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 XLV. NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 17, 1893. NUMBER 2353.

The Independent

For Table of Contents see Page 10.

A DAMASCUS NIGHTINGALE.

BY CLINTON SCOLLARD.

ON the crimson edge of the eve,
By the Barada's flutelike flow,
When the shadow shuttles began to weave
And the mountain airs to blow,
With the sight of the night's first star,
As tho it were dumb too long,
There burst on the ear a wondrous bar
From a spirit dowered with song.

And swift it swelled to a strain
That rippled and rose and ran
Through every chord of joy or pain
That throbs in the heart of man.
It told of love lightening life
And of sorrow's bitter breath;
It pealed a pæan of peace from strife
And of triumph over death.

And I knew it for God own's bird—
A prophet voice in the dark;
The budding stars in the heaven heard.
For they could not choose but hark.
Then the worn earth hid its face
And dreamed its dream of the dawn:
The voice of man was stilled for a space,
But the bird sang on and on.

CLINTON, N. Y.

SUNRISE IN THE HILLS OF SATSUMA.

BY MARY MCNEIL SCOTT.

THE day unfolds like a lotus-bloom,
Pink at the tip and gold at the core,
Rising up swiftly through waters of gloom
Which lave Night's shore.

Down bamboo stems the sunbeams slide,
Darting, like glittering elves at play,
To the thin, arched grass where crickets hide
And sing all day.

The old crows "Ca-a" from the camphor boughs—
They have builded there for a thousand years.
Their nestlings stir in a huddled drowse,
To pipe shrill fears.

A white fox creeps to his home in the hill:
A small gray ape peers up at the sun;
Crickets and sunbeams are quarreling still.
Day has begun.

MOBILE, ALA.

HOW THE WIND CAME.

BY JOE RUSSELL TAYLOR.

THE wind came this way: Trees were stirred,
And seemed to waken and to look:
And far away a bird
Let slip a little warning song;
A silver shudder ran along
The willows by the brook;

The swallows flickered from the eaves;
The cottonwood pattered soft and low
With all his myriad leaves;
A wave crept, twinkling, o'er the wheat
And ceased; and then I felt a sweet
Cool breath upon my brow.

COLUMBUS, O.

THE WAIL OF POETRY.

BY THE REV. GERALD STANLEY LEE.

THE railroad as an institution impresses most people as elaborately and ingeniously unpoetic. It is the very Colossus of Common Sense. The locomotive, whirling through the modern world as a kind of splendid braggadocio, whistles defiance to all the Muses, drives them to the mountains, and scatters them like a flurry of birds off to the sea or nooks of this world, and tells them blusteringly that they belong to the next.

Science has been opening up a whole new frontier of human thought; but where are our poetic pioneers, claiming and holding these great regions for the Soul? The harps are hung dolefully on willow trees or touched with the sobbing notes of a dirge mourning for our times:

"Do you ask us to sing our song to the rattling railroad accompaniment of such a life as this? What availeth the rhapsody of a violin in a foundry? Who can write words for the unfeeling bass of your factories? Our thoughts are lost, like the song of the bee and the rhythm of the river, in the pellmell clangor of your bells.

"Blow, ye whistles! Shriek your profanity into the holy silences of the soul! Unloose your tongues, ye bells! and scatter the heedless din of your emptiness upon the pounded air! Strike, ye hammers, till ye harden souls into steel and stamp on all the seal of matter! Factories, hum to us the blank verse of your prosperous deafness! Engines, puff at us with your smoke! Hiss at us with your steam! Whistles! bells! hammers! engines! 'tis ye are the real minstrels of this day! Farewell! Bury us with our harps, and when we hear not, dance your dance of paganism and sing your song of Matter-of-Fact upon our graves!"

Thus the plaintive poets seem like birds that have alighted in some vast machinery hall, twittering dazedly about in the flopping belts and heartless hum, with no place for their litttle restrospective nests and no place for a song and nothing to sing about, tucking their mournful little bills under their weary, homeless little wings, and pining for a chance to flutter to a more congenial world!

We have not had time to judge of the poetic possibilities that science and invention have placed before us. We have only had time to miss the old poetry in them. Rainbows were invented long enough ago for the poets to get well to work upon them, but electricity has only had time to give us its shock without giving us its message. The music of the spheres was composed and the glittering notes all put in their places somewhere about the time of creation, and the poets of a thousand generations have listened to the strains above us and written words and words for them; but the railroads and steamships and the geologies and the chemistries, the telephones and the minor electric moons that have been brought into our modern life—all these are too new and bewildering to allow us even to glance at their poetic bearings. We are too busy studying appearances to dream our way into the hearts of things. It is in the hearts that we shall find the poems. We are looking; we can do little else in these times. Poetry is more than a look; it is the thought after the look. Science sees and records. Poetry sees. She sees first with her eyes, and then she closes them for a moment and sees with her heart. We are waiting for that second look. Because these lusty young giants—the reigning Ideas of the day—will not lend themselves gracefully to the drapings of these old-fashioned intellectual tailors, it is inferred that poetry has no costume to cover the bare and scientific nakedness of our times, and cannot even find rhyming fig-leaves enough to patch together an apron for our shame. On a pedestal of dramatic logic Poetry is posing with this soliloquy:

"You will not cut yourselves to fit the clothes of your fathers, and we cannot cut your fathers' clothes to fit you."

We might as well look for to-day's inventions in yesterday as to look for the interpretations of to-day in yesterday's poems. New conditions call for new poets. We have no models. It is a time to make models. Science has been creative. Poetry has an opportunity for her old creativeness. We stand on a great poetic Sahara—opened up by our scientific men. The soul's greeting to the poet who, advancing into science with great conceptions in the hollow of his hand, shall sow the seeds of the future, and in the name of the King of the Beautiful, for the use of the Beautiful, shall make the desert to rejoice and blossom as the rose.

SHARON, CONN.

THE APPROACHING PARLIAMENT OF RELIGIONS.

ITS ATTRACTIVE FEATURES.

BY THE REV. JOHN HENRY BARROWS, D.D.,
CHAIRMAN OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE ON RELIGIOUS CONGRESSES.

RELIGION, of which Dr. Bushnell once wrote, that it alone made existence "valuable or even tolerable," is itself one of the most interesting facts of history. The present century has seen wider and swifter Christian progress than any other; and it is not surprising that the end of the century should be signalized by a convention like the coming Parliament of Religions. A learned Jewish Rabbi recently said: "I want my people to know all about that Congress; for I want them in touch with the best thought of the nineteenth century."

It has required immense labor, for more than two years, to bring about the results already assured, and each day's correspondence brings evidence of unexpected support in this colossal undertaking. It has often been said that it is easier to do a great thing than a small one. However that may be, it has been easy enough to gain the attention of mankind for the proposed Parliament. A larger measure of co-operation has been gained than the most ardent at first expected. In all parts of the world solitary thinkers and toilers have seen, in this meeting, either a realization of some fond dream, or a means of advancing some theological or missionary reform which they deemed of highest importance.

A telegram has just been handed me:

"Tientsin—Barrows—Parliament of Religions—Chicago. Coming—Candlin."

The Rev. George T. Candlin, an English Methodist Missionary in China, has gained a wide reputation as an eloquent advocate of conciliatory and enlightened methods of propagandism among non-Christian peoples. At the request of the Chairman he prepared and forwarded, some months ago, a paper of great eloquence and ability on "Christian Unity and the Work of Missions." It was not expected that he could possibly be present; but evidently his deep interest has led him to change his plans. Those who hear Mr. Candlin's address will listen to one of the most powerful pleas for Christian unity and co-operation ever spoken. They will also gain an insight into the difficulties which the present methods of uncompromising hostility to the Ethnic religions are heaping higher and higher.

From Colombo, in Ceylon, Mr. H. Dharmapala, Secretary of the Buddhist Society of Southern India, has already sailed with credentials from the High Priest of Ceylon, as the authorized representative of the present movement to revive Buddhism in India, the land of its birth. He is regarded as a man of unusual mental force and religious devoutness. He writes with great modesty; and he evidently does not think it will be any child's play to come into contact, as he says, "with the great intellects of the West." He is evidently a man of deep convictions and wide sympathies. He will meet in Chicago representatives of Northern Buddhism from Japan; and it is a singular fact that, while Christians are hoping that the Parliament of Religions will bring the disciples of Jesus closer together, Mr. Dharmapala joyfully expects that the sections of Buddhism will be drawn into more harmony of thought and feeling by this historic meeting on the shores of Lake Michigan.

In my office this morning I had a pleasant interview with the Rev. Kinjio Machida, a high priest of one of the Japanese Buddhist sects and ex-Senator of the Japanese Parliament, who brought a cordial letter of introduction from the scholarly Bunyiu Nanjio, of Tokio, who confirms in his letter the good news that we are to have an excellent representation from Japan. Papers have already been prepared in the Sunrise Kingdom by the representatives of the Faith of Gautama, which will be submitted to the Parliament of Religions. Some of our missionaries in Japan express the hope that these Oriental scholars, whose acquaintance with our language is not perfect, and who have accepted our cordial invitations, should be received by us with that gentleness, consideration and courtesy which are eminently becoming. There is no doubt that such will be the univer-

peculiar situation more fully to give it the consideration and the measure of relief which its vast importance demands.

INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY.

BY THOMAS L. GREENE.

THE address of Mr. Justice Brewer of the United States Supreme Court at Woodstock on the Fourth of July was on the decadence of liberty for the individual man. Judge Brewer gave the well-known facts of the case, that workmen were combined into trade-unions, losing their individuality, while capitalists were united on the other hand. Men could no longer do business each in his own way to suit his own circumstances, but were forced to go with the mass. Huge corporations employed large numbers who in taking service subjected themselves to a common restraint, no matter how diverse their talents or business methods. The individual is nothing; the union or the class is all in all. This state of things Judge Brewer compared to Negro slavery, arguing that in some way man should be and would be made industrially free. Many others have noted the same tendency and deplored that loss of liberty which Judge Brewer so energetically set forth.

A certain loss of independence has always been the accompaniment of advance in civilization. The savage roams the forest as inclination or hunger urges him. All nature is his. The question of hours of labor does not trouble him. The more civilized man is restrained by the property and personal rights of his neighbors, rights which have been evolved by the necessities of society. In return for his renunciation of barbarous freedom he receives certain rights of his own, with better food and clothing obtained by less labor. So the evolution of society goes on. If we define civilization as the creating and supplying of new wants, it would seem from past history that the advance would require a further contraction in the individual's right to do as he pleased. The more complex society and business become, the more must rules be made limiting man's old-time freedom. The savage traveled when he would on foot or on the back of an animal. When, however, stagecoaches came into use, the traveler had to subject himself to coach rules. A better method of locomotion—railways—in turn brought in a long list of new limitations. He who would take a journey must now go at certain hours and on certain trains, must provide himself with a ticket, and conform to rules which limit his personal freedom greatly. In return for this loss of savage liberty, the modern citizen receives cheap and rapid transportation, impossible under barbaric conditions. The real complaint to be brought against existing tendencies toward the massing of men is that the benefits to the individual are not yet enough to compensate for the freedom lost. No doubt this is true; yet it is really only to say that the evolution of our trade-unions and corporations is not yet complete. If the majority of mankind must now be directly or indirectly subject to great corporations with new limitations upon their liberty of time or of method and kind of working, the result of the sacrifice ought to be apparent in better and more comfortable conditions of life. As to the few possessed of genius or great talent, these the new civilization must provide compensation and work for, if it would continue.

But the first result of such a process of civilization must be to reduce mankind to a level; and since man is endowed with great faculties of mind and soul, leveling will degrade him. Such leveling would be fatal if it were permanent. Tennyson gave poetic form to a scientific truth when he said of Nature:

> "So careful of the type she seems,
> So careless of the single life."

Yet Darwin has also told us that the progress of life from one species to a higher was caused by individual variations which proved themselves worthy of survival. First the massing and the leveling of all to correspond with general conditions, then improvement through individual effort, seems to be a universal law to which we should expect to find a parallel in human society. An army exists as an effective fighting machine only by rigid discipline. Prompt obedience of orders by each division, company and soldier is essential. But we know that there is something yet needful, and that back of discipline the intelligence, courage and patriotism of the individual man are the decisive things. So trade-unionism in its present stage represses individual effort. No member may work faster or better than the majority, or in any way earn higher wages than the average. The same theory may be found among corporations where trade or traffic is parceled out among companies who may not take more than their share on pain of the active displeasures of the combined members.

Whether we like it or not, we have entered upon an era of organization. So far it has been combination against combination. It is conceivable, however, that in the end we may have a better industrial peace, because the necessary terms of that peace will be better understood. If there is ground for such a hope, we may then expect a development of individual liberty, but within the limits of the new conditions. The day when the small shopman kept store as he pleased is gone by; but as a department chief in a huge establishment he may be subject to restraints upon his time greater than of old, but with increased income and other privileges, including permanency. When the position of the trade-union is better settled and its actions are controlled by responsibility and fairness, we may then have a broader field for the more talented workingmen. Liberty in the old sense we cannot have again if we would advance in civilization. But liberty, industrial liberty in the modern sense of better conditions of life, in return for limitations upon personal freedom in business, is a principle whose establishment we may hope will one day be the outcome of our industrial struggle. If such limitations do not touch the essential manliness of men—as they now sometimes do—nor repress the higher nature, but leave increasing opportunity for its cultivation, we may look without dread upon the coming corporation civilization. In this way Judge Brewer's demand for individual liberty may be met; but it is hard to see in what other way or for what other purpose that end could be secured.

NEW YORK CITY.

SUBJECTION TO BRETHREN IN THE LORD.

BY PROF. JOHN T. DUFFIELD, D.D.

ONE of the surprising incidents—if that may be called an incident which is largely a cause—of the present crisis in the Presbyterian Church, is the apparent disregard of the spirit, if not indeed the letter, of the ordination vows "to maintain the peace of the Church," and to be in "subjection to brethren in the Lord."

This is undoubtedly due to a misapprehension as to the intent and the extent of obligation of this latter vow. It is not, as many seem to imagine, a vague declaration to pay what each one for himself may deem due respect to the judgment of his ecclesiastical brethren. It embodies the fundamental principle of Presbyterian Church government. *The rule of the majority constitutionally expressed, the highest judicatory of the Church being the interpreter of the Constitution.* It was intended to secure, by solemn promise, fidelity to this principle, and thus prevent in case of dissatisfaction any disturbance of the peace of the Church.

At the present stage of the crisis in the Church, and in view of recent utterances and events, it may not be untimely or amiss to call attention to the import and importance of the vow referred to, as indicated by its historical antecedents.

A schism in the Presbyterian Church occurred in 1741. In 1745 certain presbyteries that had withdrawn from what was at the time the highest judicatory of the Church, the Synod of Philadelphia, met at Elizabethtown, N. J., and organized the Synod of New York. Among other "articles of the plan and foundation of their Synodical union" was the following:

"They agree that in matters of discipline and those things that relate to the peace and good order of our churches, they shall be determined by a major vote of ministers and elders, with which vote every member shall actively concur or pacifically acquiesce; but if any member cannot in conscience agree to the determination of the majority, but supposes himself obliged to act contrary thereto, and the Synod think themselves obliged to insist upon it as essentially necessary to the well-being of our churches, in that case such dissenting member *promises peaceably to withdraw from the body, without endeavoring to raise any dispute or contention on the debated point.*"—Baird's "Digest," p. 612.

In 1758 a reunion was effected. The two synods agreed to unite in one body under the name of "The Synod of New York and Philadelphia," on a plan of union including, among other articles, the following:

"When any matter is determined by a major vote, every member shall either actively concur with or passively submit to such determination; or, if his conscience permit him to do neither, he shall, after sufficient liberty modestly to reason and remonstrate, *peaceably withdraw from our communion without attempting to make any schism;* provided, always, that this shall be understood to extend only to such determinations as the body shall judge indispensable in doctrine and Presbyterian government."

The article following prescribes:

"That any member or members, for the exoneration of his or their conscience before God, have a right to protest against any act or procedure of our highest judicature, *because there is no appeal to another for redress.*"—Baird's "Digest," p. 615; Moore's "Digest," p. 48.

From this last clause it is evident the framers of the Plan of Reunion did not anticipate that "the highest judicature" might be memorialized to reverse the judgment of its predecessor—an overture which it could not even entertain without committing the suicidal inconsistency of deciding that any decision it might give could not be regarded as authoritative and final.

As a matter of historical interest it may be observed in passing that the important article above quoted originated with *the Synod of New York*, the body known as the "New Side" in the history of that period.

The Plan of Revision of 1758 is part of the organic law of the Presbyterian Church. The obligation of a Presbyterian minister in the circumstances mentioned to "passively submit" or "peaceably withdraw" from the Church, has never been repealed. So far from this, when the present Form of Government was adopted in 1788, the obligation was emphasized by being made part of the Constitution in the form of ordination vows "to maintain the peace of the Church" and "to be in subjection to brethren in the Lord." The historical antecedents of these vows interpret precisely and unequivocally their meaning.

In his argument before the General Assembly (see Washington *Post* of May 25th) Dr. Briggs referred to an article that had recently been published by a member of the Assembly, "representing," as was stated, "that a Presbyterian minister who differs from a majority of the ministry of the denomination is honorably bound to retire from the denomination." The article referred to was published in THE INDEPENDENT of April 20th and 27th. What was maintained was this—that in case a Presbyterian minister is led to entertain views which, in the judgment of the General Assembly, are inconsistent with essential doctrines of the Confession, if his conviction of the truth and the importance of his views is so decided that he cannot with a good conscience passively submit to the judgment of the Assembly, it is his duty to peaceably withdraw from the Church.

The reference to the article was followed by an extended discussion by Dr. Briggs of the question of peaceable withdrawal from the Church under the circumstances mentioned. But for his course and that of his partisan friends since the meeting of the Assembly his argument against the view presented in the article might pass without reply.

His objections to peaceable withdrawal from the Church may be itemized as follows: (1) that the Church is not a voluntary society; (2) that one cannot withdraw from the Church "without being guilty of the sin of schism"; (3) that as "a Christian has been translated out of the realm of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son, if he voluntarily withdraws from the Church he reenters the realm of darkness." These objections indicate a confusion of thought remarkable in one so eminent in many respects for intellectuality. He evidently confounds the Presbyterian Church, a branch of the Church of Jesus Christ, with "the universal or catholic visible Church," defined in the Confession as

"consisting of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children, and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation."

Assuming that what may be predicated of the latter may be predicated of the former he reaches conclusions that are palpably erroneous. The Form of Government, Chap. II, after defining "*the universal or catholic Church*" in substantially the terms above quoted from the Confession, defines "*a particular church*" as consisting of "a number of professing Christians with their offspring *voluntarily associated together* for divine worship and godly living agreeably to the Holy Scriptures and submitting to a certain form of government." (See also the Confession of Faith, Chap. XXIII, Sec. 3.) The Supreme Court of the United States in its decision on the Walnut Street (Louisville) Church case, says:

"The right to organize *voluntary religious associations* to assist in the expression and dissemination of any religious doctrine and to create tribunals for the decision of controverted questions of faith within the association is unquestioned. All who unite themselves to such a body do so with an implied consent to this government and *are bound to submit to it.*"—"Digest," p. 260.

As to the second objection—if peaceable withdrawal from the Church when one cannot conscientiously submit to the judgment of the highest judicatory of the Church involves the sin of schism, then the Plan of Reunion of 1758 enjoins that one in the case mentioned should commit the sin of schism, and moreover should do so "without attempting to make any schism."

As to the third objection—we are somewhat inclined to *jure divino* Presbyterianism, and yet are not prepared to say that when Dr. Briggs's kinsman, Dr. Clark, withdrew from the Presbyterian and entered the Congregational Church, he went out of the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ and entered the realm of the Prince of Darkness.

Dr. Briggs maintained further, that "it is a plausible but a very superficial statement that the majority have the authority to determine whether he is right or wrong in his opinions, whether he is guilty of this deadly sin of heresy." To illustrate and substantiate his position he adds:

"It is a principle of civil government that majorities cannot always be trusted. A majority in the House of Representatives is checked by the voice of the Senate. A majority of both houses of Congress is checked by the veto of the President. The combined action of both the executive and the legislative branches of the Government is checked by the decisions of the Supreme Court. So it has been the policy to put checks on the majority in ecclesiastical courts. The Presbyterian Church, like other organized Churches, has a system of checks and balances of power and a supreme court for the ultimate decision of constitutional questions."

Now, if Dr. Briggs had been advocating an appeal from a decision of a presbytery to the General Assembly his argument would have been pertinent and conclusive, and yet, his contention was just the opposite—namely, that "a presbytery of 128 members having acquitted Dr. Briggs of all the charges against him by majorities ranging from 6 to 21, *this acquittal should be final*, and subsequently, as if to cap the climax of illogicality, he avowed that if the court of last resort should reverse the

decision of the lower court he would not submit. The Assembly, nevertheless, did reverse the decision by a vote of 3 to 1, and he has shown by his course since the meeting of the Assembly that he meant what he said.

The earnest and persistent contention by Dr. Briggs and many of his friends that a decision by a pre-bytery, that certain doctrinal teaching was not inconsistent with the doctrinal standards, should be accepted by the entire Church as authoritative and final, is a striking illustration of the extent to which the judgment of good men may be influenced by their feelings. The contention is the more remarkable in view of the fact that a conflicting decision had been given by another presbytery on substantially the same issue. In mathematics a proposition is regarded as demonstrated when it is shown that the opposite hypothesis leads to an absurdity.

If it be asked, Where is the fallacy in the reasoning by which the erroneous conclusion is reached—the argument from analogy in the proceedings of civil courts? we answer, The fallacy is in not discriminating between a trial for *immorality* and a trial for *heresy*, especially when the sole issue, as in the present case is, whether certain acknowledged doctrinal teaching is or is not consistent with the doctrinal standards. Tho immorality and heresy are alike technically "offenses," they are offenses of an entirely different character, and the consequences of acquittal are entirely different. The former is a sin in conduct; the latter an error in opinion. In a trial for immorality the issue is purely personal; in a trial for heresy the issue tho personal in form is in substance impersonal, and should be decided without regard to any personal considerations. Acquittal in the former case does not authorize the accused and others to commit the offense alleged; acquittal in the latter case is a decision that the opinions in question are not heretical and leaves the accused and all other Presbyterian ministers at liberty to teach and to preach them. It meets but a distinct statement of the issue to expose the fallacy of the contention, that in a Church whose distinctive characteristic is a common faith, any one of two hundred presbyteries can decide for the entire Church what that common faith is. No court but the court of last resort can interpret authoritatively and finally the doctrinal Constitution.

To justify his disregard of the Assembly's interpretation of the Constitution, doctrinal or ecclesiastical, if it does not accord with his judgment, Dr. Briggs maintained, that

"The vow of the subjection of the individual to his brethren is strictly limited by the obligation of the Church itself and of every minister in the Church, to the Form of Government, the Book of Discipline, the Westminster (?) Confession of Faith, and Holy Scripture. These documents make up the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church. Within these constitutional limits the majority may exercise their right to decide the questions legally brought before them. If they transcend these limits their decisions do not bind the individual or the Church—they are altogether null and void."

This, at least, is not without the merit of plausibility. Does not the Confession say:

"God alone is lord of the conscience and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are in anything contrary to his work or beside it in matters of faith and practice"; "all synods and councils, whether general or particular, since the Apostles' time may err."

Does not the Form of Government say:

"The right of private judgment in all matters that respect religion is universal and unalienable?"

All this is true; and every Presbyterian minister and member has the right to entertain and to express his opinion as to the constitutionality of any decision of the Assembly. And yet, all this does not touch the precise point at issue. The point is this—in case a Presbyterian minister, in the exercise of his right of private judgment, differs from the Assembly in the interpretation of the Constitution, is his judgment or the judgment of the Assembly to be made the rule of his conduct *in his ecclesiastical action?* Now whatever other article of the Constitution is of doubtful interpretation there can be no doubt as to the meaning of the first clause of Sec. 5, Chap. XII, of the Form of Government:

"*To the General Assembly belongs the power of deciding in all controversies respecting doctrine and discipline.*"

This does not assert or assume that the Assembly may not err. It does not deny the right of private judgment. But in every constitutional government, whether in Church or State, there must be, as was shown by Dr. Briggs above, some tribunal whose interpretation of the Constitution is authoritative and final, and the clause referred to settles that in the Presbyterian Church the General Assembly is that tribunal. Whatever else may be of questionable constitutionality acceptance of the Assembly's interpretation of the Constitution by a Presbyterian minister in his ecclesiastical action is unquestionably *constitutional*.

Further, the clause of the Constitution referred to, in connection with the vow of subjection to brethren in the Lord, and its historical antecedents, settles the question as to the duty of a Presbyterian minister who cannot with a good conscience "passively submit" to the judgment of the Assembly in a matter regarded by the Assembly as essential in doctrine or discipline.

This subject has an important bearing on the grave question now prominently before the Church as to the relation of Presbyterian theological seminaries to the General Assembly. Whether a seminary be formally under the supervision and control of the Assembly or not, the directors, being office-bearers in the Presbyterian Church, are individually under vows "to maintain the purity and peace of the Church," and to be in subjection to brethren in the Lord. If an office bearer in the Church cannot consistently with his ordination vows teach doctrines which in the judgment of the Assembly are contrary to the doctrinal standards, he cannot authorize another, or allow another for whom he is responsible, to teach such doctrines, and especially to teach such doctrines to candidates for the Presbyterian ministry. In his Report on Theological Seminaries to the Assembly in 1870, Dr. William Adams says:

"It is obvious that a matter so important as the education of its ministry should in some way be under the control of the Church."

In its statement of fundamental principles the Constitution declares "it necessary, to make effectual provision, that *all who are admitted as teachers be sound in the faith.*" It enjoins that "except in extraordinary cases, no candidate shall be licensed unless he shall have studied at least two years under *some approved divine or professor of theology.*" The compact proposed by Union Seminary and adopted by the Assembly in 1870, did not impose any new obligation on the directors individually; it simply formulated a mode of fulfilling an existing obligation. A Seminary director (or professor) is bound by the above mentioned articles of the Constitution, as well as by ordination vows, in the discharge of his duties in connection with the Seminary as in all his other ecclesiastical relations. These obligations existed before the compact of 1870. They were independent of it whilst the compact was recognized, and they continue binding whatever legal justification there may be for declaring the compact null and void.

PRINCETON, N. J.

OUR GREAT NATIONAL PARK.

BY LYMAN B. SPERRY.

Soon after the close of the War of the Rebellion an Irish boy who had seen service in the West and who, besides keeping his eyes open, had kept open ears and a receptive mind for the reports of trappers, hunters, prospectors and adventurers, became an employé of a volunteer general who had become a member of Congress.

At an opportune time this Irish servant said to the military statesman: "Why don't you Congressmen provide for an intelligent geographical and geological survey of the Territories west of the Missouri River, and see what this country possesses, before you give it all away to railroad companies and speculators? I am satisfied," said the boy, "that the far West has marvelous beauties and great wealth that the nation should discover and save before it is too late."

The result of that suggestion was that the next congressional Appropriation bill contained this provision:

"And for the geological survey of the Territories west of the Missouri River, under the direction of Dr. F. V. Hayden, $10,000."

But why the clause, "Under the direction of Dr. F. V. Hayden?" The story is, I think, of sufficient interest to justify publication.

In 1857 a poor, sensitive, almost pessimistic young man graduated from Oberlin College. He was at war with the theology of his *alma mater* and almost a hater of his race, because of the struggles he had been obliged to make, and the neglect he imagined he had experienced, during his early years. But he loved nature and almost worshiped science. In mental unrest and uncertainty, and bordering almost to despair, he set out for the West.

Finding himself in St. Louis early one summer, he secured passage on a steamer that was going up the Missouri River to the head of navigation. Reaching that far-off country, he remained there until fall. During the season he diligently studied the geology and botany of the country, and collected a quantity of natural history specimens, together with many curiosities and relics which he obtained from the natives. Returning to St. Louis he sold a part of his collection to an institution of that city for a fair price, and the remainder he disposed of further east. Encouraged by his experiences and cheered by the financial results, he returned another season to the far West; and, living much among the Indians, cultivated their good will, and became expert in Western scientific exploration and ethnological study.

The young Irishman who suggested a governmental geological survey of the Territories had met Dr. Hayden (the man above indicated), and had learned of his interesting and successful experiences in the wilds of the West. So when the military statesman asked his servant: "Do you know a good man to organize and lead such an exploring party?" the reply was: "Yes, sir; Dr. F. V. Hayden."

The following spring (I think it was 1857) found Dr. Hayden and a few assistants at Omaha, fitting out for a summer's work. The young Irishman who suggested the exploration was along, as master of transportation and general manager of the non-scientific features of the outfit. Seeing a photographer's tent among the miscellaneous habitations of embryonic Omaha, he suggested that it would be a good scheme to secure a photographer, who should take views of the interesting objects and beautiful scenery they might find. Accordingly Dr. Hayden visited the tent, and secured the services of the young artist for the season. Then began the work of the United States Geological Bureau. Its promoter in Congress was Gen. John A. Logan. The Irish boy who suggested it became known as "Col. James Stevenson." The young photographer is the artist, James H. Jackson, of Denver. Dr. Hayden, as director, achieved a world-wide reputation as an exploring scientist.

The Geological Bureau has grown to be an important Department of our Government, and the country is to be congratulated on the amount of valuable work that it has accomplished.

But of all the work done by it nothing is more interesting and far-reaching in value than that which resulted in the setting apart, as a perpetual reservation and pleasure ground, the region now known as the Yellowstone National Park.

Previous to 1871, little had been scientifically and positively ascertained regarding the many natural wonders in the vicinity of Yellowstone Lake. But in that year the Geological Bureau organized a large party and undertook a work which occupied not only that season, but also a part of 1872. The reports and descriptions of the work of 1871, verified by the fine photographs of Mr. Jackson, so interested our public men that it was comparatively easy to induce Congress to set aside, in perpetuity, as a National Park, an area about 55 by 65 miles, embracing a great variety of marvelous natural exhibitions.

Near the center of this reserved area is the beautiful Yellowstone Lake. Its blue surface reflects the sky from an altitude of 7,788 feet above the sea. The shape of the lake is somewhat like a man's hand with the index finger severed and lying at a short distance as a lonely, withering fragment. The Upper Yellowstone River, which is about twenty-five miles long, empties into the lake at the tip of the little finger. The outlet, or the beginning of the Lower Yellowstone River, is at the part which corresponds to the wrist, and is at the northerly extremity of the lake. In other words, this lake, which so closely resembles a man's hand, points its fingers toward the South. The average dimensions of this curiously outlined body of water may be given as approximately 20 by 30 miles. It is surrounded and fondly sheltered by ranges of snow-capped peaks, many of which rise 2,000 feet or more above the lake's surface. The most imposing of these mountain peaks are Doane, Stevenson, Langford and Sheridan.

It is truly a rare and inspiring experience to take the beautiful and graceful steel steamer, "Zilla," at "The Thumb" of the lake, and cruise about on the still, clear waters under the bluest of skies and in the purest of air at an altitude nearly half a mile above the summit of our boasted Mt. Washington, in New England. The exhilarating influence of the scene, aided by the rarefied air, often causes even those who are not given to slang to ask "How's this for *high?*" But beautiful lakes abound in the United States, and it would hardly pay the average tourist to come so far simply to see the bodies of water that dot the landscape of the National Park, although they are unusually beautiful in form and coloring, and remarkably interesting in landscape settings.

The really unique and surprising wonders of this region are: Terrace Mountain, with its Mammoth Hot Springs; the hundreds of hot, steaming and boiling pools; the many intense geysers; the various paint pots, or springs of boiling pigment; the gorgeous, Grand Cañon of the Yellowstone River and its imposing cataracts; and the marvelous coloring of the waters and of the rock deposits from the springs and geysers.

The rainbow seems put to shame by the variety and delicacy of the shades of color which characterize the deposits about many of the hot pools, springs and geysers in this region. Nowhere else in the world is there such beautifully tinted water or such delicately colored rock. The waters of the Blue Grotto of Capri are tame and pale compared with the Emerald Pool of the Upper Geyser Basin.

It would take a large volume adequately to describe the wonderful exhibitions which are spread out for our entertainment and instruction within the boundaries of this reservation. In this letter I can attempt nothing more than hints concerning the attractions, together with a few suggestions regarding the best time and easiest way to see them.

The best season of the year for visiting the Park is in August and September: for then the streams are at their highest stage and the cascades are most numerous, vegetation is at its best, flowers are most abundant in the openings, and the dust along the roads is least troublesome. Then, too, the stage horses are in best condition, and the drivers and other employés of the Park Association are most enthusiastic. It is also an advantage to be in the Park (and at any place of natural beauty) during a full moon; for the moonlight, particularly about the lake and at the Grand Cañon, adds very much to the effect on one's mind. But any time between June 1st and October 1st is better than no visit at all.