

The Independent.

Entered at the Post-office at New York, as Second-class Mail Matter.

"EVEN AS WE HAVE BEEN APPROVED OF GOD TO BE INTRUSTED WITH THE GOSPEL, SO WE SPEAK; NOT AS PLEASING MEN BUT GOD WHICH PROVETH OUR HEARTS."

VOLUME XLII.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 22, 1890.

NUMBER 2164.

The Independent.

For Table of Contents see Page 10.

THE SLUMBER OF KING SOLOMON.

BY A. MARY F. ROBINSON.

THE house is all of sandal-wood
And boughs of Lebanon,
The chamber is of beaten gold
Where sleeps King Solomon,

With thirty horsemen to the left
And thirty to the right,
Upon their mighty horses set
To guard him from the night.

They watch as silent as the moon,
Drawn sword and gathered rein;
They will not stir till Solomon
Shall rise and move again.

And whiter than their white armor,
Brighter than spear or sword,
Four Angels guard the dreaming King,
Four Angels of the Lord.

Four Angels at the four corners,
And burning over head
The Glory of God, the great glory
That never shall be said.

Sleep well, sleep well, King Solomon,
For He that guardeth thee,
He neither slumbers, nay, nor sleeps,
Through all eternity.

Sleep well, sleep well, King Solomon,
Lapped soft in silk and nard;
For the Angels and the Archangels
Are both thy body-guard.

With thirty horsemen to the left
And thirty to the right,
Sleep well, sleep well, King Solomon,
Through the eternal night.

PARIS, FRANCE.

RIVER-DAWN.

BY ARCHIBALD LAMPMAN.

UP the dark-valleyed river stroke by stroke
We drove the water from the rustling blade;
And when the night was almost gone, we made
The Oxbow bend; and there the dawn awoke;
Full on the shrouded night-charged river broke
The sun, down the long mountain valley rolled,
A sudden swinging avalanche of gold,
Through mists that sprang and reeled aside like smoke.
And lo! before us, toward the East upborne,
Packed with curled forest, bunched and topped with pine,
Brow beyond brow, drawn deep with shade and shine,
The mount; upon whose golden sunward side,
Still threaded with the melting mist, the morn
Sat like some glowing conqueror satisfied.

OTTAWA, CANADA.

"WHY NOT ENDOW OUR CHURCHES?"

BY W. S. RAINSFORD, D.D.,

RECTOR OF ST. GEORGE'S P. E. CHURCH, NEW YORK CITY.

THE question of Church Endowment is only one part of a larger question, a question to which the most confident may well hesitate to believe that as yet they can supply any adequate answer, namely, How shall we fit a Church machinery, "received by tradition from the fathers," to the modern conditions of our time? Out of some positions we have been forced, protest as we may. Few intelligent people any longer believe that the Christian Church is primarily a society for the discussion of religious truths. The preaching, singing, pew-renting church is fast becoming obsolete. Men no longer are interested in a church that exists chiefly as an assembly, as an audience. A tide of better views, of more intelligent conceptions, is bearing us away from this miserably inadequate conception of the Church, deeply rooted as this idea has been amid the best Puritan Christian elements of our land. For all intents and purposes, this conception seems once to have answered well enough. It is now utterly unsuited to modern spiritual needs, as unsuited as the old flintlock musket to the equipment of the modern sharpshooter. The defense of texts and creeds is all well enough; most necessary in its true place; but it is not here that the battle is to be decided.

The one question is, Can the Church grow with her duty? Can she shield and inclose, so that, shielding and inclosing, she may foster and develop, not by want of wise expansiveness squeeze to death, the truth that is her most sacred charge? Is she a tree-bark or an earthen pot? If the first, she will grow and not split; if the second, she will split and not grow. Can she take her true place, the place of a leader in human society? Can she be to all the wondrous possibilities of our national life a nursing mother?

These are the questions or some of the questions that confront the Church to-day. I say, the question of Church Endowment is only one part of these larger questions; and it seems to me in considering it, it is essential, first of all, resolutely to face the fact, that before she can do her duty, changes nothing less than radical must pass on the Church herself. Such as she is, the modern Protestant Church has allowed herself to be driven from that field which the Church, in ages past, proved to be specially her own.

There is something, to my mind, downright scandalous in the Church of the Living God, the pillar and stay of the truth, presenting to the public the spectacle it does in New York to-day, moving up-town as fast as her members grow rich, and leaving, as she moves, vast spaces in ignorance and vice, churchless, Christless; and, worst of all, all this done to the sound of ecclesiastical hosannas. How has she excused to herself this movement? Her single excuse has been, that as with the bulk of her forces she moves off the field, she leaves the sorry outpost of the mission chapel to hold her lines. Now the mission chapel is a wretched compromise for the church. The chapel is only half a church. At present, the chapel is little more than the weaker half of the preaching, singing, pew-renting establishment, up-town. All it pretends or tries to do is to establish a small church where once there stood a big one; support a second-class preacher, where the very best preaching is above all things needed; and a comparatively poor and mean edifice, just where poverty and meanness need to be uplifted and enlightened by all that Christianity can offer of what is rich, generous, beautiful and strong. It is hard to have patience with the smug Philistinism that spends hundreds of thousands of dollars on its costly preaching house, closed all the week, that fills its windows with beautiful glass, and crowds its floors with luxurious sittings, while from its membership and revenues it scarcely draws funds or workers enough to support the cramped religious charity established down-town.

It may be truly said, however, in extenuation of this policy: "I wot, brethren, that in ignorance ye did it." It is a policy well meaning, a policy that has been supported with munificent liberality by a few; but I hold it is a fatal policy, and one that has proved itself unwise, impractical, inadequate and ill-adapted. It is poor economy; it is a hand to mouth policy. It has failed and must fail. It is responsible for the spectacle so often afforded to us, that we have failed to notice the tragedy of it, the pitiable death-struggle of a dying church! It is the story of increasing opportunities and diminishing powers of meeting them, of a brave front presented to an overwhelming foe by a broken and weakened rear-guard. The mission chapel feature of our modern Christianity is failure from beginning to end, and failure in spite of the most heroic efforts and self-denying labors of multitudes of earnest Christian folk, who have been left without the support that was their due.

What is needed? How shall we do the work the mission chapel has failed to do? It must be done by large, thoroughly equipped churches, and not by small and weakly equipped ones. From the very nature of the case, the church situated among tenement and boarding house populations, that stretches out its hands and offers its worship to these, must be a more costly church to support, than churches planted where rich people dwell. It is not necessary, surely, to enlarge upon the manifest advisability of providing, for those whose lives are necessarily spent amid sordid surroundings, a worship that in its completeness and beauty, tends to lift them above these.

The great city church should, therefore, have ample provision made for orderly services and beautiful music. The man who from its pulpit speaks to the people must have the power to draw and to hold. He needs, in short, to be a preacher; for never can the preacher speak to empty pews. And fully important as these considera-

tions, is the need of surrounding the church with all those agencies for supplying that which is lacking in the life to which it ministers. Oh, for open spaces for the children to breathe in! swimming-baths and gymnasiums to aid the young people to escape the temptations of vice; clubs and societies, reading-rooms, etc.! All cost money, and money in plenty. I take it that the Roman Catholic Church has practically proved in this country that the large church is of even more importance among the poor than among the rich; and should she ever add to her present wonderfully organized system of down town churches, much larger—shall I call them more human?—measures as these I suggest, her power among the swarming parts of our cities would be truly immense.

Thus hurriedly I have glanced at part of this great question, suggested in rough outlines a plan of Christian work. Let me ask any one, how is such a plan, or anything like it possible without endowment? When I plead for endowment for our churches I need scarcely say I do not advocate endowment for all. There are instances in this city where endowments have pauperized naturally strong churches, but these were not among the poor. It seems to me idle to talk of maintaining the sort of church that ought to be maintained, amid a poor population, without endowment. Here and there superhuman efforts may do it for a time; but it is too great a strain to last. The death of one generous giver may mean the surrender of some point that is of vital importance to the whole line of work. It must always add a veritable load of care to the self-denying men who refuse to take posts in up-town churches in order to obey what they believe to be the call of God.

It seems to me only fair and reasonable, that this question should rather be put: "Why not endow our churches?" We endow universities, hospitals, libraries, foreign missions, and some men spend their whole time in endowing their children; and yet it has not yet occurred to the religious intelligence of our land, to any great extent, to endow that organization which we all believe to be the real witness and mainstay of all that is best in all of these. An endowment so great that it would paralyze all effort is, of course, not desirable; but this might be fairly left to the wise direction and management of Christian men of experience. I am very sure, that three or four great down-town churches, open and free, placed where populations are densest, managed and served not by one or two clergy, but by half a dozen, and each, say, endowed with a million, would do more to leaven and tincture with real Christianity the life of our city, than all the down-town missions of all the churches put together. But such churches as these, of course, I know well, will not be possible, till the religious common sense of all has pronounced them essential, and has forever thrown overboard and cast aside as utterly inadequate, the present too often popular conception of the duties of the Church to our social, municipal and natural life.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE GERMAN NOVEL.

BY PROFESSOR H. H. BOYESEN.

II.

THE first book which appeared in Germany to which the title of romance was given was the famous tale "Amadis"; and romance (*Roman*) is, as every one knows, the German equivalent for the English "novel." Originally the name was given merely to indicate that the book was translated from a Latin tongue, or rather from two, as the French version proved to be a translation from a Spanish original by Vasco le Sobeira. The *lingua romana* was the common Roman vernacular from which Italian, French and Spanish have sprung, in contradistinction to the *lingua latina*—the classical Latin. The German word *wälsch* is used as a collective term for these languages, and *wälsche Mähre* was formerly a common term for a fantastic, extravagant tale. Likewise the word *Roman* (*romant*) was soon applied even to indigenous tales which described love and chivalrous adventures in a high-flown and exaggerated style; and in the course of a century, as the memory of "Amadis" was obliterated, *Roman* became the generic term for all prose fiction. So great was the fascination which the book exerted upon the German public in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, that not only were editions

dren who were still infants at their mother's death in 1845. Two of these were boys, and both were Union soldiers. The eldest, now General Joseph C. Breckinridge, Inspector General, volunteered in 1861, being only nineteen years old and but recently graduated from the University of Virginia. He served in Kentucky and Tennessee, in Florida, and the Atlanta campaign, being repeatedly promoted for gallantry, until in one of the minor actions at the end of July, 1864, before Atlanta (generally included under the fight at Peach Tree Creek), he was taken prisoner with his battery in a cavalry charge. By one of the strange fortunes which follow internecine wars, he fell into the hands of his own brother, Col. Wm. C. P. Breckinridge. It is hard for one who sees Representative Breckinridge of Kentucky, and General Breckinridge of the Army, side by side in the Washington of to-day, to picture the former charging at the head of a troop of Confederate cavalry upon the battery of the latter upon one of the battle-scarred hills before Atlanta, and bearing away to a long and languishing captivity him whom the same mother had borne upon her bosom, and who had been the playmate of his boyhood.

The family fortune from the first set one against another. John C. Breckinridge, following what he believed was the true political tradition of his father and grandfather, debated with vigorous opposition, even as a college boy, with his uncles; and as his political fortunes advanced, came more and more into open conflict with them, till baffled and beaten he carried his noble talents into the service of the Confederacy, leaving his State and his country under the policy espoused by the elder generation. As a General in the Confederate army he commanded a large part of the front at Cold Harbor. Here a few weeks before the battle of Peach Tree Creek another little family drama was played to a fatal end.

Laetitia Breckinridge, the eldest daughter of John Breckinridge, the elder, had married Gen. Peter B. Porter, of Niagara Falls, Secretary of War to John Quincy Adams. The only son of this marriage was Peter A. Porter, and he had married his cousin, a daughter of the Rev. John Breckinridge, the younger. This son, educated at Harvard, Heidelberg and Berlin, one of the founders of the Century Club, and yet remembered by many for his literary and social gifts, raised a regiment and entered the service in 1862. His regiment was consolidated with the Eighth New York Heavy Artillery, of which he took command. For a long time he was assigned to the difficult task of keeping Baltimore in good humor, but at last, at his urgent request, he took the field with Grant in the Wilderness campaign. The War records tell the story of the way his regiment bore itself. One regiment alone on either side equaled its total losses. At last the fatal day, the 3d of June, 1864, found Colonel Porter's regiment lying in front of the breastworks of Breckinridge's brigade. When the order was given to prepare to storm the works, several officers of regiments stationed near by declared their belief that their men, conscious of the impossibility of the feat demanded of them, would refuse to obey the order to charge. Colonel Porter, in his quiet way, remarked: "I think my men will follow me. I shall not ask them to go without me." When the charge was sounded he reversed his cap that his men might recognize him by the gleam of the arms upon it, and led them to the assault. No one failed to follow where he led; but when he fell within a few feet of the breastworks his men rolled back like a reflux wave, save those who lay dead beside him under the shadow of the wall. That night the guns of Breckinridge's brigade kept a grim watch over the body of one of the bravest and noblest of his race.

The youngest son of Thomas J. Breckinridge, Captain Charles Henry Breckinridge, was at West Point till the War was over. He was stationed at Mobile after the War, and in the summer of 1867 he was leaving the post, on his way, under leave of absence, to be married, when it was announced to him that yellow fever had broken out in the garrison. He at once returned to his post, and in a few days fell a victim to the disease and died. No sacrifice of love and life on the altar of duty was ever more complete than his.

I might follow this theme much further, and tell many an incident to illustrate how true the men and how brave the women of this family have been under the promptings of loyal hearts; but I trust enough has been said to show that there has never been wanting "a Breckinridge on the right side of the line." I pray God, there may never be! And I trust that I have not too greatly colored the narrative of the chronicler with the gratitude of the man for a mother's instruction in love of country and of a freedom which is for all men alike, and not for a privileged class.

WHILE all Europe is talking of Prince Bismarck, few know how the great Chancellor and his ancestors got their name. Bismarck is the name of one of those ancient castles a short distance from Stendal, on the road from Cologne to Berlin, in the center of the old Marquisate of Brandenburg. The castle had this name because it defended the "Marca," or the line where the river Biese formed a boundary in former times, or mark of defense against intruders. Hence the name Bismarck.

THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY PROFESSOR CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D.

I.

THE Revision movement in the Presbyterian Church is demanding a thorough study of the Confession in all its parts and in all its bearings. One of the most interesting questions in connection with this study is the use that the Westminster Confession makes of the Word of God in its citation of proof texts. I give a table of the proof texts of the Confession and a study of the use of the New Testament and the Psalter in the volume recently published entitled, "How shall we Revise the Westminster Confession of Faith?" I now propose to give a study of the Old Testament in the Confession.

There is a very general opinion in the minds of the Christian public that the old Puritans made an excessive use of the Old Testament. We doubt whether there is any good ground for this opinion. It is probably based upon the fact that they looked at the hard and stern side of religion. The Westminster divines cite the Pauline writings 667 times, the Gospels 248 times, the other New Testaments writings 247 times, the entire Old Testament only 431 times. The Confession is built on the theology of Paul rather than on the Old Testament, or the Gospels, or the other Apostles. It presents the Pauline type of theology. It is not comprehensively Christian. It is not comprehensively biblical.

I. THE HISTORICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The Hexateuch is cited 105 times, all the other histories only 61 times. Judges is not used at all. Ruth is used but once and Esther but twice.

1. The first chapter of Genesis is used to prove the Westminster doctrine of creation as follows:

"It pleased God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, for the manifestation of the glory of his eternal power, wisdom and goodness, in the beginning, to create or make of nothing the world and all things therein, whether visible or invisible, in the space of six days, and all very good.

"After God had made all creatures, he created man, male and female, with reasonable and immortal souls, endued with knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness, after his own image," etc.

But the first chapter of Genesis does not teach the doctrine of creation out of nothing. The creative work begins with a primitive waste and formless chaos. The doctrine that the world was created in the space of six days is not there, for the first day's work was the creation of light. The creation of the heavens and the earth, so far as the primitive chaos is concerned, was not included in the six days' work.

The only other passages of the Old Testament cited to prove the doctrine of creation are Job xxvi, 13; xxxiii, 4, to prove the agency of the divine Spirit; Ps. xxxiii, 56, civ, 24, to prove wisdom and goodness in the creation; and Gen. ii, 7; Eccl. xii, 7, to prove the creation of man with reasonable and immortal souls. Ps. xxxiii, 5, 6, is omitted from the American list. But the splendors of the doctrine of creation as brought out in Job x, 8-11, xxxviii, 1-6; Ps. viii, 3-6; xix, 1-6; xxxiii, 7-15; civ, 1-23; cxxxix, 13-16; Prov. viii, 22-31; Is. xl, 12-28; Amos ix, 6, and many other passages are altogether neglected. The Westminster doctrine of creation is a reproach to the Presbyterian Church of the nineteenth century. The revision movement has only brushed against this chapter thus far, but ere long it will overflow it with irresistible tide.

2. In chap. iv the only verses cited are 4, 5. These are used in the Confession, XVI, 6, 7, to prove that good works are accepted in Christ and that works done by unregenerate men cannot please God because they proceed not from a heart purified by faith. The propriety of this use of these verses may be questioned. But the important passage, Gen. iv, 7: "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou doest not well, sin coucheth at the door," with its doctrine of the genesis of sin in the individual; and all other corresponding passages in the Old Testament, as to the origin and development of sin in the individual, are neglected by the Confession, which is too much absorbed in the doctrine of original sin.

3. Gen. xv is in some respects the most important in the book. It is not used at all in the Confession. These fundamental passages for the doctrine of redemption are overlooked:

"Fear not, Abram; I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward" (1). "And he believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness" (6). Alongside of this may be placed the neglect of Luther's famous passage: "But the just shall live by his faith" (Hab. ii, 4).

4. Exod. iii, 15, gives an account of the deliverance of Israel from Egypt. It presents many important doctrines. The only uses made of these chapters are the following:

(a). Exod. iii, 14, is cited (Conf., II, 7) to prove that God is "most absolute." The Revised Version is: "And God said unto Moses, I am That I Am: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I Am hath sent me unto you." This passage proves that God is the ever-living or the eternal God, or that he is a God ever with his people, as it is variously explained. But

it does not teach that he is "most absolute." (b.) Exod. iv, 24-26, the story of Zipporah circumcising her son, is cited (Conf., XXVIII, 5) to prove that it is a great sin to neglect the ordinance of baptism. (c.) Exod. xii, 48, is used (Conf., XXVII, 1), to prove that the sacraments put a visible difference between those that belong to the Church and the rest of the world. (d.) The only other use of these chapters is the citation of vii, 3; viii, 15, 32, which tell of the hardening of Pharaoh's heart (Conf., V, 6), to prove that "the wicked harden themselves, even under those means which God useth for the softening of others." All these hard features of the narratives are picked out; but the gracious dealings of God with Israel, his long-suffering with Pharaoh and the Egyptians, and his wonders of redemption escape attention. Our Saviour cites Exod. iii, 6 (Luke xx, 37), to show that God as the living God of the fathers was not the God of the dead but of the living. And the spirits of the blessed, in the Apocalypse of John, sing the song of Moses and the Lamb, with hearts and minds filled with Exod. xv. But the Westminster Confession has no room for these words of life and this hymn of redemption.

5. Exod. xix gives the Sinaitic covenant, which is cited again and again in the Scriptures, and presents several golden threads which are entwined throughout the Bible. The following words in their historic importance outweigh fifty hard texts that have been cited in the Confession. "Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice, indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me from among all peoples; for all the earth; is mine and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (Exod. xix, 5, 6).

6. Exod. xxiv gives us an account of the covenant sacrifice, which justifies the name of old covenant as applied to the Old Testament institutions, and which in the New Testament is again and again contrasted with the New Covenant sacrifice of Calvary; and yet not a word of it is in the Westminster Confession.

7. Exod. xxxiii, 30, seq., presents the doctrine of atonement and forgiveness of sin without sacrifice. This and many other kindred passages find no recognition in the Confession.

8. Deut. x, 12-19, is a wonderful passage, setting forth the love of God and exhorting Israel to love their God. This is all passed over and verse 20 alone is used (Conf., XXII, 1), and that is cited simply to prove "a lawful oath as a part of religious worship."

9. Deut. xxx is a magnificent chapter. It is cited by Paul in Romans x. But the only use made of it by the Westminster Confession is of verse 6 (Conf., X, 1) to prove "renewing their wills, and by his almighty power determining them to that which is good," which is rather a heavy weight to place upon the clause "The Lord God will circumcise thine heart"; and verse 19 (Conf., IX, 1) to prove the natural liberty of the human will in its power to choose life.

10. The song of Moses, Deut. xxxii, and the blessing of Moses, Deut. xxxiii, both splendid pieces of poetry and full of rich doctrine, are not used at all in the Confession.

11. There is no use of the song of Hannah (I Sam. ii, 1-10) which filled the mind and heart of the blessed Virgin when she sang her Magnificat.

12. The covenant with David (II Sam. vii; I Chron. xvii) is at the basis of the theology of the Psalmists and the Prophets. There is no reference to it in the Westminster Confession.

II. THE POETICAL BOOKS.

1. The precious doctrine of divine discipline in Job vi, 17-27, is ignored by the Confession.

2. The only use made of Job xiv, is an effort to prove from "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one" (4), "that death in sin and corrupted nature is conveyed to all the posterity of our first parents" (Conf., VI, 3).

3. Chap. xix, 26, 27, is incorrectly cited (Conf., XXXII, 2) to prove the doctrine of resurrection. These verses really teach communion with God in the middle state, a doctrine which is set forth in many passages of the Old Testament and the New, but which in most cases is overlooked by the Westminster divines.

4. The following precious psalms are not used at all—i, viii, xxiii, xxvii, xlii, xliii, xlvi (Luther's Psalm), xlvi, lxiii, lxvii, lxix, lxx, lxxx, lxxxiv, lxxxv, lxxxvi, lxxxvii, xci, xcvi-xcix, cviii, cxviii, cxx, cxxi, cxxiii-cxxix, cxxxix, cxlviii-cl.

5. The Praise of Wisdom (Prov. i, 7-9) is one of the most important writings in Old Testament theology. There are but four citations from it in the Confession: (a.) i, 20, 21, 24 and viii, 34 are used (Conf., XXI, 6) to prove worship in public assemblies, which is a curious misinterpretation and abuse of these passages. The American edition omits i, 20, 21, 24. It ought to have crossed out viii, 34, likewise; (b.) ii, 17, is cited (Conf., XXIV, 1) to prove the unlawfulness of polygamy. It certainly had nothing whatever to do with this subject. (c.) viii, 15, 16, is cited (Conf., XXIII, 2) to prove the lawfulness of the civil magistrate. These are the only uses made of the magnificent inspired writing by our Confession of Faith.

6. Ecclesiastes is used twelve times; but five of these uses are of the single verse vii, 29: "God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions."

This verse was used so often because it is one of a very few that refer to the original state of mankind. The Westminster doctrine of primitive righteousness is built on these slender foundations.

7. The Song of Songs is used thrice (Conf., X, 1; XVII, 8; XVIII, 4); but these are all perversions of Scripture. The middle one was rightly rejected from the American list, but the other two remain. Chap. 1, 4: "Draw me, we will run after thee," is used (Conf., X, 1) to prove that men respond to the effectual call "most freely, being made willing by his grace." Chap. v, 9, 3, 6, is used (Conf., XVIII, 4) to prove that at times "God withdraws the light of his countenance" from Christians.

8. Lamentations is used but twice. The following verses of chap. iii, are cited: "For the Lord will not cast off forever (81) . . . Wherefore doth a living man complain, a man for the punishment of his sins" (89). It is characteristic of the Westminster Confession that it neglects the following verses:

"It is of the Lord's mercies that we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not (23). They are new every morning; great is thy faithfulness (25). The Lord is my portion, saith my soul; therefore will I hope in him (24). The Lord is good unto them that wait for him, to the soul that seeketh him (25). It is good that a man should both hope and quietly wait for the salvation of the Lord (26).

. . . But tho he cause grief, yet will he have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies (32). For he doth not afflict willingly nor grieve the children of men" (33).

The Prophets will be considered in another article.

A WORD WITH THE LUTHERANS.

BY REV. M. W. MONTGOMERY,
SUPERINTENDENT SCANDINAVIAN DEPARTMENT OF THE AMERICAN HOME
MISSIONARY SOCIETY, MINNEAPOLIS.

The essence of the lament of Rev. E. J. Wolf, D.D., in THE INDEPENDENT of May 1st over the missions of the Congregationalists and of other denominations among the Scandinavians and Germans, is found in the following sentence.

"The most discouraging obstacle which a body of zealous Evangelical (i. e., Lutheran), pastors complain of, is the determined effort of some wealthy denominations to appropriate to their use the material which, by every consideration, belongs to the Lutheran Church."

The fallacy in the above statement is in this; viz., in the claim that all foreigners who come from countries where a Lutheran State Church exists are, therefore, Lutherans and "belong" to the Lutheran Church of the United States, and no other denomination should have missions among them. Simply because these people come from countries where the State Church counts all its citizens as members of its State Church—whether they be real Christians, or only nominally, the openly wicked, or skeptics—therefore the Lutherans set up the claim that all these immigrants "belong" to the Lutheran Church, and any missions among them by Congregationalists, Methodists, Presbyterians or Baptists is "proselytizing." As well might the Episcopalians claim all English immigrants. By this fallacy the above denominations must do nothing toward offering the Gospel to our seven millions of immigrants, since most of them come from State Church countries. Thus the loose ideas of State Churches of the Old World concerning qualifications for church-membership and communion at the Lord's Table are to be transplanted to the New World. Thus American churches are to keep "hands off" from foreigners lest the latter become Americanized.

The position of the Lutheran Church in this matter is illustrated by the Lutheran minister in the city of St. Paul, Minn., who walked angrily into a Congregational Sunday-school and led out of the room such children as he claimed "belonged" to the Lutheran Church, although sent to this Sunday-school by their parents. It is further illustrated by the Lutheran churches of Wisconsin who have joined hands with the Roman Catholics in opposing the law of that State, which recognizes that all children shall, for a part of each year, attend schools in which the English language is taught.

In view of the vast multitudes of foreigners whom we so freely admit to this country, it is essential to the safety and well-being of our Republic that the despotic and loose State Church customs be left on the other side of the sea, and that no anti-American and anti-English language foreignisms be tolerated in the United States. This claim of Dr. Wolf, that all who have ever, in any land, willingly or unwillingly, saint or sinner, borne the "Lutheran" name, must, in the United States—they and their children—be left exclusively to the care or the neglect of those Old World priests who immigrated with them, is a part of this same policy. It is intensely sectarian, intolerant, un-American. They may as well take notice that they are in the wrong country for the successful propagation of such narrowness. In seeking to perpetuate in this land those ideas which have made Europe to groan through many long centuries, they are as certain to be disappointed as boys who would build snow houses in February and expect to dwell in them through the heats of July and August.

This word "belong" to the Lutheran Church" is an important one to them. With it they conjure. With it they blind the eyes of some who do not know how elastic

a bond it is; again they fly it as a flag of warning to other denominations. But, under this word "belong," lie the sharpest thorns of criticism upon the Lutheran Church, and the complete justification for the missions of other denominations. It is this absorbing willingness and desire to have anybody and everybody "belong" to the Lutheran Church, which makes the Congregationalists and others "debtors unto" our immigrant populations from the State Church monarchies of Europe. The Shibboleth of the Lutherans is too apt to be "Belong to the Lutheran Church!" that of these other denominations, including the Swedish Mission Friends, and the free German and Norwegian Churches, is the command of Christ, "Come and follow me!"

OUR WASHINGTON LETTER.

BY KATE FOOTE.

We have just brought in four new States, and several more are doing their best to be included within the fold. It sets one to looking over our Western States with a critical eye. Montana behaved while she was in the process of organizing herself as a State in such a way as to provoke a great deal of criticism. It was "conduct unbecoming an officer of the Republic, which a State is under our form of government," as a Western Member said. But she has a population that entitles her to a representative, tho it is to be hoped he will appear better than his constituents did at the time of their elections last winter. Nevada, on the contrary, has not population enough to be represented at the National Government. She ought to be remanded to the Territorial condition until she fills up her quota. She has not population enough to be taxed for the support of her State government. Her Legislature met this difficulty with a plan, neat, political—crafty. In every quarter-section of land a certain number of acres was reserved as school lands. These were picked out among the few valleys there are in the State, and from the best of the land everywhere. These lands were sold at a dollar and a quarter an acre, a cattle company buying them, paying fifteen cents on a dollar down and interest at six per cent. on the remaining sum. By this process all the best lands in the State are in the hands of a cattle company, and the result is that, physically, politically and financially, it is in the hands of that sort of a syndicate. Any farmer who wishes to get land in Nevada, has to take the worst there is, at a distance from the market. Naturally he does not take very much, irrigation will have to be carried on in a large way before the spare land can be made valuable. Congress gave a fair sum for the irrigation of our desert lands last year, and has been asked to renew it again this year. It is to be hoped it will be granted and that a portion of it will be meted out to Nevada so that immigration may flow into the State and justify it in sending two Senators to Congress and the one Representative which is all it can have, and he has not the numbers behind him which a State is required to have when it sends a Representative. Senator Stewart, of Nevada, is the president of the cattle company that controls the State, and he, with Mr. J. T. Jones, own large silver mines there. The legislation they are most interested in is, naturally, free coinage of silver and the question of irrigation. Mr. Stewart is Chairman of the Committee of Mines and Mining, and of the select committee on the Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands, and a member of that on Territories. Mr. Jones is upon that of Mines and Mining and several others not so immediately connected with the practical legislation of his State. Mr. Stewart has had ups and downs in his fortunes, but through it all hung on to the great house he built out by Dupont Circle, when that was so far out of town that there were cow-pastures between it and the fashionable streets. He rents it to the Chinese legation now, and does not complain of the arrangement; as a Western man he ought to have such a prejudice against his tenants as to treat them ill; but I do not understand that he does.

Mr. J. P. Jones, his colleague, made a speech on the silver question that is rather amusing to read, because of the unhesitating way in which he named all the reasons for trouble in the money market and the other markets—they were to be laid to the lack of silver; he did not say a lack from his mines. He tried to be modest about it, and said that he had reported the bill from the Committee on Finance, but that it did not fully reflect his views regarding the relation which silver should bear to the world. He bore down hard upon the creditor classes here and in England, who are wicked enough to want their loans in gold value paid back in coin of equal value. It was so selfish in them, and such a course led to idleness, poverty and misery. "Gold is the instrument of confiscation and spoliation," said Mr. Jones, and is to the advantage of the creditor classes in the United States. Then he spoke of the debtor class. "The aspiring, audacious, energetic men, the up-builders, the designers, the men of achievement, of executive power, they are the debtors—they are the constructive force in every community," said Mr. Jones; "they and the silver miners are the class who should be allowed, the first variety to contract debts, and the second kind, the miners, would give them silver to pay it with." And so on. Mr. Jones talked for three hours, and

then did not finish all he had to say. His compeers paid him some attention—it is the first silver bill speech we have had in some time. Mr. Stewart gave one a year ago, not so long as this and more historical, less personal than Mr. Jones, not so amusing. The other Senators listened, thinking how to apply the question to themselves—the Western men wondering how much their constituents would require of them in the way of favoring the bill; and the Eastern men looked anxious, wondering how much their constituents were involved with Western men; some of them were sure to be so, that there would be a division in the sentiment, and each one would require its Senator to declare himself on its side; the only truly happy Senator on the silver question will be the one who can take a course between wind and water.

The House went on with the tariff debate—cutting it short to a degree that astonishes one who does not know how much the work of it has been done in the committees. The number of people that have appeared before the Ways and Means and a few other committees, would fill a fair-sized town. Every time you met a stream of men in the corridors—and you did that nearly every day for weeks before the tariff bill was brought before the House—it was sure to be a deputation from some manufactory or importers' firm, who had been in to see what they could do for their particular interest, before some committee. Consequently more than any other tariff bill, its work has been done before it appeared in the House. With that and the feeling that grows stronger all the while, namely that there has been so much argument on the subject that there is nothing now left to say; there may be a short debate and a short session. Mr. Reed is getting approval even from the Democratic side at last in the way he makes business go on in spite of a large and rebellious minority. A short session appeals favorably to everybody, and a Democrat said the other day: "Reed has made us do our work. I don't like him, but he has expedited the business of the House and we—well, we don't object to that in our hearts, altho we are disposed to kick."

Senator Sherman commenced the series of entertainments which were given to General Sherman, during his visit here, with an evening reception to his brother. The invitations were numerous and so were the guests. Everybody wanted to see General Sherman again, and it was pleasant to watch the people turn at once to him after shaking hands with their host and hostess.

"I take every chance I can get to see him now," said an old friend of the General; "our greatest war-heroes are almost all gone, my days are shortening up my chances for meeting him; one or the other of us is soon to go before long. See him, as alert and quick in his movements, as he was in that glorious time when we were marching through Georgia, when he said to me one day: 'I know every mounted officer in my whole column.' It seemed almost impossible and I stared at him. His eyes twinkled—just as they do now while he is talking to that bright-looking woman—and he said: 'I know him by the color of his horse.' I laugh now as I think of the oddity of knowing a man in that way."

The reception was followed by a dinner to celebrate the sixty-seventh birthday of Senator Sherman, to which the President himself came, likewise the Vice-President, and ten or twelve other distinguished men—and Mrs. Sherman was the only lady. A dinner by the President followed, given in the private dining-room at the White House, a beautifully furnished room, much pleasanter in its appointments than the State dining-room, and a smaller room, where guests can see each other across the table. Miss Rachel Sherman, the youngest daughter of the General, was there. She was born since the War, and consequently has no memory of her father connected with his War-days. I heard her say once: "I don't remember anything about the War, because they would have it before I could," with a little tone of regret as if she envied her older sisters, who were more fortunate than she.

The last thing of all was the Blaine wedding, of which so much has been said that there is absolutely nothing new to add to it. Miss Blaine is the elder of the two daughters still living, and is a very pleasant person to know. Her manners are fine, not in any bad sense of that word, but meaning gentle, considerate, thoughtful. She is not regularly pretty, but her face lights up when she talks, and with her amiable manner you forget to think whether she is one of the regulation red and white beauties that are not uncommon among American girls, and you remember the charm of another sort she gave you, and you wonder why the English language is not so much richer, as it would be and ought to be with a word to express that attraction. She met Mr. Damrosch while on a carriage trip with a party in England, made up by Mr. Andrew Carnegie. Some of the wiser heads saw what was coming then, tho an intimate friend of the family, who was also one of the party, did not observe it and was quite surprised to hear of the engagement. Mr. Damrosch is musical "clear down to the ground," and gave a series of lectures in New Haven this winter which filled blue-blooded people of that literary little city with the greatest satisfaction. "We have had," said the wife of one of the college dons, "three things in one day this week. Fancy it! a Damrosch lecture, then a tea and a party in the