually commands, that the servant shall serve the *same* master six years: "When thou sendest him out free from thee, thou shalt not let him go away empty; thou shalt furnish him liberally out of thy flock, and out of thy floor, and out of thy wine press: of that wherewith the Lord thy God hath blessed thee, thou shalt give unto him. It shall not seem hard unto thee, when thou sendest him away free from thee: for he hath been worth a double hired servant unto thee in serving thee *six years*."—*Deut.* xv, 13—18. This language and these injunctions are wholly inconsistent with the idea that the servant was a subject of speculation, and could for six years be treated as an article of merchandise.

There is one and only one passage in the Pentateuch, which *apparently* implies that the master might sell, or, more properly, hire out his domestic servant, viz: *Ex.* xxi, 7—11. In this case a father sells his daughter as a maid-servant, but most unquestionably, from the context, with the agreement that she is to become the wife either of the master or of his son. But if the purchaser does not fulfil this part of the contract, "if she please not her master, who hath betrothed her to himself, then shall he let her be redeemed." That is, he shall not retain her as a servant, but he shall be compelled to let her go back to her father's, on receiving back an equitable portion of the money he had advanced for her. It is added, "to sell her unto a strange nation he shall have no power, seeing he hath dealt deceitfully with her." The obscurity of this passage is probably owing to a defective translation. The reason assigned for prohibiting the sale—"seeing that he hath dealt deceitfully with her"—seems to imply that, had he not thus dealt with her, he might have sold her. Such an inference must be incorrect, since, if he had *not* dealt deceitfully with her, he would have made her his wife, or his daughter-in-law, in which case he could not have sold her. Among the Jews and other Eastern nations, it was customary for fathers to receive a valuable consideration for their daughters given in marriage. This custom arose from polygamy, which, by creating a sort of monopoly in wives, increased the demand for them, while it lessened the supply. Thus we read of paying "money according to the dowry of virgins"—*Ex.* xxii, 17. So when David was about to marry Saul's daughter, he was informed "the King desireth not any dowry." Caleb demanded, as the price of his daughter, the capture of Kirjath-sepher. Othniel performed the exploit, and married the daughter.

In the case before us, the girl had been bound by her father for six years, and for her services, as well as for her dowry, he had been paid in advance. Hence, during this time she might not marry without the consent of her master, as the marriage would virtually defeat the contract, and the master would lose the money he had paid. In ordinary cases, the master might for a pecuniary consideration, to be paid by the intended husband, give his consent; and this, in Jewish phraseology, would be called selling the girl. But in this instance, one of the conditions of the indenture was, that the master himself or his son, would marry the girl during the six years. The master, however, deals deceitfully and determines not to execute the condition. Under these circumstances, he is forbidden to sell the girl to another for a wife: "To sell her to a strange nation, he shall have no power." A strange nation means, in the Old Testament, a foreign, and, of course, a heathen nation. As no *nation* buys a woman, the expression is equivalent to "to sell her *in* a strange nation he shall have no power." Now it is utterly inconceivable that the law should permit a Jew, whether man or woman, to be forcibly sold, not only to a heathen, but a heathen residing in a heathen nation. The Vulgate renders it "another people," and the Septuagint, still more accurately, "another *family*." This last version relieves the passage from all difficulty. The master shall not sell the girl into another family as a *wife* for one of its members. He shall receive back a fair portion of the money he advanced, and the girl shall return to her father.

But suppose the master so far fulfils his contract as to marry the servant to his son: in that case the law exacts from the husband a rigid fulfilment of his duty to his wife. If he does not treat her as his wife, she may leave him, and no part of the money advanced for her shall be returned.—*Ex.* xxi, 11.

OF THE FAMILIES OF HEBREW DOMESTICS.

If the Hebrew servant "came in by himself he shall go out by himself: if he were married, then his wife shall go out with him."—*Ex.* xxi, 3. That is, if a man and his wife hire themselves, they shall both be discharged at the end of six years. But what if the servant takes a wife during his term, is she also a servant, and does her term expire with her husband's? The servant, as we have seen, was domesticated in his master's house, formed one of the family, and of course could have no family distinct from his master's. Hence it is to be presumed, that a servant hiring himself for six years, did not marry without his master's consent, since the master would be obliged to maintain, not merely the husband, but the wife and children also. The law seems to suppose that the servant will not marry, except through the interference and good will of the master. "If his master have *given* him a wife, and she hath borne him sons or daughters, the wife and her children shall be her master's, and he shall go out by himself."—*Ex.* xxi, 4. It will be observed that the wife is to be retained on the expiration of her husband's term of service, only on two conditions: first, that she had been *given* by the master, and, secondly, that she had borne children. Had she not been given by the master, he could not retain her; nor, even if given, could she be retained, unless she had borne children. The master had *given* a wife to his servant; that is, he had procured one for him, by advancing a sum of money to the woman's father. But the wife necessarily became, like her husband, incorporated in the family, and she and her children were maintained by the master. The very circumstance of her having children, while it lessened the value of her services, increased the expense of the employer. Hence, to make a compensation to him for the money originally paid for the wife, and for the expense and trouble which she and her children had since cost him, they were retained in his service on the departure of the husband. But how long were they to be retained? The text indeed says "they shall be her masters;" but, as we have already seen no Hebrew could possibly be a chattel, the expression can mean no more than that the wife's children shall continue servants. But the law is explicit that no Hebrew servant, man or *woman*, (*Deut.* xv, 12,) shall be compelled to serve more than six years. Hence the necessary inference is, that the wife with her children shall serve out the usual legal term of six years. As the wife married during her husband's term, she of course entered her master's service *after* its commencement. Hence it was, for the reasons stated, only equitable that she should complete her term, and serve six years from her marriage. It is not to be supposed that a similar term of service was exacted of each child, for, in that case, a mother might be separated from her infants—a cruelty utterly at variance with the humanity of the Mosaic laws of servitude.

There was one remarkable exception to the general law limiting service to six years—an exception throwing much light on the relation of master and servant in the Jewish commonwealth, and evincing the extreme jealousy with which the law watched over the personal freedom of the poor and friendless.

In immediate connection with the law authorizing the master to retain the wife and children, we have the following enactment: "If the servant shall plainly say, *I love my master*, my wife and my children, I will not go out free, then his master shall bring him unto the judges: he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the door-post, and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl, and he shall serve him forever."—*Ex.* xxi, 5, 6. From this law are derived several very important inferences:

1. It follows, that the master had no power of separating families, no selling of wives and children. Under the peculiar circumstances already mentioned, the master had the right of retaining the wife and children in his service for a limited time. But then the father and husband had the privilege, on certain conditions, of remaining with them. Now, these conditions, and the ceremony which sanctioned them, would have been utterly idle and useless, if the master could the next day sell the wife and children. It irresistibly follows, that neither the wife nor children could be sold by the master.

2. The next inference is, that the relation of master and servant was such, that the law takes for granted that servants would often love their masters, and desire to remain permanently in their service. Hence the law is founded on the presumed affection of a servant for his master. In the law quoted, the servant is supposed to say, "I love my master, *my wife and my children*, I will not go out free." Here love for wife and children are united with love for the master, in determining the servant to remain in service; and hence the law seems to be limited to the case of a man with wife and children. But the limitation is merely apparent, and we have in this place only the application of a general law to a particular case. The general law we have in *Deut.* xv, 12—17: "If thy brother, an Hebrew man, or an Hebrew *woman*, be sold unto thee, and serve thee six years, then in the seventh year thou shalt let him go free from thee. And it shall be, if he say unto thee, I will not go away from thee, *because he loveth thee and thine house*, because he is well with thee, then thou shalt take an awl, and thrust it through his ear unto the door, and he shall be thy servant forever. And also unto thy *maid-servant* thou shalt do likewise."

Thus every single servant, man or woman, as well as the married man having children, had the privilege of remaining in the service of the master, and being maintained by him, and this without his consent—a privilege which the law presumes the servant may exercise from the attachment he bears to his master and family, and from a sense of the kindness and comforts he had enjoyed. There is no reason to suppose that any other code of laws ever granted to servants such a privilege from such expectations.

It is not probable that where a servant thus forced himself on a master, and exacted a maintenance, without regard to the wants and convenience of the latter, he was entitled to wages. Yet we can readily understand, that in a state of society so inartificial as that of the Jews, one in which the population was crowded, but in which the field for enterprise and industry was exceedingly limited, it might be a great and precious privilege for a poor man to be incorporated in a kind, worthy, and affluent family, as a domestic, even without wages, but secure of humane treatment and sufficient food and raiment, and especially as he was intimately acquainted with the family, having lived six years in it, and now of his free choice made it his home and asylum.

3. We may infer from this law the extreme care with which personal liberty was guarded. The servant, at the end of his term, was to have the choice of leaving or remaining with his master, while the master was to have no choice in dismissing or retaining him; but the very privilege accorded to the servant might be used as a pretext for retaining him against his will. At that age, and among the Jewish people, the art of writing was probably confined to very few. Hence, certain ceremonies were substituted for written contracts. Thus we find, in *Ruth* iv, 7, 8, the kinsman of Boaz assigning to the latter all his pre-emption right and title to the land left by Elimelech. Instead of giving to Boaz a quit-claim deed, signed, sealed, and acknowledged, the kinsman says, before witnesses, "Buy it for thee. So he drew off his shoe." The transaction is thus explained by the historian: "Now, this was the manner in former times in Israel, concerning redeeming and changing; for to confirm all things a man plucked off his shoe and gave it to his neighbor; and this was a testimony in Israel." So Boaz, when he had received his kinsman's shoe, "said unto the elders and all the people, Ye are witnesses this day that I have bought all that was Elimelech's."

The servant who decided to remain in his master's service entered into no written contract or obligation to that effect. Of course, the master had no written evidence that the servant was freely retained. Yet had a verbal consent on the part of the servant been sufficient, the master, if so disposed, might have pretended that such a consent had been given, and a poor, friendless man might have been forcibly and most wickedly kept in servitude. The humane and provident provisions of this law made the free consent of the servant a matter of public notoriety, and respecting which no question could arise. On the servant announcing his intention to remain, "the master shall bring him unto the judges"—that is, both are to appear in open court, and there the servant is to acknowledge his desire and intention to remain in his master's service. But more than this: he shall submit to receive a permanent mark in his person, indelibly testifying that he acted freely, and not by compulsion. After having made his declaration in court, his master shall bring him "to the door or unto the door-post, (probably the court-house door,) and bore his ear through with an awl." These precautions and this peculiar ceremony guarded at once the rights of both servant and master. It was impossible for the master to claim the services of the other after six years, against his consent; and it was impossible for the servant to claim exemption from service, and the liberty of leaving his master at pleasure, while the hole in the ear bore witness of his formal public engagement to remain.

4. Another important inference from this law is, that the servant could not be sold. The servant voluntarily chooses to remain with his master, because he *loves* him and his house, and *is well* with him. The law accords him, under certain conditions, the privilege of staying with his master. Now, the object of the servant and the whole purport of the law would be frustrated, could the servant be immediately sent to market and sold to another.

There still remains an important inquiry as to the meaning of the last clause of this law: "And he shall be thy servant FOREVER."—*Deut.* xv, 17. The word forever, as applied to the service of one man for another, is of course used in a limited sense. The most natural inference would be, that it is here equivalent to the phrase "during life." But as the inducement of the service was love for the master—which, of course, would cease with his death—and as the breaking up of the family would probably follow the decease of its head, and as the servant could not be sold, we might without violence construe "forever" to mean that the servant shall serve the master as long as they both shall live. Yet there are serious difficulties in giving even this extended meaning to the term. In the first place, such a construction would often conflict with the positive law giving liberty to all the inhabitants of the land at the Jubilee; and, secondly, it would frequently operate injuriously to both servant and master. It will be remembered that the servant, after serving six years, became entitled to claim from his master a continued maintenance for continued service, whether his master wanted him or not. This was intended as a benevolent provision for the poor servant. But this same poor servant, if a Hebrew, became at the Jubilee, if he survived his father, a freeholder, vested with his share of the landed inheritance belonging to his family. Why, then, should he be compelled to serve, when he might have land and a home of his own? And why should a master be compelled to maintain a servant, now perhaps old and incapable of labor, when that servant was no longer an object of charity? It is more congenial with the whole spirit of Jewish legislation, as well as with the positive ordinance of the Jubilee, to understand the "forever" as henceforth, for the future, regardless of the six years' statute of limitation. The servant is to serve the master without any farther contract; he is to serve him continually, without intermission, till released, with all other servants in the land, at the Jubilee. There can scarcely be a doubt that this is the true meaning of the law, and especially as this was the meaning which the Jews themselves attached to it. Josephus tells us that the servant who chose to remain with his master was "set free only at the coming of the Jubilee, which is the fiftieth year."—Book iv, ch. 8.

TREATMENT OF HEBREW SERVANTS.

In *Lev.* xxv, 39—43, we find the following injunctions: "If thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor and be sold unto thee, (sell himself,) thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bondman, (servant,) but as a hired servant; and as a sojourner he shall be unto thee, and shall serve thee unto the year of Jubilee, and then shall he depart from thee, both he and his children with him, and shall return unto his own family, and unto the possession of his fathers shall he return; for they are my servants which I brought out of the land of Egypt; they shall not be sold as bondmen (servants.) Thou shalt not rule over him with rigor, but shalt fear thy God."

This reference to the Jubilee has already been explained. The law now under consideration is given *in connection* with the establishment of the institution of the year of release. The general law limiting service to six years is here *accommodated* to the Jubilee; when the six years would extend beyond the year of Jubilee, then the service is to terminate at that year.

We find in this law some general principles laid down, which were to influence the conscience of the master, not specific enactments controlling his conduct: "Thou shalt not compel him to serve as a servant"—"they shall not be sold as servants." What are we to understand by these expressions? and how are such declarations to be reconciled with the various legal provisions made respecting the sale of Hebrews *as servants*, and with the fact that Hebrew *servants* are spoken of so frequently in the books of Moses? The translators, not understanding the *spirit* of the prohibition to compel a Hebrew to serve *as a servant*, and of Hebrews being sold *as servants*, so apparently at variance with the whole code of servitude, thought proper to substitute bondman and bondmen for servant and servants; thus conveying the idea that although Hebrews might be servants, *they* might not be *slaves*. The command, "Thou shalt not compel him to serve *as* a servant," is explained by the next clause of the sentence: "But as a *hired servant* and as a *sojourner* shall he be unto thee." In other words, although he is your servant, and is bound to obey your orders and to perform any labor you may require of him, still you are morally bound to treat him with kindness and consideration. A hired servant is one who contracts to do a specific work for pay, and he is not bound ordinarily to do any and every kind of work. Now, be considerate to your servant, and, instead of exercising an arbitrary authority over him, behave towards him with the same forbearance and moderation you would show to a hired servant, whose wages you must pay at night, and who will not return to you in the morning if you treat him ill. Instead of treating your servant as a servant—as one who has no will of his own, and to whose feelings you pay no regard—treat him as a sojourner in your family, as he really is; and do you try to make him comfortable and happy. Such is the true meaning of the injunction not to treat an obed *as* an obed; and it explains the declaration, "They were my servants which I brought out of the land of Egypt; *they shall not be sold as servants*." This is not a prediction, for many Jews have been sold among their conquerors; nor is it a prohibition of Jews selling themselves as servants, for this the law most explicitly allowed. It is a mere repetition of the rule just quoted, enforced by the consideration of the favor shown to the Jews by God himself. The whole spirit of the rule is comprised in the precept, "Thou shalt not rule over him with rigor, but shall fear thy God." To rule with rigor is an indefinite expression, and the language, instead of being defined by law, is left to be interpreted and applied in the fear of God, by each master for himself.

Such are the great moral rules given by the Mosaic law with regard to the treatment of domestic servants. The benevolence which dictated these rules is farther displayed in the manner in which masters are required to dismiss their servants on the expiration of their six years' service: "When thou sendest him out free from thee, thou shalt not let him go away empty; thou shalt furnish him liberally out of thy flock, and out of thy floor, and out of thy wine press." Here, again, is an injunction addressed to the *conscience* of the master. He is to make a *liberal* present to his departing servant, of meat, and grain, and wine; but how much of each is left to his own sense of duty. The injunction is intended to excite a kind interest in the future welfare of the servant, while the amount of the gifts to be made to him are very properly to be governed by circumstances, and not by positive law.

FAMILIAR INTERCOURSE BETWEEN MASTERS AND SERVANTS.

We have already seen that the six-year domestics were incorporated into their master's family. Hence the servant of a priest might eat holy flesh, a privilege denied to the *married* daughter of the priest himself. So the servant eat the Passover with his master, which a friend or lodger in the house could not do. All this proves that the servant was considered a member of the family. As such, he united with the family in its religious social rites. Of course, all the men servants went up to Jerusalem three times a year, with their masters, to observe the ritual solemnities.—*Ex.* xxiii, 17. The feast of Weeks was a national festival, held at Jerusalem, and the command respecting it is, "Thou shalt rejoice before the Lord thy God, thou and thy son and thy daughter, and thy man servant and thy maid servant."—*Deut.* xvi, 11. So also at the feast of Tabernacles: "Thou shalt rejoice in thy feast, thou and thy son and thy daughter, and thy man servant and thy maid servant."—*Deut.* xvi. 14.

Not only were the servants partakers of the great annual feasts, but they were also partakers of the ordinary feasts which followed the sacrifices. Thus: "There shall be a place which the Lord your God shall choose, to cause his name to dwell there; thither shall ye bring all that I command you: your burnt offerings and your sacrifices, your tithes, and the heave-offering of your hand, and all your choice vows which ye vow unto the Lord; and shall rejoice before the Lord your God, ye and your sons and your daughters, and your men servants and your maid servants."—*Deut.* xii, 11, 12.

We have already seen that the law contemplated that the master and his sons might intermarry with the maid servants, and that it guards these women from becoming the victims of fraud. Not only did sons of the family marry maid servants, but masters gave their daughters to men servants. Thus we learn, incidentally, that Sheshan gave his daughter to his servant for wife, and that this servant was a stranger, an Egyptian.—*I Chr.* ii, 34. We find Samuel, then at the head of the Jewish Commonwealth, giving a select dinner party, as it would seem, in honor of Saul, and bringing Saul *and his servant* into the parlor, and making them "sit in the chiefest place among them that were bidden, which were about thirty persons."—*I Sam.* ix, 22. Now, this servant was not an officer, but a menial, in the family of Kish, and was engaged with Saul in looking for his master's asses. In these various cases of social familiarity with servants, we find an illustration and explanation of the apparently paradoxical rule we have before considered, of not treating a servant *as* a servant.

LEGAL PROTECTION AFFORDED TO SERVANTS.

Where the intercourse between masters and servants was of the character we have described, the treatment of the latter must ordinarily have been kind and tolerant. The murder of a servant, like that of any other person, was punished with death.—*Lev.* xxiv, 17. There was, however, a hypothetical case of the homicide of a servant, in which by law the master was to be acquitted of a murderous intent: "If a man smite his servant or his maid with a *rod*, and he die under his hand, he shall surely be punished, (that is, with death;) notwithstanding if he continue a day or two he shall not be punished, (put to death,) for he is his money."—*Ex.* xxi, 20, 21.

As the master had paid the wages of his servant in advance, the presumption in law is, that he did not intend to kill him, and thereby inflict a pecuniary loss on himself. But this presumption is rebutted if the master continues the beating till the servant expires, dies "under his hand." In this case the master is a murderer, and must himself die the death. But the presumption revives, and shall in law be equivalent to proof, if the beating is with a *rod*, and not a deadly instrument, and if the servant survives for a day or two, that the master did not intend to take the life of his servant, for had he intended to so he would probably have taken a more efficient instrument, and would have continued its use till his object was accomplished. The phrase, "he shall not be punished," can only mean not as a murderer; for when the master was to be severely punished for knocking out his servant's tooth, it would be preposterous to suppose that he might with impunity beat him so cruelly as to cause his death.

The Jewish law went farther, probably, than any other has ever gone in punishing offences against the person. The principle of the law on this subject was, "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe."—*Ex.* xxi, 24, 25. Hence, "If a man cause a blemish in his neighbor, as he hath done so shall it be done unto him—breach for breach, eye for eye, tooth for tooth; as he hath caused a blemish in a man, so shall it be done unto him again."—*Lev.* xxiv, 19, 20. We can readily believe that masters subject to such a law would be exceedingly careful how they "caused a blemish" in a servant. By this law a servant had the same protection against outrage as his master himself. But a still farther protection was afforded him by another law: "If a man smite the eye of his servant, or the eye of his maid, that it perish, he shall let him go free for his eye's sake: and if he smite out his man-servant's tooth, or his maid-servant's tooth, he shall let him go free for his tooth's sake."—*Ex.* xxi, 26, 27. Thus, while public justice was avenged in causing the master to lose an eye or a tooth, the servant was in a greater or less degree compensated by the recovery of his freedom, without restoring any portion of the wages he had received for the whole term.

MASTERS NOT AUTHORIZED TO BEAT THEIR SERVANTS.

No power is given in the law to a master to chastise his servant, nor is there a hint given that any such right was claimed and exercised. The law, indeed, supposes that masters might beat and murder servants as well as other men, and provides for their punishment, but it nowhere intimates that a master may lawfully beat his servant, however moderately. Indeed, where courts of justice were expressly restrained from awarding more stripes than forty as a punishment for crime, (*Deut.* xxv, 3,) it cannot be supposed that Jewish masters were permitted to wield the scourge at pleasure.

SERVANTS MIGHT ACQUIRE AND HOLD PROPERTY.

No law prevented the servant from acquiring and holding property. We have seen him authorized to redeem himself, to vacate his contract with his master for the remainder of his term if he be able, "out of the money that he was bought for," out of the wages he had received in advance, by paying back an equitable portion of the money for the unexpired term. When Saul was at a loss for a present to Samuel, his servant offered him money for the purpose.—*I Sam.* ix, 8. The servant had money in his pocket, which was more than his young master had. Gehazi, servant to Elisha, fraudulently obtained considerable money, no attempt was made to take the money from him, nor does the narrative contain the slightest intimation, that, being a servant, the money belonged to his master. The fact that Ziba, the servant of Saul, had himself twenty servants, proves conclusively that obed does not mean slave; but it does not prove that domestic servants were capable of holding property, as there is no reason for believing that *he* was a domestic—he seems rather to have been a land agent. Still, the right of domestics to property is beyond a doubt, and the allusion we have quoted to the money he had received from his master, and his right to use it for his own redemption, settles the point.

RELIGIOUS RIGHTS OF SERVANTS.

To the privileges granted by the Mosaic law to the six years' servant is still to be added, the regard paid to his religious rights. On the subject of religious observances he appears to have been placed on an entire equality with his master. Not only was every seventh day abstracted from labor, but twenty-two days were to be spent at Jerusalem during the three national festivals, together with a few other days of religious solemnities, in which no work was to be done; and to these days of leisure are to be added the time spent in travelling to and from Jerusalem three times a year. It is remarkable, that although the women were not required to attend the national festivals, yet Moses, speaking of the two feasts of Weeks and of Tabernacles, says of each, "Thou shalt rejoice in thy feast, thou and thy son and thy daughter, thy man servant and thy maid servant."—*Deut.* xvi, 11, 14. This language, although never understood as commanding the attendance of the women, certainly permits and recommends it.

DOMESTIC SERVANTS NOT PERMITTED TO DISSOLVE THEIR CONTRACT EXCEPT BY REDEMPTION.

Before dismissing the subject of Hebrew domestics, it may be well to notice a mistake into which some Anti-Slavery writers have fallen. The law, as we have seen, pointed out a method in which the servant might at any time dissolve his contract for six years' service. He might redeem himself by paying back to his master, "out of the money that he was bought for," an equitable portion of the wages he had received, in proportion to the unexpired term for which he had bound himself. If he had not the money, any relation or friend might advance it for him, and then he went out free.—*Lev.* xxv, 48—50. Hence we find, in Nehemiah, certain of the returned Jews complaining of their poverty, and stating, as a grievance resulting from it, that they brought into bondage (service) their sons and daughters, "neither is it *in our power to redeem them*, for other men have our lands and vineyards."—*Neh.* v. 5.

The writers alluded to, overlooking this wise, just, and merciful provision, have supposed that the servant might at pleasure abscond from his master, without paying back the unearned wages he had received. This opinion is founded on *Deut.* xxiii, 15: "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee. He shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best; thou shalt not oppress him." If this law applied to the six years' servants, then it in fact nullified and destroyed the most merciful and blessed system of domestic servitude the world has ever known. A poor man hires, in Scripture language, sells himself, for six years as a servant, and receives down his wages for the whole term. The next day, with the money in his pocket, he leaves his employer, and with perfect impunity resides where he pleases, enjoying the fruit of his fraud and breach of faith? It is impossible to suppose that God ever made a law so inconsistent with justice and fair dealing, and so destructive to the very system he had established; for who, under such a law, would pay wages in advance? We find that two of Shemer's servants absconded, and took shelter in the family of the King of Gath, and that they were pursued and recovered by their master. But why did they seek refuge among the Philistines if they would have been safe from recapture in any house in Jerusalem? It is moreover obvious that this supposed law is in palpable contradiction to the law of redemption. Why was the servant to redeem himself by paying back a portion of the money he had received, if he might legally redeem himself without cost, by merely running away?

The passage in Deuteronomy is wholly insulated, having no connection with what precedes or follows it, and hence no light is thrown on it from the context. In *Deut.* xxii, 1, we have a law of an opposite character: "Thou shalt not see thy brother's ox or his sheep go astray, and hide thyself from them; thou shalt in any case bring them again unto thy brother." The escaped brute must be restored, but not the escaped MAN. These two laws utterly repudiate the idea of the divine sanction of property in MAN. But who is the *escaped* man? The term *escaped* here implies a deliverance from involuntary servitude, not a breach of a voluntary contract. If this law applied to Hebrew servants, then they had a legal right to leave their masters, and a legal departure can hardly be called an escape. The law is obscurely expressed. To whom is it addressed? What is meant by "he shall dwell with *thee*?" "Thou shalt not oppress him." To whom is this injunction given? There can be little doubt that the Jewish State, or Commonwealth, is the party addressed. It is the Government, not every individual citizen, that is forbidden to surrender the fugitive, or to oppress him, and is required to *permit* him to live unmolested where he pleases. This construction is strengthened by the expression, escaped "unto *thee*." Fugitive servants do not ordinarily escape *to* an individual, but to another land or people. On the whole, the most natural interpretation of this law, and the one most consistent with the voluntary character of Jewish servitude, is, that it is a statute relating to servants in foreign lands, who escape from their masters into Judea. There is not a particle of evidence that in the time of Moses there was a single chattel slave in all Syria; and admitting that the escaped servant was a servant by contract, still it was a case over which the Jewish magistrates had no jurisdiction. They were not bound to enforce contracts made between citizens of foreign countries, any more than we are to surrender an English apprentice who escapes to us. The fugitive servant who settled in Judea, of course, renounced idolatry, and embraced the worship of the true God. Hence the cheerful hospitality with which he was to be received, and the prohibition to oppress him.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

LETTER FROM CINCINNATI.

The Ohio State Election — The Temperance Question—Agricultural Fairs—Annual Meeting of the American Board.

CINCINNATI, *Oct.* 20, 1853.

To the Editor of the National Era:

The election in this State on the 11th inst. has resulted in the success of the Democratic party by large majorities. The returns thus far received indicate that the majority for Medill for Governor, over Barrere, will be at least 30,000, and probably more; and for Bartley for Supreme Judge, and the other candidates on the Democratic ticket, the majorities will be nearly as large. There was no election for members of Congress this year, and there was little interest felt among the mass of the people, scarcely any excitement, and not by any means a full vote polled.

The Maine Law question has been the principal one entering into the canvass, and in many of the counties candidates for the Legislature were voted for favorable to the passage of a prohibitory law, similar in principle, if not in all its details, to the Maine Law. In this city and county the Temperance party had its ticket, which was supported by the Free-Soilers and many of the Whigs. Much effort was made to rally all the strength possible to its support, and numerous excellent and enthusiastic Temperance meetings have been held, which have had their *moral* influence, and will not be without their results in strengthening and correcting public sentiment on the subject, whatever may be the fate of the present movement for a prohibitory law.

This section of the State is decidedly the most difficult field for the triumph of the Temperance cause; the drinking customs and the numerous drinking-shops of a large city, and the many distilleries in the country around it, present the most formidable obstacles to its success. In the northern part the cause is stronger, and some Maine Law candidates have been elected. There is no probability that a prohibitory law will be passed by the next Legislature, but the agitation of the subject among the people must have a beginning, the public opinion enlightened and emboldened and concentrated, and the next year, or the year after, the law will be passed. Sooner or later, as surely as the years roll around, and truth and light spread, will this righteous object be reached. Let no friend of Temperance despair on account of the failure of present efforts. The cause is too good an one to go backward, and it needs only perseverance, patience, and unwavering faith in the triumph of its principles, to bring about, in a few years, the realization of our fondest hopes.

If the political world is comparatively tranquil, the people of the West have been more deeply interested than heretofore in more peaceful and profitable pursuits. The State and county agricultural fairs have excited more than usual interest, and the attendance at the exhibitions shows that the mechanical arts and agriculture are receiving greater attention, and assuming the position they ought to occupy. A month since, the fourth annual State fair of Ohio was held at Dayton; since that, the Kentucky State fair has been held at Lexington; the Indiana State fair, at Lafayette; and a great Southwestern fair at or near Louisville. The last named, which took place last week, must have been a grand affair, according to the accounts given of it in the Louisville papers. The show of blood horses must have been fine, the most celebrated horses in Kentucky having been entered as competitors for prizes. At the same time, the first fair of the Louisville Mechanics' Institute was held in the city, which, by the accounts, must have been highly creditable to those contributing, and, for a first effort at a mechanical exhibition, rather better than was expected. Both these fairs have excited great interest, and the weather being pleasant, the week has been described as a gala day to the people of Louisville. She is certainly advancing in the mechanic arts, and in every branch of industry; and in the number of new buildings going on, and her commerce, is giving signs of renewed prosperity. Louisville is not as deeply involved in Slavery as the more Southern cities, and being well situated for both commerce and manufactures, and many of her business men from the North, she may become eminent for the extent of both departments of trade. At every evidence of her substantial prosperity, men of all sections should rejoice.

The session of the American Board of Foreign Missions, held here the first week in this month, was a meeting of much interest and importance. The Board assembled on the 4th inst., and adjourned on the 7th. This was its 44th annual meeting, but the first one held in this city, or in the West. The attendance from the East was much better than from the West, which was owing to the fact that the Board has always excited the most interest and received its largest pecuniary support from the churches of the East—the single State of Massachusetts contributing to its funds annually more than all the churches in sympathy with it west of the Alleghenies.

This Association was organized in Connecticut in 1810. The first missionaries who embarked for the East, under the appointment and protection of the Board, sailed from our shores in 1812. They were Messrs. Newell, Judson, Nott, Rice, and Hall, who settled at Bombay, Serampore, and Ceylon. Such was the feeble beginning of a system of missionary enterprise that has now extended itself over millions of the heathen, and taken such deep root that its salutary influence is felt and recognised in every land where its missions have been established. The annual revenue of the Board is something over $300,000; its mission stations number 156; the whole number of persons in their employ is 647, which includes preachers, physicians, native assistants, &c. There are 11 printing establishments, which have circulated 922,595,924 pages of religious and missionary matter; 94 churches; 810 schools of every grade, containing 23,564 students and pupils.

The Board has taken deep root in the affections of the churches who support it, and is steadily advancing in strength and influence at home and abroad. The meetings here were attended by crowded audiences, and the reports of the Secretaries, as well as the addresses of returned missionaries, of whom there were a dozen present, were listened to with deep interest. With all the fault we may find with the policy of the Board in regard to Slavery in the Indian missions it is a noble institution, and has accomplished a vast amount of good. May the circle of its influence extend through many years to come!

We have genuine Indian summer, October weather, just now. The air just cool enough to be pleasant, dry, smoky, but invigorating. The river is very low; coal, flour, and provisions, generally high; and every one longing for a good rain and high water. I have a number of items of interest which I shall give your readers next week. Yours, P.

PATENTS.

Z. C. ROBBINS, Attorney for Procuring and Defending Patents, Washington, D. C., makes Examinations at the Patent Office, prepares Drawings and Papers for Applicants for Patents, and can be consulted on all matters relating to the Patent Laws and decisions in this and other countries. He also continues to devote especial attention to arguing *rejected* applications before the Commissioner of Patents, in which line of practice he has succeeded in procuring a great number of valuable patents. His fee for an examination at the Patent Office is five dollars; for other services the charge will be reasonable. Reference can be made to members of Congress, or to those for whom Mr. R. has transacted business during the past nine years. Aug. 25—eow

ANTI-SLAVERY WORKS FOR SALE AT THIS OFFICE, BY LEWIS CLEPHANE.

Life of Isaac T. Hopper—price $1.25, postage 21 cents.
Uncle Tom's Cabin—price 37½ cents, postage 12 cents; five copies for $2, postage paid.
Uncle Tom's Cabin in German—price 50 cents, postage 15 cents.
Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin—price 50 cents, postage 16 cents.
White Slavery in the Barbary States, by Hon. Charles Sumner—price 50 cents, postage 12 cents.
Giddings's Speeches, one volume 12mo—price $1, postage 25 cents.
Goodell's American Slave Code—price 75 cents, postage 18 cents.
Manuel Pereira—price in cloth 75 cents, postage 12 cents; in paper 50 cents, postage 10 cents.
Address LEWIS CLEPHANE, National Era Office.

ONE THOUSAND BOOK AGENTS WANTED, *To sell Pictorial and Useful Works for the Year 1854.*

1,000 DOLLARS A YEAR.

WANTED, in every county of the United States active and enterprising men, to engage in the sale of some of the best books published in the country. To men of good address, possessing a small capital of from $25 to $100, such inducements will be offered as to enable them to make from $3 to $5 a day profit.

☞ The books published by us are all useful in their character, extremely popular, and command large sales wherever they are offered.

For further particulars, address, postage paid, ROBERT SEARS, Publisher, 181 William street, New York.
Oct. 20—4t

GEO. W. NEWCOMB, *Attorney and Counsellor at Law, Chicago, Ill.*

WILL pay particular attention to collecting business in Chicago and vicinity. Oct. 20.

FREE PRODUCE STORE.

A LARGE assortment of Dry Goods and Groceries, free from the stain of Slavery, for sale by EZRA TOWNE, Agent, 207 Fulton street, New York.
Oct. 13—7t

WHITE SLAVERY IN THE BARBARY STATES,

BY HON. CHARLES SUMNER. With 40 splendid illustrations by Billings, engraved by Baker & Smith. It makes a beautiful 16mo volume of about 140 pages, bound in cloth, thin boards, printed in the most elegant style, on the best paper.

THE ARGUMENT.

Introduction. Territory of the Barbary States. The Subject and Sources of Information.

I. *Origin of Slavery.* Slavery in the Barbary States.

II. *History of White Slavery in Barbary;* Early Efforts against it—by Ferdinand the Catholic, by Charles V, by England, by France, by Holland; Freedom by *Redemption;* Freedom by *Conspiracy;* Freedom by *Escape;* White American Victims to Barbary; Parallel between White and Black Slavery; Triumphant Abolition of White Slavery.

III. *True Character of White Slavery in Barbary,* Apologies for White Slavery; Happy Condition of the White Slaves; Better off in Barbary than at Home; Better off than the Free Christians in Barbary; Nevertheless, Unquestionable Enormity of White Slavery in Barbary. Conclusion. Price 50 cts.; postage 12 cts.

For sale by LEWIS CLEPHANE, Office National Era.
March 31.

TEN THOUSAND COPIES IN THREE WEEKS!

MRS. CHILD'S Great Work, a True Life of the IMMORTAL HOPPER, the American Howard Five thousand copies of this thrilling work were sold in two weeks. The second five thousand copies are now ready. It is a book which should be read by every American. Published by JOHN P. JEWETT & CO., Boston, JEWETT, PROCTOR, & WORTHINGTON, Cleveland, Ohio, And for sale by all Booksellers. Oct. 13—3t

AGENTS WANTED.

THE subscriber is now publishing a Splendid Steel Engraving of the Lord's Prayer, which is meeting with a large sale. The business offers rare inducements to active and energetic men, as there is no competition, and pays a profit of 100 per cent. A small cash capital only required. Apply, by letter or otherwise, to GEORGE W. FRANK, No. 25 Courtlandt street, New York.

Among the many testimonials which the publisher has received in its favor, he subjoins the following from the Rev. J. C. Lord, D. D., of Buffalo, N. Y.:

"I have examined the beautiful steel plate engraving of the Lord's Prayer, and think it superior to anything I have ever seen, and well worthy the patronage of the Christian public. J. C. LORD."
Oct. 13.

IMPORTANT TO YOUNG MEN.

I OFFER for sale upwards of thirty different Receipts, many of which have been sold the past year for five dollars a-piece, and the whole comprising so many different ways to make money. In the sale of one of the articles alone, I have known young men the past year to make from five to twelve dollars per day; and in the manufacture and sale of any one of the articles, no young man of energy and ability can fail to make money. Address E. BOWMAN, Boston Mass., enclosing one dollar, and the whole number of Receipts will be forwarded by mail. No letter taken from the office unless prepaid. June 16.

WEEKLY EVENING POST.

PROSPECTUS.

TO add to the interest and usefulness of the Evening Post, we have enlarged it by an addition of an equivalent to about four additional columns. The Weekly and the Semi-Weekly editions were enlarged twelve columns only about three years ago. Four more columns added now increases the sheet to double the size of the paper on which they were originally printed.

In announcing this enlargement, which, we may be permitted to say, is one of the results of the growing confidence of the commercial and industrial interests of the country in the course of the Evening Post, it is our duty to make our especial acknowledgements to those numerous friends, both personal and political, who, through evil report and through good report, have cheered us with their generous countenance and given us annually recurring proofs of their esteem and attachment, uninfluenced by the fluctuations of party opinion or the smiles and frowns of men in power, which too often seduce or frighten men from the course their consciences approve—the manly assertion of truth and the steady resistance of error. We take fresh courage from our success thus far, and from their friendly co operation, to persevere in the path which we have deliberately chosen, and they have as deliberately approved.

We avail ourselves of this occasion to congratulate our readers upon the arrangement which we have been so fortunate as to make with Colonel Benton for the publication of a series of articles from his "Thirty Years in the United States Senate," which will be continued through the year and until the work shall be published, some time in 1854.

We are also in negotiation for a series of private papers and reminiscences of another eminent democratic statesman, which we hope to bring out in the course of a few weeks.

TERMS OF THE WEEKLY EVENING POST.

Single copy, one year, 52 numbers,	$2.00
Three copies, one year, 52 numbers,	5.00
Five copies, one year, 52 numbers,	8.00
Ten copies, one year, 52 numbers,	12.00
Twenty copies, one year, to one address,	20.00

Subscriptions may commence at any time. Payment in advance is required in all cases, and the paper is invariably discontinued at the expiration of the advance payment.

Persons who sent in their subscriptions before the enlargement will receive the paper at the old rate for the year. New subscribers sending us one dollar will receive the paper for six months.

Money may be remitted for subscriptions in letters at our risk; but the postmaster at the place where the letter is mailed should be made acquainted with its contents, and keep a description of the bills.

Bills of any specie-paying bank in the United States or Canadas received at par for subscriptions.

We have no travelling agents. Any one wishing to receive the Evening Post need not wait to be called on for his subscription. All that is necessary for him to do is to write a letter in as few words as possible, enclose the money, and write the name of the subscriber, with the postoffice, county, and State, and direct the letter to WILLIAM C. BRYANT & CO., Evening Post Office, New York.

THE SEMI-WEEKLY.

Persons residing at points where mails arrive oftener than once a week are requested to examine the Semi-Weekly. We regard it as the cheapest political newspaper published in the United States.

TERMS.

Single copy, one year	$3.00
Two copies, one year	5.00
Five copies, one year	12.00
Ten copies, one year	20.00

EVENING POST, DAILY.

This paper is published at three o'clock precisely, and contains the latest news received in the city of New York up to half-past 2 P. M., by railroad, steamboat, or telegraph, from all quarters of the globe. It also gives the transactions at the stock board, and the condition of the money market on the day of its publication, together with the usual matters of interest to general readers. The Evening Post is one of the official papers of the city of New York, and its daily edition contains the official reports of the proceedings of the Boards of Aldermen of the city, when in session. The subscription price is $9.00, if paid in advance, or $10.00, if paid at the end of the year.

The style of the firm, in the name of which all business is transacted, and the address for all communications designed for the proprietors or editors, is, WILLIAM C. BRYANT & CO., Corner of Nassau and Liberty sts.

P. S. Correspondence containing news is respectfully solicited from all quarters, and if used will be paid for.

Matter intended for the paper should be written plainly, and only on one side of the sheet. Aug. 25.

NO HUMBUG NOR CHANCE.

A SURE GAIN!—Full authority and ability to prosecute a business that can be made to yield at least $20 per week, will be sent to any one who will enclose 25 cents in P. O. stamps, post paid, to J. CLAY PARKER, Hagerstown, Md. This is no soap humbug, nor the like take-in so common, but is connected with a literary discovery of the utmost value. Oct. 27.

CARD.

ISAAC ROBERTS, Dealer in Real Estate. Office, No. 1 Union Buildings, Norristown, Pennsylvania; and No. 7 Walnut street, Philadelphia. Feb. 3—1y

THE LITTLE PILGRIM.

A Monthly Journal for Girls and Boys.

EDITED BY GRACE GREENWOOD.

A PAPER, under the above title, will be published at Philadelphia on the first day of October next. In size and general character, this publication will resemble Mrs. Margaret L. Bailey's lately discontinued *Friend of Youth*, the place of which it is designed to take.

Terms.—Fifty cents a year, for single copies; or ten copies for four dollars. Payment invariably in advance.

All subscriptions and communications to be addressed to L. K. LIPPINCOTT, Philadelphia.

PROSPECTUS.

THE BOOK OF BOOKS, IN SEPARATE VOLUMES.

THE first volume of the first, simplest, and cheapest edition of the Divine Library—or, Cyclopedia of Inspiration—will be put to press as early as the encouragement, received by subscriptions, will allow.

This will be the Book of GENESIS, containing the Sacred Text, and as complete an Appendix as can be afforded for the price.

The price will be 50 cents, in stiff paper binding, suitable for mailing. Other copies, according to binding.

Persons favorable to the plan are requested to subscribe for this first volume. It is expected that they will be so much pleased with it as to desire its successors; but there will be no obligation beyond the single volume. Succeeding volumes will vary in price, according to their number of pages—no one costing more than the first; some of them, perhaps, not more than half as much.

Subscribers will be informed, by Circular, of the readiness of the volume for distribution; and be promptly supplied, on reception of payment.

Address (as early as practicable) T. H. STOCKTON, 68 Lexington st., Baltimore, Md.
Oct. 20.

ATTENTION!

SOLDIERS who served in the various wars, and sailors, or their widows or heirs, to whom arrears of pay, extra pay, bounty land, pensions, &c., may be due, may find it to their advantage to have their claims investigated. Address A. M. GANGEWER, Attorney and Agent, Washington, D. C. Bounty-land warrants bought and sold.

THE AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, IN THEORY AND PRACTICE.

ITS Distinctive Features shown by its Statutes, Judicial Decisions, and Illustrative Facts. By William Goodell, author of the "Democracy of Christianity," "Slavery and Anti-Slavery," &c. The work contains 430 pages 12mo, neatly bound in cloth. Price 75 cents per copy, postage 18 cents. For sale by L. CLEPHANE, Office Nat. Era.
June 30.

The following is an extract of a letter from Hon. William Jay to the author:

"Your analysis of the slave laws is very able, and your exhibition of their practical application by the Southern courts evinces great and careful research. Your book is as impregnable against the charge of exaggeration as Euclid's Geometry, since, like that, it consists of propositions and demonstrations. The book is not only true, but it is *unquestionably* true."

MINING AGENCY,

New York, 110 *Broadway*, *Rooms Nos.* 8 *and* 9.

THIS Agency is established for the purchase and sale, on commission, of unimproved Mines and Mining Stock in Companies organized and at work; also, for furnishing all kinds of Machinery and Mining Tools, as ordered; also, the Chemical Analysis of Ores and other substances, as forwarded from any part of the country.

A printed circular, giving full explanations, will be sent in answer to any post-paid letter enclosing one three cent Post Office stamp.

I. R. BARBOUR & CO., No. 110 Broadway, New York.
July 21.

STAR AND ADAMANTINE CANDLES, AND LARD OIL.

LARD OIL of the finest quality, in good shipping order. Star and Adamantine Candles, *full* weight, 16 ounces to the pound. These candles are excellent for all climates, especially California, Brazil, the East and West Indies, and Africa. Orders for any quantity executed promptly.

THOMAS EMERY, Lard Oil and Star Candle Manufacturer, Cincinnati, O.
March 24.

HALLETT, DAVIS, & CO.'S ÆOLIAN AND LEMUEL GILBERT'S BOUDOIR PIANO FORTES.

New York Ware Rooms at T. S. Berry & Co.'s 297 Broadway; Philadelphia Ware Rooms at J. E. Gould & Co.'s, (successors to A. Fiot,) 196 Chestnut street.

BEING determined to offer the public the best Piano Fortes that are manufactured, we have arranged with the above-named Boston manufacturers, to keep constantly on hand at our ware rooms in New York and Philadelphia, in addition to our stock of New York and Philadelphia Pianos, a full and well-selected assortment of their celebrated Pianos.

Messrs. Hallett, Davis, & Co. have been long and favorably known as manufacturers, whose Pianos, for volume, purity, depth and sweetness of tone, and for the great length of time they would stand in tune, could not be excelled. They have recently introduced the "grand patent suspension bridge," which imparts the firmness and volume of tone of the Grand Piano. Their Æolian, having the latest and most improved voicing, is pronounced superior to any other. There is no instrument so desirable for the parlor as their Æolian Piano Forte, combining all the beauty, brilliancy, and soul-touching pathos of the piano and parlor organ.

Of Lemuel Gilbert's Boudoir Pianos it is only necessary to say, that by a series of experiments continued for eight years, he has triumphantly succeeded in making an instrument for small rooms, fully equal to the square piano.

All of the above instruments warranted in the fullest manner. The prices, at either of our ware rooms, the same as at the manufactories in Boston. We will select instruments with or without the Æolian, and forward them to any part of the United States; and if they do not prove satisfactory, they may be returned at our expense, and the purchase money will be refunded.

We are engaged largely in publishing Music and Musical Works of every description, at both New York and Philadelphia; and having purchased the extensive catalogue of Mr. A. Fiot of Philadelphia, and having all the Boston publications, we are prepared to offer better inducements to the trade, and to schools and seminaries, than any other house.

We also keep a large assortment of second-hand Pianos and Melodeons, for rent or sale.

T. S. BERRY & CO., 297 Broadway, N. York.
J. E. GOULD & CO., successors to A. Fiot, 196 Chestnut st., Philadelphia.
March 24—tf

THE GREAT BRITISH QUARTERLIES AND BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE.

Important Reduction in the Rates of Postage!

LEONARD SCOTT & CO., *No.* 54 *Gold street, New York*, continue to publish the following British Periodicals, viz:

The London Quarterly Review (Conservative.)
The Edinburgh Review (Whig.)
The North British Review (Free Church.)
The Westminster Review (Liberal.)
Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine (Tory.)

These Reprints have now been in successful operation in this country for *twenty years*, and their circulation is constantly on the increase, notwithstanding the competition they encounter from American periodicals of a similar class, and of numerous *Eclectics* and Magazines made up of selections from foreign periodicals. This fact shows clearly the high estimation in which they are held by the intelligent reading public, and affords a guarantee that they are established on a firm basis, and will be continued without interruption.

Although these works are distinguished by the political shades above indicated, yet but a small portion of their contents is devoted to political subjects. It is their *literary* character which gives them their chief value, and in that they stand confessedly far above all other journals of their class. *Blackwood*, still under the masterly guidance of Christopher North, maintains its ancient celebrity, and is at this time unusually attractive, from the serial works of Bulwer and other literary notables, written for that Magazine, and first appearing in its columns both in Great Britain and in the United States. Such works as "The Caxtons" and "My New Novel," both by Bulwer; "My Peninsular Medal," "The Green Hand," and other serials, of which numerous rival editions are issued by the leading publishers in this country, have to be reprinted by those publishers from the pages of Blackwood, *after it has been issued by Messrs. Scott & Co.*, so that subscribers to the Reprint of that Magazine may always rely upon having the earliest reading of these fascinating tales.

TERMS.

	Per an.
For any one of the three Reviews	$3
For any two	5
For any three	7
For all four of the Reviews	8
For Blackwood's Magazine	3
For Blackwood and three Reviews	9
For Blackwood and the four Reviews	10
For Farmer's Guide, complete, 22 numbers	5

CLUBBING.—A discount of 25 per cent. from the above prices will be allowed to clubs ordering four or more copies of any one or more of the above works. Thus: four copies of Blackwood or one Review will be sent to one address for $9, four copies of the four Reviews and Blackwood for $30, and so on.

POSTAGE.

To any part of the United States on Blackwood, 24 cents per annum; on either of the Reviews, 14 cents.

Remittances and communications should be always addressed, post paid, to the publishers, LEONARD SCOTT & CO., 79 Fulton st., N. Y., Entrance, 54 Gold street.

N. B.—L. S. & Co. have recently published, and have now for sale, the *Farmer's Guide*, by Henry Stephens, of Edinburgh, and Professor Norton, of Yale College, New Haven, complete in two volumes, royal octavo, containing 1,600 pages, 14 steel and 600 wood engravings. Price, in muslin binding, $6; in paper covers, for the mail, $5. Sep. 29.

NOTICE.

DANIEL R. GOODLOE, Attorney and Counsellor at Law, offers his services to the Public as an Agent for Pension, Bounty Land, and other Claims upon the Federal Government. July 7.

S. S. WILLIAMS,

Attorney and Counsellor at Law, Washington City,

PRACTICES in the Courts of the District of Columbia, and before the Departments of the Government. Office over Banking House of Selden, Withers, & Co. June 30—tf

S. M. PETTENGILL & CO.,

NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING AGENTS, ARE the agents for the *National Era*, and are authorized to receive advertisements and subscriptions for us at the lowest rates. Their receipts are regarded as payments. Their offices are at New York, 122 Nassau street; Boston, 10 State street. June 24